

Collapse of international order, or a Controlled chaos?

Dr. Alexander Kouzminov

Introduction

Modernity is mistakenly perceived as a series of chaotic crises, random conflicts and arbitrary decisions of individual leaders. In fact, humanity lives at a historical point similar to the Middle Ages, when eternal institutions collapsed, empires disappeared, and new centres of power are starting to merge.

A very important process has begun in the world – the era of global economic, political and social change. This transformation could take several decades of – war, famine, and disease. The change in world order at first happens slowly, and then gains speed in leaps. Now, for more than twenty years – the world has been living in conditions of global restructuring and redistribution of power and authority, – the consequences of which are seen in many political, economic, and military conflicts. It is important to understand the components of this process and how they will affect the main aspects of international and domestic relations.

1) Key events as the beginning of global change:

The following key moments can serve as the turning points of world reconstruction.

- Globalization reached its peak with the end of Cold War, then intensified in the 1990s and early 2000s, after which the process of partial deglobalization and the formation of a multipolar world had begun. This had accelerated global economic growth due to new markets, and helped reduce inflation in developed countries. Integration of several billion workers into the global economy has led to increased profits for multinational companies, which has provided a stable foothold for global stock markets. Trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border capital flows, have increased dramatically.
- The 2008 financial crisis was extinguished via printed money. Globalization had reached its peak, notably because advanced manufacturing technologies were no longer dependent on the location of production where labour costs are cheapest.
- More and more countries have begun to question the benefits of financial liberalization, which has been a central feature of the last wave of globalization.
- Globalization has undermined the power of national governments and has been blamed for growing inequality, tax evasion by multinational corporations and unwanted migration.
- The undermining of the emerging multipolarity began with the coup in Ukraine in 2014, when the legitimately elected president was overthrown and his legitimacy was not challenged even in the West. The goal of the American elite and the liberal-globalist forces of war was to create a threat in Ukraine near Russia, similar to the Cuban Missile Crisis. Such a Ukraine, rearmed by the West and motivated by cave Russophobia (a variant of racism), was called upon to finally solve the "Russian question", namely, to destroy it as a state and then proceed to aggressively contain China, playing trade and economic interdependence against it.
- With the crisis in Ukraine, the collapse of the international legal order has accelerated. The collective West not only refused to negotiate with Russia on security guarantees for the

expansion of NATO to the borders of Russia, but also, contrary to its own "values" of human rights and national minorities, denied the existence of the problem of suppressing and persecuting the Russian-speaking population of Ukraine, as well as in the Baltic countries.

- The roadmap for the transition to a new world order was outlined by neoliberal globalists (former left-wing neoliberals) in the "Great Reset Plan", which was solemnly presented and discussed during the June (2020) and January (2021) meetings at the World Economic Forum in Davos.
- The new socio-economic formation (NSF), which the globalist neoliberals declared in the "Great Reset Plan", is intended to replace the dying capitalism and liberal democracy, as the neo-globalist elite¹ believes, does not meet the challenges of the 21st century and provides for the "zeroing out" of all spheres of human life and the emergence of a qualitatively new system in education, nutrition, healthcare, culture, and social relations.
- The new economic model, enshrined in the Declaration adopted at the G20 Summit in Osaka in the summer of 2019, is based on the concept of the digital economy, which will drive the exponential development of technologies based on "Big Data" collected with the help of smart technologies (for example: digitalization of man and economy, artificial intelligence, bioengineering, robotics, etc.). The introduction of such an infrastructure of "inclusive capitalism" and the digital world is taking place under climate and pandemic pretexts.
- Neo-globalists want to weaken the model of the nation state as an actor in international relations with the further transfer of state sovereignty to global governance institutions. This is planned to be done through regionalization, on the one hand, and through the stimulation of all kinds of crises (hybrid wars, conflicts, crises, pandemics, and calls to "submit to global authority, because global crises require global solutions."
- Despite the fact that the "New World Order" is trying to control the supranational world elite,² a consensus has begun to form among many national leaders that the world needs a fairer and more sustainable model of governance than traditional capitalism.³

Lessons and conclusions:

- The most important feature of 'inclusive capitalism' is the deep involvement of the supranational world's elite and their transnational corporations into the management/governance of society.

2) Formation of the "New World Order"

The next 10-15 years will be a turbulent time. It will be difficult to understand the general picture, what is happening to the geopolitical balance of power. It will be difficult to understand the logic of how the world processes and events are developing (or not-developing at all).

The geopolitical landscape in the coming years will be characterized by the emergence of a world where global and regional powers will seek to play a leading role in the formation of a "New World Order". At the same time – at supranational and national levels, a reshuffling of old and new elites will occur – each seeking to establish their place under the sun, amidst the ongoing global changes.

It is not yet clear, what shape the new political world map might take. Most likely, it could take the form of regionalization, such as BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) alliances. Alternatively, the world could be divided into competing superpower blocs.

The task of the neo-globalists – while building a qualitatively new formation in human history, – is to weaken the main centres of power, that is, the superpowers; so that they can consolidate supranational power in their own, trans-corporate hands. Along this path, they view the independent nation-state as a futile governance model and an ineffective actor in international relations. This inevitably leads to the emergence of struggle between various segments of the world, – a struggle for participating in the restructuring of the world order, which leads to wars and conflicts in different parts of the world. Each side, the so-called neo-globalists and traditional conservatives has their own global project for a new world.

The neo-globalists, essentially the global financial cartel, envision a financial-corporate world where the line between transnational corporations and the state will be erased, and governance will be exercised by corporations through international institutions. In this project, states would formally exist under a close control of corporations.

Traditional conservatives focus on preserving the nation-state, modernized industry, and the middle and working classes. The nation-state continues to exist, but is subordinate to international financial institutions; and tech-savvy transnational corporations are subordinate to the state.

Lessons and conclusions:

- The formation of a global project of a new world can eventually get out of the control and lead to large-scale conflicts and wars.

3) International law no longer exists

The kidnapping of President Maduro and the establishment of direct external control over Venezuela, threats to Mexico, Cuba, and Denmark (we are talking about Greenland), and attacks on Iran, which destroyed the military-political and religious leadership of the country – a sovereign power that was in a state of negotiations with the United States and did not abandon them – radically changes the balance of power in the world, abolishes the norms of international relations and the rules of international politics.

The liberalism of the collective West very quickly disappeared from the agenda. No one talks about liberal values or democracy anymore – all of that is a thing of the past. Now only the right of the strong applies, the right of the fast – the one who strikes faster or performs this or that action quicker – turns out to be right, and everything else becomes only an additional (and in fact, false) justification.⁴

Western liberal values and democracy are all in the past, and the cult of global power reigns. Western civilization with its cult of violence, Satanism and perversion ("Epstein's kingdom") is throwing off its masks before our eyes and is beginning to attack in earnest.

President Donald Trump has declared that international law no longer exists: "*What is moral is what I believe to be.*" In early January 2026, Donald Trump stated that he does not need international law, and that his "own morality" and "own mind" are the only constraints on his

power as president, rather than international law or traditional checks and balances.⁵ On topic after topic, President Trump made clear that he would be the arbiter of any limits to his authorities, not international law or treaties.

