

A global reorganization of the world

Dr. Alexander Kouzminov

Foreword

In this article, I continue to develop the topic of the global reorganization of the world, the redistribution of power and power in the rapidly emerging new world order, and its possible consequences, which I began to analyse in my articles "*Collapse of international order, or a controlled chaos*", "*The spirit of Anchorage has faded. What's next*", and "*Should we expect a new Yalta-45, and wait a world divided into spheres of influence?*" – all were published this year.

The topic of a new world order is becoming increasingly acute, especially in connection with the expected trilateral meeting of world leaders Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping and Donald Trump at the APEC summit on November 18-19, 2026, in Shenzhen, China, which will be attended by representatives of 21 states, including Canada, Japan, Mexico and South Korea.

1. The main factors that gave rise to the crisis of the existing world order

To determine which driving forces are shaping a new world order, it is first necessary to identify and analyse the causes of a profound, large-scale civilizational crisis.

Main sources of geopolitical threats

The primary imbalances and contradictions, that have given rise to the global crisis are as follows:

- the contradiction between the growth of production and consumption and the available resources necessary for development;
- the acute conflicts of interests between industrially developed Western countries and countries supplying raw materials;
- contradictions between nations, national elites and the transnational elite;
- the contradiction between the volume of accumulated financial mass in the world, and the scale of the sector of the real world economy.
- the contradiction between the spiritual void of the "free market" – which gives rise to the rule of money – and the spiritual foundations of the civilizations that are shaping a new world order.

These geopolitical threats can be addressed through the following mutually opposed measures:

Establishment of fair global commodity-money relations.	or	Control of the main planetary raw materials by industrialized countries through their domination over the countries supplying raw materials.
Establishing a world order as a society of sovereign states that protect the interests of their own peoples.	or	Building a single world domination with the dominant role of supranational authorities, radical weakening or complete elimination of state sovereignty.
Elimination of the global "financial mass".	or	The conversion of the global "financial mass" into the real sector of the economy, which will lead to the absolute economic dominance of the transnational financial elite over the world.

Elimination of the domination of the transnational financial elite in international economic relations, economic sovereignty of states.

or

Building a single world state with the transformation of the modern transnational financial elite into a single subject of world power.

Establishing a unified spiritual foundation for world order.

or

Suppressing the spiritual identity of all other civilizations.

The main factor determining today's global and regional changes in the world has become the global economic crisis, which has affected almost all aspects of life in modern civilizations.

The world is on the verge of a resource crisis

The most profitable sectors of the world economy today – are threatened by a shortage of resources. Western civilization has exhausted its raw materials and is unable to obtain them from its former colonies. The lack of resources is a real threat to today's humanity, but not because they are not enough, but because all the investment resources of the world are drawn in three spheres:

- financial speculation – an area into which money has been flowing for quarter of a century;
- the military-industrial complex, which is increasingly taking on a character of an ever-bloodier entity;
- high technologies, primarily artificial intelligence.

*“We are facing a very serious situation. Europe faces a fundamental vulnerability to external energy shocks. This situation threatens to impose further costs on our industries and our households. And this is linked to our dependence on imported fossil fuels”, – the European Commissioner for Energy and Housing Dan Jørgensen.*¹

The entire socio-economic model of the collective West countries was built and held together on obtaining cheap or free (as was the case with the colonial countries in Africa, Asia and other countries) natural raw materials. By the beginning of the 21st century, the world had changed dramatically – the centuries-old colonial system collapsed, and the countries of the "anti-imperialist coalition" began to talk about building a multipolar world.