Stephen Miller, the president's homeland security adviser, said at the same time that the Trump administration would act from a position of strength, not from a position of international law, in order to achieve its foreign policy goals: "*You can say whatever you want about international pleasantries and all that. But we live in a real world that is governed by force, coercion, and authority. This is the iron law of the world.*"⁶

In response to recent events related to U.S. claims to Greenland, the economic blockade and possible seizure of Cuba, the war with Iran, and other negative actions of the White House, the Kremlin responded that international law has indeed ceased to exist in the world: "*Unfortunately, we have all lost what we call international law. <... > It is not <clear> how someone <can> be urged to follow the norms and principles of international law. In fact, it no longer exists. De jure it exists, but de facto it no longer exists. <... > No one will be able to formulate what law has taken the place of the disappeared international law. We can only speculate on this topic, but no one will give a clear definition,*" – Dmitry Peskov, press secretary of the President of the Russian Federation.⁷

Lessons and conclusions:

- Today, it is no longer possible to talk about compliance with international rules, laws or any norms of international relations in the world.
- The former liberal globalist world order, based on "rules", no longer exists.

4) A "New World Order" in the American way

A significant shift has occurred in the US administration's policy. The new National Security Strategy 2025 (Strategy 2025)⁸ states that the United States will henceforth focus on the "Western Hemisphere," while maintaining cooperation among western European and North American nations (political, economic and defence issues). The White House proclaims direct American hegemony, with US dominance over the entire American continent, which is clearly reflected in Strategy 2025:

- complete and absolute sovereignty of the United States and independence from any transnational institutions, rejection of globalism;
- suppressing significant geopolitical influence on all countries of North and South America from other major powers (China, Russian, European countries);
- United States to establish direct military-political and economic hegemony over both America and adjacent spaces.

Strategy 2025 includes the promotion of US vassal regimes in Latin America, the removal of politicians that are undesirable to Washington, and interference in the internal affairs of any states in this region – under far-fetched pretexts.

"Under our new national security strategy, American dominance in the western hemisphere will never be questioned again" – this is how the US President formulated the key principle of his the

"Donroe Doctrine,"⁹ – what Donald Trump now calls the updated version of the two-hundred-year-old Monroe Doctrine.¹⁰

Note: The Monroe Doctrine was used by the United States in the late 19th century to create the Pan American Union, also known as the International Union of American Republics, which was transformed into the world's first regional organization, the Organization of American States, after World War II,¹¹ to keep its southern neighbours under control.

Within the Strategy 2025 and as per the new picture of the world according to Washington, – such concepts as Western civilization, identity, cultural continuity, social cohesion on this basis, and others, – were heard for the first time (not to mention criticism of globalism and the "end of history"). The allies were invited to switch to these ideological positions as a condition for preserving transatlantic relations. In fact, the United States has recognized that the new world order will be inter-civilizational, and in order to maintain its advantages, the West will have to prove its competitiveness in a qualitatively new global environment – by means of a civilizational cleansing of its society, no matter how painful and retrograde it may seem.

How true is this? According to the Strategy 2025, a balance of power is needed not only on a global scale (which America should be the guardian of), but also in certain parts of the world.

Donald Trump's Davos address in January¹² and Marco Rubio in Munich in February of this year¹³ suggest that Washington still has to reckon with an uncomfortable reality, including the reaction of allies to the goals of Strategy 2025 and its real capabilities, including military, to achieve its aims.

Reassuring the allies, Rubio criticized the left-liberal value system and tried to explain the fallacy of the false hopes of the liberal democrats, their complacency and confidence in guaranteed world domination after the collapse of the USSR: "*The euphoria of this triumph victory led us to a dangerous delusion: that every nation would now be a liberal democracy; that the ties formed by trade and by commerce alone would now replace nationhood; that the rules-based global order would now replace the national interests; and that we would now live in a world without borders where everyone becomes a citizen of the world. <... > This was a foolish idea of living in a world without borders,*" – Secretary of State Marco Rubio at the Munich Security Conference.¹⁴

Regarding the preservation of transatlantic solidarity, Rubio also tried to reassure EU leaders: "*In a time of headlines heralding the end of the trans-Atlantic era, let it be known and clear to all that this is neither our goal nor our wish, because for us Americans, our home may be in the Western Hemisphere, but we will always be a child of Europe. <... > For the United States and Europe, we belong together.*"¹⁵

The transatlantic era thus continues. At the same time, Rubio emphasized the strategic aspect of Europe: "*We want Europe to be strong. <... > Our fate has always been and will always be intertwined with yours. Because the fate of Europe will never be indifferent to us.*" He assured that nothing threatens NATO either. "*We do not want to separate from Europe, but we want to revive the alliance.*"

History repeats itself, only now without games of equality under the pretence of interstate associations – there is now only a harsh dictatorship and the right of the strong.

In essence, US allies have become expendable materials for American policy, – unable to voluntarily accept the fundamental changes in the world that harken back to the history before the two world wars, but to do so requires knowing history and understanding that it matters.

The shift in US priorities in Europe is also evidenced by the fact that Trump's tariff sanctions over Greenland were intended to target Northern Europe – the most anti-Russian part of NATO and the European Union. As for Canada, the focus is on restoring Anglo-Saxon unity in North America, something the Americans have strived for since the 1812-1814 war with Great Britain. (Canada, created in 1867 by the British North America Act, is under the authority of the British Crown).

The new American-style world order (or, more precisely, the American-centric West, as envisioned by Washington) is associated with a "great war" or a "war of all against all," meaning those who are able to participate. While Strategy 2025 vaguely states that "*the outsized influence of larger, richer, and more powerful countries is an enduring truth of international relations,*" White House was more explicit in its first National Security Strategy of 2017,¹⁶ speaking of "*a world of strong sovereign powers competing with each other.*" Now, "*rejecting the ill-fated concept of global dominance,*" America "*will encourage other countries to put their interests first*"; it also offers its own interpretation of "*fairness.*" The outcomes of these global conflicts, according to Trump administration, reveal a new balance of power and a new "who's who" in world politics.

At the same time, we must not forget that Washington is concealing the true goals of its Strategy 2025, which are inconvenient for its allies. Washington's conservative revolution has the ultimate goal of returning America to the "golden 1950s" when it was on the rise, to bring it back both domestically (the Democrats' destruction of traditional identity) and internationally (globalization and the burdens of a global empire), and make it great again.

In this situation, the inclination to stability encourages the leading players, to formalize the result achieved under these new/old rules in order to provide themselves with space for further development. Therefore, the factor of force is a key instrument of international relations at the current transitional stage of world development, which implies the need to reckon with the power of others, be it military, economic and technological.

Donald Trump's other construct is a Peace Council. Washington declares its intention to extend the Peace Council for Gaza, created by Trump to resolve the problem of the Gaza Strip and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, to other regional conflicts, including Venezuela and Ukraine. The Council acts on the basis of a UN Security Council resolution. But, despite the fact that the Council's connection with the UN remains, we are still talking about a geopolitical structure parallel to the UN, the leadership of which will be exclusively American, and not collective Western and, perhaps, even directed against America's traditional allies, which do not fit into the new system of geopolitical coordinates of the United States.

The success of each new US action and military operation will make Trump administration increasingly confident in its abilities. Donald Trump's rhetoric is becoming more and more outspoken and harsh. He actually legalized prohibited political techniques and started with Venezuela, being sure that no one would stand up for Venezuela. Having started the war in Iran

together with Israel, Trump was also confident that Iran would have neither political nor military-economic support nor allies.

Washington will have to acknowledge its inability to influence processes in Eurasia, as it will be unable to split the regional and transcontinental associations of the SCO and BRICS, isolating them from their other members, including Brazil, South Africa, the Middle East, and other Asian and African countries. Multifaceted cooperation has already emerged here, providing a safety net and alternative to the global architecture controlled by the US and the West (including the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development), and serving the national development interests of the member countries.

The current US administration's lack of incentive to comply with international laws and regulations is leading to anarchy and chaos. Washington, as it currently stands, is demonstrating that compliance with international law is for the weak. For the US, there are no rules. This very postulate could lead to tragic consequences for the world – a world war. And it could start unexpectedly.

The Trump administration wants America to dominate all key regions, including Europe, East Asia and the Middle East. But America's dominance for the Trump administration should serve to strengthen, not erode, its statehood and nation – therefore, instead of globalization, that is, the domination of supranational Atlantic elites, there should be a super-strong United States, which directs everyone, dictates to everyone, coerces everyone.

The attack on Venezuela, the attempt to strangle Cuba energetically, the desire to annex Greenland and Canada, as well as a large-scale attack on Iran – can be regarded as Trump's American withdrawal from the international legal order created on the basis of the Yalta-Potsdam system, without formally leaving the UN.

Lessons and conclusions:

- The former "global policeman" continues to lose control of the world. This situation is described in Strategy 2025: "*The days when the United States, like Atlas, held the entire world order on its shoulders are a thing of the past.*"
- The US administration has embarked on a path of rewriting international rules, erasing existing ones and openly appealing to the civilizational primacy of the West.
- The US strategy of "peace through strength" is becoming a universal rule for everyone, which Donald Trump sees as a real alternative to the UN. As a result of the actions of Trump administration in Europe (tariffs, trade war), on the American continent (threats and subordination to the American will of Venezuela, Greenland, Cuba), in the Middle East (war with Iran, plans to rebuild the region), chaos in other regions of the world is not just intensifying, but is a storm brewing.
- On the near horizon, Trump's America faces geopolitical loneliness.

5) Position of the European Union

Until recently, Washington could boast of the multi-layered system of alliances it had built by subjugating NATO and Europe. However, recent years have made it clear that even the European partners of the United States are now struggling to stay in the field of American interests, or are

beginning to act solely for their own benefit, ignoring US demands on key issues, pursuing an increasingly independent policy, and sometimes arguing harshly with the "big brother" over sanctions and global conflicts.

Politico and Public First conducted a survey in the UK, France, Germany, and Canada – and found that a significant part of the population of these countries now sees the United States as an unreliable and destructive player on the world stage. In Canada, this figure is 56%, in the UK – 35%, in France and Germany – 40%. In addition, 63% of Canadians, 52% of Germans, 47% of French and 46% of British believe that the United States is more likely to create problems for other countries than to solve them.¹⁷

Former Vice President of the European Commission Josep Borrell once declared that "*Europe is a garden <...and...> most of the rest of the world is a jungle, and the jungle could invade the garden.*"¹⁸ Europeans lived under this illusion for a long time, finding themselves at the epicentre of what is commonly called a unipolar world. They enjoyed their "paradise" and sowed chaos in the surrounding "jungle." Now Europe is no longer part of the unipolar world, but its periphery, part of that very jungle where the law of force alone applies. In this "garden," from the US perspective, only one state remains – the US itself. The US is primarily concerned with its sovereignty, its security, its development, and is uninterested in anyone else.

For decades, EU countries have been guided in their politics, security, and even economy toward the United States as part of the Atlantic partnership, each time choosing between European sovereignty and obedience to Washington. Washington pretended to consider the European as equal partners and listened to their opinion, which created the illusion of a consensus of the collective West. The White House destroyed this model and brutally forced the European Union to recognize its vassal position.

In this new situation, the European Union has become independent against its will, and has begun to talk about the need for a European security system in conditions when the United States poses a new serious threat. European politicians are increasingly urging not to rely on United States.

Starting from the end of 2025, the European Union entered into a political and economic war with the United States. The European Parliament voted to suspend the ratification of the trade agreement with the United States. This document was supposed to provide American exporters with the opportunity to import goods into Europe duty-free. President Donald Trump, the White House bargaining master, was told "no" for the first time.

The reason for the freeze was the new US duties imposed on a number of Western European countries. This, in turn, was a response to European attempts to prevent Washington from taking over Greenland.

"*This means that Donald Trump will not receive duty-free access for his American products to the EU internal market. Trump <... > has lost a lot,*" said MEP Manfred Weber. He added that Europe is thus sending a clear signal to the United States.¹⁹ It is noteworthy that this may not be the only "signal" that Brussels will send. Earlier, French President Emmanuel Macron called on the leadership of the European Union to block American investors from entering European state markets, block investments in a number of areas, and impose other sanctions against the United States.

Back in 2020, the President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, unveiled a geopolitical strategy to promote a pan-European "joint military-industrial complex" with the goal of creating a genuine European defence union over the next five years.²⁰ In February 2026, she said that Europe should be more independent. Von der Leyen rejected suggestions that stronger European autonomy could weaken transatlantic ties, saying "*an independent Europe is a strong Europe, and a strong Europe makes for a stronger transatlantic alliance.*"²¹

The European Union sounded an alarm, following: the United States' claims to Greenland, the kidnapping of the Venezuelan president, and threats to Cuba. The outbreak of war in Iran has cemented the US's abandonment of Europe. The war has only accelerated the deterioration of transatlantic relations. The mixed reactions of European capitals have sparked genuine indignation in Washington. The reasons for this rift have been brewing for some time – from disagreements over the Ukrainian conflict to Washington's complete unwillingness to consider the opinions of European leaders.

For the MAGA movement, fears about Europe have been confirmed. For the current US administration, the European continent is not a serious player on the world stage. The war in Iran makes these divisions even sharper. The two political classes are beginning to realize that each worldview is irreconcilable with the other.²²

United States assures to the European Union, that it remains committed to ensuring the security of Europe and nuclear deterrence and will protect any NATO member – in the event of a military conflict. But whether this is really so, is a rhetorical question.

Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty (1949) is the cornerstone of NATO, establishing that an armed attack against one member in Europe or North America is considered an attack against all. It mandates that members will take necessary actions, including armed force, to assist the attacked ally, reinforcing collective defence.

With the arrival of Donald Trump in the Oval Office, the bloc has lost the remnants of subjectivity, and Trump himself treats NATO without any respect. Back in 2016, during his first election campaign, Trump questioned NATO's Article 5, stating: "*Estonia is in the suburbs of St Petersburg. 40% of Estonia is Russian... I'm not sure I would risk nuclear war over some place that is the suburb of St Petersburg.*"²³

In 2018, during his first presidential term, Trump questioned the need to defend Montenegro, which had recently joined NATO: "*It's a tiny country with very aggressive people. They can get angry, and – congratulations! – You have the Third World War.*"²⁴ A year later, the US president abruptly cancelled the final press conference and left the NATO summit ahead of schedule.