Table 1: Global distribution of consumption expenditures

Western civilization holds the lead, consuming **more than half of** the world's total consumer spending (World Bank Group, 2024 data):

Civilizational community	Main countries/Regions	Share of global consumer spending
Western	USA (\$19.9 trillion), European Union (\$15.7 trillion), Great Britain, Canada, Australia	53 – 55%
Far Eastern (Confucian)	China (\$7.5 trillion), Japan (\$2.2 trillion), South Korea, Taiwan	17 – 19%
Islamic	Middle East (Saudi Arabia, UAE, Iran), North Africa, Indonesia, Pakistan	7 – 9%

Latin American	Brazil (\$1.4 trillion), Mexico (\$1.3 trillion), Argentina, Colombia	7 – 8%
Hindu	India (\$2.1 trillion)	3,5 – 4%
African (Tropical)	Sub-Saharan Africa (Nigeria, South Africa, Ethiopia)	2,5 – 3%
Orthodox (Eurasian)	Russia (\$1.1 trillion), Belarus, Kazakhstan, etc.	2 – 2,5%

Table 2: Share of the countries of the "golden billion" in the world's population, %

The population of the "Golden Billion" countries (developed nations in Western Europe, North America, Japan, Australia, New Zealand) accounts for 12–15% of the total global population.

USA	European Union	Japan	Canada	Australia	Rest of the world
4,6	7,7	2.0	0,5	0,3	~85

The pre-revolutionary situation in the West

There is a severe shortage of energy resources in the world. Europe is especially suffering from their shortage, which used to receive these resources from Russia at minimal, cheap prices. The refusal to directly supply Russian gas and oil has led to Europe's unequal position on the world market.

In the current harsh economic climate, Europe has nothing to offer the world that would compel the world to continue paying it the equivalent of a "colonial tribute" – that is, by supplying cheap energy resources and raw materials. Having received this "colonial tribute" for the past few centuries, the peoples of Europe – now a consumer society – have become profoundly corrupted. Will this consumer society be willing to forfeit its former standard of living? Will its members demand answers from their own governments as to why this has happened? And might the sharp decline in the quality of life for the European populace trigger revolutionary processes across the continent?

Mass demonstrations, riots, uprisings – of a dissatisfied society have already swept across Europe. They are not yet organized and they do not have leaders, but even these spontaneous actions cause fear among the European elites. Will the idea of changing the social system in Europe arise in the consumer society that has existed for hundreds of years? Are not these still spontaneous and unorganized disorders – the threshold of revolutionary changes in Europe?

The reasons for the current difficult situation in Europe – is that Europe has lost its raw material colonies. Most likely, mass demonstrations of the people in Europe, in which radical forces play a large role, will be harshly suppressed. As a result, there is a very high probability of the formation and strengthening of fascist-oriented forces in Europe, in order to neutralize radical sentiments, remove the class struggle for better socio-economic living conditions of the people from the agenda, consolidate the power of the industrial bourgeoisie and support the globalist elites.

To sum up: in the case of Europe, we are witnessing the death throes of capitalism. At the same time, it is clear that European elites find themselves in a state of crisis: they must either launch a war against an enemy they have designated for undermining the consumer society for the collective West (this primarily means Russia), or else face being swept away by their own people.

2. A new world order on the terms of Western civilization

Recently, in Greece, the Secretary of State Marco Rubio cast the West as a civilization defined by its warriors and conquerors, not by its democracies.² According to Marco Rubio, the exclusivity of a unified Western civilization, or the "*intellectual core of humanity*", is determined by "*a special cognitive and desire for knowledge, a special desire for travel, acquaintance with foreign lands and their development*". According to Rubio, the "*world of the civilized hierarchy*", getting acquainted with new lands, actually captured them, enslaved and/or destroyed their peoples, in order to then plunder the surviving peoples for centuries in the colonial system imposed on them. A special desire for "*acquaintance with foreign lands*" was shown by the Anglo-Saxon civilization.

Here are a few examples.

British colonial policy in India was based on the systematic extraction of resources for the benefit of the mother country, the destruction of the traditional way of life and strict administrative control, which lasted from the middle of the 18th century until 1947.