The White House pushed for the US to reduce its direct contribution to NATO's collective budget from 22% to 16%, forcing the Europeans to cover the difference. During the 2024 election campaign, Trump said that if Russia attacked an "*ally that doesn't pay,*" he would not only fail to protect it, but would "*encourage Russia to do whatever the hell it wants.*"²⁵

A very common fear in Europe is that the United States is gradually turning away from some of its allies and is moving away from the rules that it itself promoted; that Donald Trump wants to divide the world, so he takes the Western Hemisphere; while the East is ready (or will be forced) to cede to Xi Jinping, and Europe to Putin.

In his annual address to French ambassadors at the Élysée Palace in Paris в январе 2026, French President Emmanuel Macron outlined France's foreign policy priorities, sharply criticizing the US for "*gradually turning away*" from some of its allies and "*breaking free from international rules*", while levelling criticisms and claims against China and Russia, according to a press release issued by the Élysée Palace: "*We are living in a world of great powers with a real temptation to divide up the world*", Macron said, rejecting what he described as a "*new colonialism and new imperialism*." Macron did acknowledge that "*multilateral institutions are functioning less and less effectively*."²⁶

Europe is truly alarmed by the "Donroe Doctrine". European fears are understandable: the Americans will reach an agreement with Putin on Ukraine, and then abandon their security guarantees, leaving the Old World alone to deal with Russia.

US Permanent Representative to the European Union Andrew Pazder criticized the Industrial Accelerator Act, since according to the diplomat, it will harm the collective defence of allies: "*Adopting the proposed rules would be a serious mistake and a direct violation*" of the terms of the trade agreement between the United States and the European Union.²⁷

The Industrial Accelerator Act, which the European Commission plans to publish in March, aims to stimulate the European economy and curb the industrial downturn. Currently, the European Union's manufacturing industry is forced to shut down production and lay off thousands of workers due to cheap Chinese imports, high energy prices and the cost of complying with the EU's strict climate initiatives.²⁸

The United States expresses dissatisfaction with the emergence of this bill and emphasizes that the European Union and the United States have a very intertwined defence industrial base, and many companies producing weapons for NATO and Ukraine have production facilities in both Europe and the United States; that the use of language that favours Europe could be very dangerous because it weakens our joint defence efforts.

The US needs a strong Europe even less than its allies in the Persian Gulf countries. Nevertheless, a united European Union without serious internal contradictions is the most powerful trade and production bloc that can economically oppose the United States. A strong Europe may even turn on protectionism (its own tariffs) to protect itself from American goods and services. A strong Europe can say "no", for example, to American sanctions against China or pursue its own policy in the Middle East. And finally, a strong euro is a potential threat to the dollar's dominance.

Therefore, from Donald Trump's point of view, Europe must be strong enough to buy American goods, including weapons and liquefied natural gas (LNG). But weak enough not to have its own unified army nor world-class production centres.

Lessons and conclusions:

- European Union has ceased to be part of the unipolar world it created, turning into its periphery, experiencing all the risks and threats posed by the unipolar world.
- Under Donald Trump, the EU countries are feeling the consequences of their own policy, under which the right of the strong is asserted in the world.

6) Central Asia – Creation of the Turkic World

In August 2025, the United States took control of the Zangezur transit corridor connecting Azerbaijan with Nakhichevan through the Syunik Voivodeship (the Syunik southernmost province) of Armenia, after Armenia transferred it to the US administration for 99 years. This project has a number of serious geopolitical traps, as it symbolizes the redistribution of power in the South Caucasus. In particular, it does not meet the interests of Russia, since Armenia and Azerbaijan are shifting their foreign policy interests to the West. It does not meet the interests of Iran, since Azerbaijan is connected to Nakhichevan through Iranian territory, and Tehran does not want to lose its transit status.

If the Zangezur corridor is established, it will have profound geopolitical implications, as an unimpeded land passage from Nakhichevan to Azerbaijan will give Turkey access to the Caspian Sea and Central Asia. This, in turn, will open up new economic opportunities for Ankara in the South Caucasus and Central Asia, as well as the opportunity to strengthen ties with the Turkic peoples inhabiting these regions. Turkey is trying to take them under its control, creating a project of its Turkic world – the empire of the "Great Turan" – following the example of the European Union.

Strengthening the unity of the Turkic states is a mainstream narrative that Turkey has been promoting in the post-Soviet space since the early 2000s. If recently this meant cultural and economic cooperation designed to bring together peoples with common ethnic roots, now there are calls to ensure this unity not by "soft power", but by military means. We are talking about the creation of a system of security treaties on the basis of the Organization of Turkic States – the prototype of a future military bloc.

In October 2025, Azerbaijan hosted the XII summit of the Organization of Turkic States (OTS), which brought together Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan, where it was stated that the Turkic countries should become a single "centre of power" against the backdrop of modern geopolitical challenges and collectively confront those who violate "norms and international law."²⁹

The participants agreed to jointly develop the military-industrial complex, exchange military technologies and hold general military exercises in the post-Soviet space for the first time in history. In 2025, Turkey and Azerbaijan have already conducted more than 25 bilateral and multilateral exercises (for example, the Birlik-2025 (Unity-2025) exercises in Uzbekistan with the participation of other Central Asian states).

Many heads of state perceived the ideas of Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev with restraint – there has been no public support from them yet. Despite the fact that the Secretary General of the OTS, Kubanychbek Omuraliev, rejected the possibility of turning the OTS into a military bloc and called for the development of ties with external allies, Turkey and Azerbaijan have not abandoned their goal of creating a Turkic analogue of NATO – their strategy looks soft, but long-term.

The formation of a Turkic military bloc carries serious risks for Russia.

If earlier the military exercises held under the auspices of the Turkic countries since 2010 were mainly anti-terrorist all this time, then in recent years their nature has changed notably. First, they began to be held with the participation of Turkey, a NATO member country. Secondly, infantry units, aviation, unmanned aerial vehicles and naval forces began to participate in them. That is,

the focus has shifted from counter-terrorism tasks to working out scenarios for a large-scale war and the use of high-precision weapons.

It should also be remembered that Central Asia is a sphere of influence not only for Russia, but also for China. Therefore, China is unlikely to want to see a Turkic military alliance there and will oppose the emergence of such military alliances in the post-Soviet space. However, at this stage, Russia does not have much political and economic leverage over the countries of the region to thwart these plans.

Russia has traditionally maintained a high level of loyalty with Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan and will not force them to refuse to participate in OTS military exercises at least in 2026. If the question arises about the membership of these states in several military alliances at the same time – in the Collective Security Treaty Organization and in the "Turkic NATO" – it will become much more acute. It is important that by that time Russia retains political and economic levers of influence on the countries of the region.

In December 2025, a meeting was held of the OTS in Baku, Azerbaijan, where the creation of a single map of the Turkic world was discussed.³⁰ Prior to this, the Ministry of National Education of Turkey announced, that the term Central Asia would be replaced by Turkestan. The organization is already developing common geographical, including military, maps of the Turkic world. A single pool of financial donors is being formed, a common Turkic alphabet recognized to unite languages, textbooks for all Turkic states are being actively developed, etc. In addition, Turkey is increasing the supply of its weapons, gradually transferring Central Asian countries NATO standards. That is, the integration of the Turkic states under the auspices of Turkey is in full swing.

There is an active formation of a single energy space of the Turkic countries and the unification of two energy corridors for the export of "clean" energy to Turkey and Europe. The transportation of hydrocarbon resources from the eastern coast of the Caspian Sea to the western coast (to Azerbaijan) through a pipeline passing through the Caspian Sea – is becoming one of the priorities for the Turkic states. The infrastructure for receiving this gas is already ready, and Turkey notes that the formation of a common energy space and cooperation between the Turkic countries will contribute to their development. It will also have a turning point on the European and Mediterranean energy markets.³¹

If the historical unification is completed according to Turkey's plans, Russia will be ousted from its zone of geographical security. Having built the great Turan in the post-Soviet space, Turkey will begin to expand within Russia. In addition, in recent years, military-technical cooperation between Azerbaijan and Turkey has continued to develop – with the aim of creating a common security system in the South Caucasus. Obviously, Turkey will play a leading role in this project.

Lessons and conclusions:

- The expansion of military cooperation between the Turkic states within the framework of the OTS may lead to the creation of a new military bloc on the territory of the former USSR.
- The military rapprochement of the post-Soviet countries with Turkey as a NATO member creates systemic challenges for the Collective Security Treaty Organization. This increases the potential for conflict not only in Transcaucasia, but also in Central Asia.

7) The Middle East

The countries of the Persian Gulf, which allowed the deployment of American military bases on their territory, counted on reliable protection from the United States, but in the end – they received a serious threat to their own security. These bases do not protect, but only provoke dangers. At the same time, the support to the United States by the Gulf countries is declarative, formal, and at the slightest change in the balance of power, they can easily turn away from the United States. Against this background, only relations between the United States and Israel remain unchanged: there is a total coincidence of interests, mutual support and a strategic alliance that is not subject to short-term expediency.

According to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the United States is obliged to protect allies in the broad sense of the word. In March 2026, American bases became the main targets of Iran's counterattack. Israel and the United States resorted to provocations, hoping to attract the Persian Gulf countries to their side in order to expand the geography of the conflict.

The situation with the alleged recent shelling of the US Incirlik airbase with nuclear weapons in Turkey by Iranian missiles is extremely confusing – there is no public evidence in the form of fragments of missiles. If we assume that Iran is being framed, then the circle of interested parties is quite wide, and each has its own motives.

For example, there is a hypothesis that Shiite radicals allegedly dream of drawing Iran into a full-scale war with NATO. They may believe that Tehran is being too cautious and that a "hit" of the U.S. nuclear arsenal in Turkey is the perfect way to get its way.

The most traditional candidate for the role of organizer of false flag operations, however, is the Israeli intelligence service Mossad and Israel in general. After all, Israel's main goal is the final solution of the "Iranian issue" through the hands of the United States and NATO. The Americans themselves – also want a change of Iranian regime.

It will be difficult for the US administration to justify a long-term operation against Iran, and Democrats in the Senate are ready to tear him to pieces for this. Therefore, Washington needs to either end it quickly or come up with a new threat.

However, Turkey can also play a role, and there are many reasons for this. This includes strengthening the military presence in the region, for example, in Cyprus or Syria, under the guise of protecting against the Iranian threat. And the consolidation of the nation around Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in the face of an "external enemy". And a test of the loyalty of NATO allies – will they force the United States to really defend Turkey?

Meanwhile, Iran's Ambassador to Ankara, Mohammad Hassan Habibollahzadeh, stated that his country was not involved in the incidents involving missiles shot down in the airspace and is awaiting an investigation by a joint task force, as military observers recall.

Reports of missiles flying towards nuclear weapons are a powerful lever of pressure on public opinion. This legitimizes any pre-emptive strikes on Iran as a "defence of global security."

In early March, the Iranian General Staff reported that Iran had not and is not striking at the territory of friendly countries, in particular, Oman. Iran called two incidents at once a "false flag

operation", accusing Israel of organizing them. It was about the attack on Saudi Aramco oil refineries in Saudi Arabia. Iranian sources (in particular, the Tasnim agency) said that Tehran was not involved in the strikes on Saudi refineries. According to the Iranian side, Israel carried out these strikes to discredit Iran and distract the attention of the international community from attacks on civilian targets inside the Islamic republic.

Then there was an incident with a drone in Azerbaijan – the drone was allegedly launched by Iran. The General Staff of the Iranian Armed Forces officially denied the information about the launch of its UAV into the airspace of Azerbaijan, calling the incident another provocation by Israel. Tehran is confident that the purpose of such operations is to draw its regional neighbours into conflict with Iran.

American journalist and media figure Tucker Carlson says authorities in Qatar and Saudi Arabia have arrested agents enlisted with the Israeli spy agency Mossad planning bombings, to blame it on Iran, and describing the incidents as part of a broader effort to destabilize Persian Gulf countries.³² Carlson argued that the objective behind the plots was to undermine regional stability.

Against the backdrop of these events, Tucker Carlson released a video that can be safely called scandalous (however, definitions like "shocking" are already heard). The footage shows the speech of rabbi Yosef Mizrachi in August 2024. "*Strike Al-Aqsa <Mosque in Jerusalem> and show that Iran did it!*" – says the rabbi in the video (see the screenshot for 2024 https://t.me/voiceofiran_ru in the link).³³

Note: The Al-Aqsa Mosque compound in the Old City of Jerusalem, Islam's third-holiest site.

Carlson notes that if such a provocation were to occur now, Israel would bear no responsibility. It would be entirely different countries that would reap the consequences. But the plan for such provocations is clearly creaking along. Arab states are in no hurry to engage in a war with Iran. However, this doesn't mean the provocateurs will give up their attempts.

The above proves that the United States and Israel are dragging their allies into an unnecessary war at any cost.

The future balance of power in the world will largely depend on how long Iran can resist a war with the United States and Israel. Iran may be the last thing standing in the way of a direct war between Western civilization and the proponents of a multipolar world.

According to experts close to the Kremlin,³⁴ if Iran continues to wage this war after the destruction of its political leadership, if it does not surrender, does not throw out the white flag and does not capitulate, then it may end badly for the collective West, the US administration, and NATO countries. But if the new leadership of Iran declares surrender, or the military simply cannot continue fighting, – then the war will be short.

Then all other states will begin to act in the same way as the United States and Israel, regardless of international law. This will untie the hands of many regional powers that will do whatever they want. So, the situation can very quickly come to the use of nuclear weapons.

Lessons and conclusions:

- The war in Iran, which has affected the Persian Gulf countries, is not a temporary conflict. It is no longer a peaceful region and there won't be one for a long time.
- The geography of the conflict in the Persian Gulf can expand at any moment.
- It is no longer possible to talk about compliance with international rules, laws, or any norms of international relations in the world.