The Opium Wars in China in the 19th century were military conflicts between Great Britain (with French participation in the United States); and Qing China over the import of huge quantities of opium by the British East India Company to cover the deficit in the tea and silk trade. The defeat of China led to the signing of unequal treaties, the payment of a huge indemnity, the transfer of Hong Kong Island to Great Britain, the opening of five ports to foreign trade, and the beginning of the "century of humiliation".

In fact, Marco Rubio publicly acknowledged – that the expansionist nature of Western civilization is its main virtue. In his speech, he recorded the rejection of equality and the creation of favourable conditions for the "bad", that is, for the backward peoples, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, and the creation by Western civilization of favourable conditions for the "better". If we follow the logic of Marco Rubio, the "civilized West" must at all costs ensure domination over the world by suppressing and creating unfavourable conditions for those peoples whom the "intellectual core of humanity" considers "bad", that is not the countries of Western civilization.

As a far-sighted pragmatist, the Secretary of State noted that Western civilization has only a decade left to address this challenge, as this decade will determine what the world will look like for the next century. Marco Rubio stated quite frankly, that if Western civilization fails to secure global dominance, it will find itself in a far worse position than it is in today.³

The speech of the US Secretary of State can be viewed as a manifesto of the aggressive part of Western civilization, and in fact the main part of the Western elite, which declares a hybrid war on the entire "anti-imperialist coalition" for world domination in order to restore (there is no longer even a question of preserving it!) its world domination on the planet. In fact, this is a soft camouflaged form of speech, similar to what Adolf Hitler proclaimed when he spoke about Germany's exceptionalism and its right to expansion and domination.

*"The stronger must dominate and not mate with the weaker, which would signify the sacrifice of its own higher nature. A state which, <...> dedicates itself to the care of its best racial elements, must sooner or later become the master of the earth. Who <...> does not wish to fight in this world, where constant struggle is the law of life, has no right to exist. The sacred mission of the German people is to gather and preserve the most valuable racial elements <...> and to raise them to a position of dominance", – Adolf Hitler.*⁴

In other words, Marco Rubio has, de facto, identified which entity – be it a state power or some other force – is the latest to lay claim to global hegemony. Who is it: the U.S. government, the globalists, the "deep state" (with its ties to those globalists), or global financial centers, or others?

3. War as a means of resolving global crises and redistributing the world

The resolution of global crises in the 20th century (of the geopolitical situation, formed at that time) took place through the First and Second World Wars. Without a significant infringement of the interests of the largest geopolitical subjects, it seems that it will not be possible to resolve the current civilizational crisis peacefully. Consequently, the use of military force is inevitable to resolve the crisis, and given the global nature of the crisis, it can be assumed that the scale of the use of military force to resolve the crisis is also acquiring a global scale.

Western civilization is united by one thing: the desire to restore colonial control over the world, the labelling of those who supposedly hinder its development as enemies, and the promise to the disadvantaged strata of the people that they will live better by plundering other people. The reason why this is extremely simple: the Western elites are trying to preserve both themselves and their existing social system of consumption – by trying to seize other people's natural resources through *hybrid wars*.

In a *hybrid war*, the entire spectrum of methods and technologies of interstate confrontation is used: informational, economic, political, special operations both on the territory controlled by the enemy and on its own; legal and illegal opposition political forces, especially in the state authorities; the organization of mass demonstrations of the population against the existing government in the country; the use of the "fifth column" and foreign mercenaries; the legitimization of contenders for power controlled by the aggressor by recognizing their right to represent the people of the country, who allegedly "opposed the tyranny of the current government".⁵

The task of hybrid warfare is to crush the current regime of the enemy country and take control of power in the country through the above actions.

4. Is a big war inevitable?

The "civilized West" views Russia as its primary enemy, the main obstacle preventing it from acting as a global hegemon.

"Europe's course of confrontation with Russia creates serious risks for global security" – from the unpublished article "Ukraine, Europe and Global Security" (June 16, 2026) by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov for Politico Europe.⁶

In the article, Lavrov simply and honestly stated Moscow's position and presented facts that the West prefers not to notice, because otherwise the European political elites become uncomfortable.