8) China's position

China opposes the sole rule of the world by major powers. Commenting on the concept of the G2 – the joint management of the world by China and the United States, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi said at the annual press conference at the session of the National People's Congress (People's Republic of China parliament) in March 2026: *"China will never follow the old path in which a strong nation inevitably seeks hegemony, nor will it support the logic of the world being jointly ruled by major powers."*³⁵

He stressed that China and the United States, of course, have a significant impact on the world and can change the way states coexist, but it should not be forgotten that there are more than 190 countries on the planet.

The Minister noted that world history has always been written jointly by all countries and the future of mankind has always been created jointly by the peoples of all nations. As for the Middle East, the diplomat stressed that the major powers should uphold justice and make a positive contribution to the peace and development of this region. *"Therefore, pluralistic coexistence is the true face of human society, and multipolar coexistence is the proper form of international order. No matter how the international situation develops and how developed China becomes, the country will never seek hegemony or expansion,"* Wang Yi said.³⁶

Commenting on relations between China and the United States, the minister noted that *"relations between China and the United States affect the interests of many parties and have an impact on the whole world. If the two countries do not interact with each other, it will only lead to misunderstandings, misjudgements, conflicts, confrontation and further damage to peace... Both China and the United States are large states. We cannot change each other, but we can change the way we coexist, namely to adhere to mutual respect, defend the foundations of peaceful coexistence, and pursue the prospects for mutually beneficial cooperation."*³⁷

The struggle for resources to maintain the development of its economy – reflects China's transformation into a strategic competitor for the United States, so China's disengagement and rebuff from the United States will be inevitable. On the other hand, part of the European elite seeks cooperation with China (but on its own terms), while their military-industrial complex is interested in exacerbating relations with China and Russia.

The collective West is also concerned that Russia could become an important source of raw materials for China. At the same time, Russia and China are demonstrating a course toward even closer economic rapprochement, even hinting at the possibility of a military alliance, while the neo-globalist elite sees China as a potential driver of a new world order in the future.

For its part, China understands that provoking conflicts along the Silk Road could impede China's ties with Europe, posing a threat to Iran and Russia. Therefore, China is preparing its

infrastructure for the moment when it is cut off from access to the West. In April 2021, an agreement was signed on China's assistance to Iran for 25 years in exchange for the modernization of Iran according to the Chinese model, where China will invest \$400 billion in 10 sectors of the Iranian economy.³⁸

China will also seek to maintain control over South China waters, which means controlling trade routes to Taiwan, Japan, and Korea. In Africa, India (and Japan) and China will clash over resources. China accounts for 62% of Africa's interstate bilateral debt, and since the 2008 global financial crisis, China has gradually increased direct lending to developing countries. About 60% of China's total loans to developing countries are collateralized. When a country asks for debt relief, Chinese creditors can claim rights to the pledged assets.

However, some experts on sinology do not rule out the threat of a world war with China, since Trump has added uncertainty and risks not only to Sino-American relations or US-Russian relations, but also to the entire world system. One way or another, in the context of the formation of a new world order, the formation of new coalitions, most likely, some risk of military conflict will remain until the end of Xi Jinping's tenure until 2035, experts say. It is possible that the "Uyghur factor" may also be involved.³⁹

Note: The "Uyghur factor" is a geopolitical and domestic political issue related to the situation of Uyghurs in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China. Since 2014, China has been pursuing a policy of strict control due to threats to its own security. This factor affects China's relations with Turkey, Central Asia and the West. Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Turkey. The presence of Uyghur diasporas in neighbouring countries affects China's relations with these states.

Lessons and conclusions:

- China is a strategic competitor for the collective West, a supporter of a multipolar world, opposing the sole rule of the world by major powers.
- China justifiably claims to be one of the leading participants in the formation of the "New World Order".

9) Russia's position

Russia is in a state of multifaceted war with the West. Russia should not be deceived by the hybrid nature of this war, nor by the United States' desire to "softly" disengage from it, shifting the burden of responsibility to Europe and turning it into a war that doesn't affect the mother country or the core of national identity, but is waged on the periphery of its zones of influence, with varying success, and without consequences for the status of the main players.

In this situation, Russia can draw two conclusions. *First*, that acquiring weak and distant allies who are incapable of independent defence is a risky and costly strategy. *Secondly*, – the White House's frank statements about disregard for international law and the proclamation of the right of the strong as the supreme law – means, that in a world of predators, one cannot afford to be weak. This reality requires an appropriate force to protect one's own interests and ideas about the truth.

Russia will never allow the division of a unified Russian space, regardless of whether the European Union tries to counteract Russia alone or together with the United States. The most radical evidence of this was Russia's self-determination as an "original state-civilization," as stated

in the Concept of Russia's Foreign Policy,⁴⁰ and Russia's positioning on the side of the Global South and East.

Europe, – Russia's recent trading partner, is feverishly looking for ways to survive in a reality of its own making. Drawn into an open clash with Russia in order to destroy its growing influence in the world, European politicians not only superficially assessed the consequences of this for their own economy, but also did not realize at the expense of what resources and, most importantly, whose well-being they had so far maintained their standard of living.

Against the backdrop of Europe's systemic crisis, the most painful for it was the break with the Russian market. As a result, trade and logistic routes (previously controlled by the West) have been transferred to new hubs, which, unlike the European Union, do not intend to repeat mistakes and sacrifice colossal profits during the global economic downturn.

At present, the countries of the Middle East are more disposed than ever to a friendly and constructive dialogue with Moscow. The reason is obvious: as the United States increases its control over oil resources in various parts of the world, it is transforming itself from the main consumer of OPEC hydrocarbons into a direct and very aggressive competitor of this cartel. The energy-producing countries that are leaders in the Middle East are interested in the long-term and strategic nature of trade ties with Russia. They will not abandon ties with Russia as easily as the European Union did.

Russian leaders state that Russia does not seek dominance, confrontation, or expansion in the post-Soviet space, and will take a more pragmatic approach to assessing real needs and the possibilities for meeting them.⁴¹

Despite this, Russia is being encircled through the consolidation of the Turan belt as a buffer between the West and the East and the opposition of integration projects – Turkism vs. Eurasianism. In this context, in March 2021, an "informal" Summit of the Cooperation Council of Turkic-Speaking States (Turkic Council) was held, which nevertheless discussed and adopted a number of formal documents.⁴² The goal of the association is to develop transport and energy routes bypassing Russia through the Caspian Sea, the South Caucasus and further to Anatolia.

Back in the last century, Zbigniew Brzezinski⁴³ drew a map in which, according to the old American plan, the "Anaconda Noose," Russia would be dismembered into twenty-two parts, each under US control. This plan is being implemented without a single step deviating from its original intent. The kidnapping of the *de jure* president of Venezuela Nicolás Maduro, the threats to Cuba, the assassination of the supreme leader of Iran Ali Khamenei, and the war in Iran are not random, unrelated actions, but a systematic strangulation of Russia, the expulsion of its allies, and the deprivation of markets and room for manoeuvre.

The "Anaconda Noose" will not stop tightening its rings until it crushes Russia's last ally, and no Minsk or Istanbul agreements will curb its appetite. "Anaconda" swallows one partner and ally of Russia after another according to Brzezinski's plan.

Experts close to the Kremlin believe that the only thing that can stop Brzezinski's plan is not another note of protest, but a direct harsh rebuff. This requires the will and determination, the same as Iran's, to start acting according to the same rules by which the collective West operates.

Therefore, in their view, discussing Russia's security and negotiating with those who developed the plan to destroy Russia, never abandoned it, and plan to strangle Russia is not even naïveté, but criminal stupidity.⁴⁴

With regard to Russia, Washington's logic is extremely simple: Europe must be drawn deeper into a trade war with Russia, suffer losses, be exhausted – and eventually become destroyed and weakened. Such a scenario is beneficial to America, which is now losing even the appearance of allied support from once loyal partners.

Russia has the right to protect its interests in the Western Hemisphere without the sanction of Washington and Brussels: neither the United States nor the collective West can dictate here. Otherwise, they will have to go into a direct conflict with Russia, which is obviously unacceptable for them, – it would be fraught with nuclear war, due to the context of a dramatically changed situation in the field of global strategic stability.

But the further the United States and the collective West push their operations and adventures, the greater the likelihood that they will cross an invisible line, prompting a completely different response from their geopolitical adversaries – Russia and China. Moscow and Beijing possess deterrent forces that countries in Latin America and the Middle East lack. What the response of the largest countries in the Eastern Hemisphere might be is an open question. However, the prevailing view in the West – is that Russia will never use nuclear weapons under any circumstances, ignoring the conditions under which Russia could use its nuclear arsenal, according to the Doctrine of Nuclear Deterrence.⁴⁵

Lessons and conclusions:

- Attempts by the collective West to "isolate" Russia and present it as a "pariah" have failed.
- Russia wants to take its rightful place in the modern world, thanks to the challenges that were made to it with the start of the special military operation.
- Russia and its international partners, primarily in BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, are in favour of strengthening the international system with the UN playing a central role, which does not exclude the option of renewing or recreating the world organization on a more just, inter-civilizational basis through the efforts of the world-majority states, when conditions arise for this.
- Russia should not discuss its own security with those who plan to strangle it.

10) Final thoughts – What happens next?

The collective West no longer exists as a single political, ideological and geopolitical entity. Globalist projects are collapsing, even the Euro-Atlantic unity, the fate of NATO, and the UN are in question. Gradually, a new map is emerging, where several separate and sometimes conflicting formations begin to appear in place of the collective West.

Attempts to hold onto the old world, to restore the old international rules, or to wait for "everything to settle down" are not only pointless, but they are dangerous. The old world has already disappeared, even if it seems to some that it still exists. Everything else is a bygone era.

The world is changing radically before our eyes, and the actual meanings of these changes are not yet understood. The processes that today look like chaos – are in fact a phase of reassembling the global order. The moment has come when the role of states is being determined – for the long cycle ahead in history. During such periods: neutrality, passivity, and the expectation of a "return to normality" do not work. Moreover, they are dangerous.

It is necessary to take a sober look at what is happening and abandon illusions. The world is entering a tectonic turning point, and the outcome of this process does not guarantee that countries will maintain their usual situation. In fact, the most important global cycle has already been launched, comparable in scale to the collapse of the Middle Ages and the birth of a new world.

Therefore, right now, the time has come for a tough struggle among world and regional leaders to participate in the active expansionist policies of their states, to enter the "zone of power" and become its participants, the results of which will determine the role of their states and peoples for a very long historical cycle to come.

The fundamental shift in the global balance of power and the rapid degradation of international law must be reversed, otherwise the use of nuclear weapons may escalate. It's highly likely that the situation won't spiral out of control and won't lead to a more systemic global war. Rather, a state of "managed chaos" will be maintained through hybrid wars, resource competition, cyberattacks, pandemics, drinking water shortages, and famine.

Final conclusions:

1. Trust in international laws and rules has been undermined. The rules of international politics and international relations are changing before our eyes.
2. An active struggle for the status of global and regional powers is underway.
3. The struggle for resources, spheres of influence and security is intensifying, which becomes a source of new conflicts and wars.
4. Independent centres of power are being actively formed within the framework of a multipolar world.
5. The era of domination by a single superpower is coming to an end. A multipolar world is being formed, followed by a possible strengthening of global governance through international institutions (new or old) and corporations.
6. The fate of the collective West in the emerging multipolar world depends on itself—whether to be part of this world or to become a civilization closed off from the rest of the world.
7. The factor of power is becoming a key instrument of international relations in the current transitional stage of global development.

¹ The term "neo-globalist elite" often refers to a transnational capitalist class or a network of political, corporate, and academic figures who promote neoliberal policies - free trade, deregulation, and the privatization of public services - often with little accountability to national electorates. This group is sometimes described as a "Davos