First point: Lavrov has warned that a direct clash between NATO and Russia could rapidly escalate into an exchange of nuclear strikes with catastrophic consequences. This is not a threat – it is a warning.

Second: The West views Ukraine as the "strike force" for future European armed forces.

Third: France's plans to create a "European nuclear umbrella" are a path to disaster, not to strengthening security. Europe, which constantly reproaches Russia for militarism, is itself tacitly rearming and preparing for a big war.

It is precisely these three simple points that alarmed the editorial team at *Politico Europe*. This is because they shatter the core myth of Western propaganda: that Russia is the aggressor and Europe is an innocent victim. According to Lavrov, the EU leadership has three goals, all of which lead to the same result: escalation.

The first goal is to create an image of an enemy. Russia must become the "evil", a picture which justifies any military spending. For this, a well-known tool is used: Russophobia, which the European Union generates on an industrial scale.

The second goal is to consolidate Europe. The European Union is bursting at the seams: economic problems, the migration crisis, riots, crime and much more. Without an external threat, the project of a united Europe may fall apart.

The third goal is to prepare society for war. People must get used to the idea that a clash with Russia is inevitable. But there is a nuance: in a nuclear war, the European Union will inevitably lose. And even Brussels understands this. Therefore, the truth is hidden from the Europeans.

That is why *Politico* removed Lavrov's article. Because if the European average person finds out that his government is dragging the country into a war in which Europe has no chance, he will ask: why? – and it will be impossible to answer this question.

Nuclear arithmetic: who targets whom, and how many times

In a hypothetical nuclear war, the winner is not the one who has more moral arguments, but the one who has more warheads and the least chance of receiving them in return.

According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), as of January 2026, Russia has 5,420 nuclear warheads, the United States has 5,042. The total European nuclear arsenal (excluding American warheads on European territory) is 500-600 warheads. France (290-300) and Britain (225) combined have a nuclear potential that is ten times less than Russia's.

The main thing – is that Europe does not have a system that could reliably repel a massive Russian strike. Russia does. Moscow remains the only region covered by the A-135 Amur multi-level missile defence system. In June 2026, Russia formed a new air defence division with S-500 Prometheus complexes capable of intercepting nuclear warheads. *Politico*, which was afraid to publish Lavrov's article, writes: over the next decade, Russian missile defence systems will be improved to such an extent that they will be able to repel all nuclear strikes from the UK and France.

Even if Europe launches everything that it has, Russia will lose less. Why? Russia has a huge territory. Forests, steppes, mountains. Dispersed objects. Europe has everything concentrated. Paris, London, Berlin, Rome are not just cities, they are political, economic and cultural centers. A blow to them is a blow to the very existence of European civilization.

The European Union's plan to achieve full "combat readiness" for a conflict with Russia by 2030 – until this date, Brussels intends to prolong the conflict in Ukraine as much as possible in various ways. NATO's eastward expansion (including the accession of Finland and Sweden), attempts to involve Armenia and consolidate its influence in Ukraine and Moldova – confirms Europe's course towards geopolitical expansion. At the same time, Ukraine is seen as a future key element of autonomous European armed forces for new conflicts with Russia. This situation poses serious risks to global security, since a direct clash between NATO and Russia could quickly escalate into a nuclear conflict with catastrophic consequences.

Russia is not going to attack Europe, and the Europeans know this. The Estonian Foreign Intelligence Department, in its annual report published in February 2026, stated that Russia does not intend to attack any NATO state either in 2026 or next.⁷

Putin also sent a powerful signal to the European Union, saying: "*We are not going to fight with Europe, <...> but if Europe suddenly wants to fight with us and starts, we are ready right now. There can be no doubt about it. <... > In the event of a conflict with Europe, it will develop rapidly*". At the same time, Russia will act differently from Ukraine, because "*if Europe starts a war with Russia, then Moscow will have no one to negotiate with to end it*".⁸

"*The Russians are smart enough not to attack NATO*", Admiral Rob Bauer, the ex-Chair of the Military Committee of NATO, said candidly.⁹ It would seem that the issue is settled, but far from it. The NATO alliance is expanding initiatives near the borders of Russia and calls it "deterrence of Russian aggression".