-
- Men" phenomenon or a "transnational capitalist class" that operates beyond the constraints of traditional nation-state boundaries.
- 2 The supranational global elite is the heads of transnational corporations, financial oligarchs, bankers, heads of the media, international organizations, and religious leaders.
 - 3 In 2025, according to *Forbes* magazine, the world's richest 1% own more than half of the planet's wealth; the 3,028 billionaires on the Forbes list have a combined fortune of \$16.090 trillion, equivalent to 75% of humanity; and the top 10 multi-billionaires have as much wealth as the poorest half of the world.
 - 4 Dugin: There are definitely no rules. It may come to nuclear weapons. *Tsargrad*, March 2, 2026; <https://tsargrad.tv/news/dugin-pravil-tochno-net-delo-mozhet-dojti-do-jadernogo-oruzhija> (In Russian).
 - 5 David E. Sanger, *et al.* Trump lays out a vision of power restrained only by 'My own morality'. *The New York Times*, January 8, 2026.
 - 6 Stephen Collinson. Trump's new US mission statement: Strength, force, power. *CNN*, January 6, 2026;
 - 7 Nadezhda Korzun. The Kremlin said that de facto international law no longer exists. *Gazeta.Ru*, March 8, 2026; https://www.gazeta.ru/politics/news/2026/03/08/28014277.shtml?utm_auth=false (In Russian).
 - 8 National Security Strategy of the United States of America. *White House*, November 2025; <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/2025-National-Security-Strategy.pdf>
 - 9 The "Donroe Doctrine", alternatively styled as the Trump Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, is an interpretation of principles of President Donald Trump's foreign policy in the Americas.
 - 10 The Monroe Doctrine 1823 is a United States foreign policy position that opposes any foreign interference in the Western Hemisphere.
 - 11 The Organization of American States is the world's oldest regional organization, established in 1948 and headquartered in Washington, D.C., to promote democracy, human rights, security, and development across the Americas. Comprising 34 independent member states, it serves as the premier political forum for dialogue and cooperation in the Western Hemisphere.
 - 12 Special Address by Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America. *World Economic Forum*, January 21, 2026.
 - 13 Marco Rubio. Remarks: Secretary of State Marco Rubio at the Munich Security Conference. *U.S. Department of State*, February 14, 2026; <https://www.state.gov/releases/office-of-the-spokesperson/2026/02/secretary-of-state-marco-rubio-at-the-munich-security-conference>
 - 14 Secretary of State Marco Rubio at the Munich Security Conference. *U.S. Mission to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe*, February 14, 2026.
 - 15 Andrea Mitchell. Marco Rubio has warmer words for Europe weeks after Trump's harsh Davos comments. *NBC News*, February 15, 2026.
 - 16 National Security Strategy of the United States of America. *White House*, December 2017; <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>
 - 17 Mikhail Katkov. "It will not be as it was." The United States frightened the allies with the redivision of the world. *RIA Novosti*, December 26, 2025; <https://ria.ru/20251226/ssha-2064632792.html> (In Russian).
 - 18 Wilhelmine Preussen. UAE furious over EU foreign policy chief Josep Borrell's 'jungle' remarks. *Politico*, October 18, 2022.
 - 19 Simone De La Feld. European Parliament responds to Trump, freezes EUUS tariff deal. *EUNews*, January 20, 2026; <https://www.eunews.it/en/2026/01/20/european-parliament-responds-to-trump-freezes-eu-us-tariff-deal/>
 - 20 State of the Union 2020. Address by President von der Leyen at the European Parliament Plenary. *European Commission*, September 17, 2020.
 - 21 "Europe must become more independent - there is no other choice", says President von der Leyen at 2026 Munich Security Conference. *European Commission*, February 17, 2026.
 - 22 Freddie Hayward. The Iran war makes it official - America is breaking with Europe. The Maga movement thinks Europeans are fundamentally unserious on foreign policy. *The New Statement*, March 2, 2026.
 - 23 Shaun Ley. Baltic states fearful of Trump's Nato views. *BBC*, November 21, 2016.
 - 24 Guy Delauney. 'Stupid statements' - Trump WW3 jibe stuns Montenegro. *BBC*, July 19, 2018.
 - 25 Michael O'Hanlon. Trump threatens U.S. allies. What message does he send to enemies? *U.S. News & World Report*, October 17, 2024.
 - 26 Liu Xin. Macron strongly criticizes US, mentions China and Russia; speech reflects Europe's frustration over eroding influence: expert. *Global Times*, January 09, 2026.
 - 27 Suzanne Lynch, *et al.* US envoy warns 'Made in Europe' plan will damage allied defense. *Bloomberg*, February 20, 2026.
 - 28 The production base of the European Union is estimated at 2.6 trillion euros. The EU's manufacturing base is valued at €2.6 trillion.
 - 29 Azerbaijan and Turkey are building an analogue of NATO in Central Asia and Transcaucasia. What is known about the new military bloc and why is it dangerous for Russia? *Rambler*, November 25, 2025.

-
- ³⁰ Syrym M. Parpiyev and Adilbek A. Yermekbayev. Turkic or Central Asian? Azerbaijan's entry tests the region's identity. *The Diplomat*, December 02, 2025; <https://thediplomat.com/2025/12/turkic-or-central-asian-azerbaijans-entry-tests-the-regions-identity/> (In Russian).
- ³¹ 5th Meeting of the Ministers of Energy of the OTS convened in Istanbul. *Organization of Turkic States*, December 10, 2025; <https://www.turkicstates.org/en/news/5th-meeting-of-the-ministers-of-energy-of-the-ots-convened-in-istanbul>
- ³² Saudi Arabia, Qatar foiled Mossad bombing plots on their soil: Tucker Carlson. *Ansarollah*, March 3, 2026; <https://ansarollah.com.ye/en/archives/796770>
- ³³ "Tell me Iran did it": Tucker Carlson released a scandalous video about a Tehran "set-up." *Tsargrad*, March 7, 2026; https://tsargrad.tv/news/skazhite-jeto-sdelal-iran-taker-karlson-obnarodoval-skandalnyj-rolik-o-podstave-tegerana_1587659 (Screenshot from 2024: https://t.me/voiceofiran_ru) (In Russian).
- ³⁴ Aleksander Dugin is a Russian political philosopher and a leading theorist of Russian neo-Eurasianism and the leader of the International Eurasian Movement. Although he has no official ties to the Kremlin, he is often referred to in foreign media as "Putin's brain"; others say that his influence has been greatly exaggerated. Since 2012, Dugin has been a member of the Expert Advisory Council to State Duma Chairman Sergei Naryshkin, Director of the Foreign Intelligence Service since 2016, and a permanent member of the Security Council of Russia. In 2014, the American publication *Foreign Policy* included Dugin in the top 100 "global thinkers" of the modern world in the "agitators" category. Source: Wikipedia; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aleksandr_Dugin
- ³⁵ Wang Yi: China does not support the logic of global governance by major powers. *RIA Novosti*, March 8, 2026; <https://ria.ru/20260308/mir-2079320480.html> (In Russian).
- ³⁶ Major countries should contribute to peace in the Middle East, Wang Yi said. *RIA Novosti*, March 8, 2026; <https://ria.ru/20260308/mir-2079318825.html> (In Russian).
- ³⁷ Wang Yi: Lack of cooperation between the US and China will lead to confrontation. *RIA Novosti*, March 8, 2026 <https://ria.ru/20260308/vzaimodeystvie-2079319252.html?in=t> (In Russian).
- ³⁸ Ghazal Vaisi. The 25-year Iran-China agreement, endangering 2,500 years of heritage. *Middle East Institute*, March 1, 2022; <https://mei.edu/publication/25-year-iran-china-agreement-endangering-2500-years-heritage/>
- ³⁹ Alexander Gabuev. The world is not immune to a military conflict between the United States and China. *Carnegie Moscow Center*; <https://carnegie.ru/publications/?fa=68499> (In Russian).
- ⁴⁰ The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation (approved by the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin on March 31, 2023). Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; <https://www.mid.ru/ru/detail-material-page/1860586/>
- ⁴¹ See, for example, Putin: Russia does not need to dominate the post-Soviet space. *Delfi*, July 2, 2012; <https://www.delfi.lt/ru/abroad/russia/putin-rossii-ne-nuzhno-dominirovat-na-postsovetском-prostranstve-55191769/>; Putin: Moscow does not seek domination, expansion and confrontation. *MIR24.TV*, October 28, 2016; <https://mir24.tv/news/15240797/putin-moskva-ne-stremitsya-k-dominirovaniyu-ekspansii-i-konfrontacii> (In Russian).
- ⁴² Turkistan Declaration of the Informal Summit of the Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States. *Organization of Turkic States*, March 31, 2021; <https://www.turkicstates.org/en/news/turkistan-declaration-of-the-informal-summit-of-the-cooperation-council-of-turkic-speaking-states>
- ⁴³ Zbigniew Brzezinski is an American statesman and National Security Advisor to US President Jimmy Carter. He is the author of numerous works, including "The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives". He is one of the most influential and leading ideologists of US foreign policy.
- ⁴⁴ Alexander Dugin. The situation is critical! "The Sword of Katchon" instead of the NWO is the last chance: Dugin dotted the attack on Iran. *Tsargrad*, March 01, 2026; <https://tsargrad.tv/articles/rubric/direktiva-dugina-2> (In Russian).
- ⁴⁵ On Approval of the Fundamentals of State Policy of the Russian Federation in the Field of Nuclear Deterrence. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of November 19, 2024, No. 991; <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/5131>