30 November 2025 Chair of the NATO Military Committee Admiral Giuseppe Cavo Dragone said that the possibility of pre-emptive strikes against Russia is being discussed within the alliance.¹⁰ The head of the German Armed Forces Support Command, Lieutenant General Gerald Funke, claims that the conflict could occur in 2028-2029, and Germany will be at the epicentre of this conflict.¹¹

The European Union has set a goal to prepare for war with Russia by 2030, Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban said in December 2025.¹² According to him, the European Union has a plan of four stages of preparation for war, and three of them have already been passed. The fourth stage involves direct confrontation, and "*the decision on this issue has already been made*". According to the former prime minister, the transition of the European Union to a war economy testifies to the preparation for war.

The European press may continue not to publish articles that do not fit into the agenda of politicians in Brussels, but this will not make the nuclear threat disappear. It will only become more real. And when the moment comes when words no longer mean anything, these politicians will remember that they were warned. But it will be too late. If every European asks himself: why is my government afraid of even publishing an article that talks about the risks of nuclear war? Why does it want me to live in ignorance while the world teeters on the brink of disaster? The answer will be simple: because it is preparing me for this war. And it does not want me to ask unnecessary questions.

The EU industry has embarked on a war footing

At the NATO summit in The Hague on June 25, 2025, the member countries of the alliance agreed to increase total defence spending to 5% of GDP by 2035. Spending by European NATO countries increased by 20% over the year to \$574 billion. Brussels has launched the *ReArm Europe* rearmament programme for 800 billion euros and the *Security Action for Europe* (SAFE) fund for another 150 billion euros. Rheinmetall has dramatically increased the production of 155-mm shells from 70 thousand to 1.1 million per year, opened the largest plant in Europe in Unterluis and is creating military production workshops from Lithuania to Hungary. Germany has delivered a tank brigade for 5,000 people and 105 Leopard tanks to Lithuania, and plans to deploy this contingent to a division.

To ensure that all of this can be rapidly moved toward a theatre of military operations, the European Parliament has approved a "military Schengen" project – the creation of a unified space for the swift, unhindered, and coordinated movement of troops, military equipment, and cargo across the borders of European countries.

The armies of the European Union are conducting military exercises near the borders of Russia without interruption. Examples of recent exercises: *Steadfast Deterrence* (2024, 2025, 2026, 2027 – planned) for all 32 NATO countries; *Cold Response 2026* (9-19 March 2026, involved 25,000 troops from 14 allied countries); *Arctic Conditions* in Norway's largest military exercise in 2026; *SWORD-26* (April 27-May 31, 2026, involved roughly 15,500 personnel from 11 nations across NATO's Eastern Flank); *Ramstein Flag 2026* (RAFL26), (June 9-19, 2026, more than 200 combat aircraft from 18 countries are involved); *Gallant Boar 2026* (June 16-26, 2026, involved more than 10,000 troops and about 6,000 units of military equipment from Lithuania, Poland and France); *Steadfast Noon* (October 2026) – exercises aimed at preparing for nuclear war (about 2,000 military personnel and more than 70 aircraft from 17 countries of the collective West participate).

It is not Russia who needs a war in Europe, it is Europe itself that needs it – more precisely, those who have already subordinated everything to it: budgets, factories, politics, the very existence of their countries. But a big war requires an aggressor, and he refuses to start a war. This means that all that remains is to provoke Russia so that it has no choice but to respond, and the European political elites call this response an "attack". As it happened with Ukraine.

Potential sites for provocations

Kaliningrad

The Kaliningrad region is the most vulnerable territory of Russia to possible military provocations.

The commander of the US Army in Europe and Africa, General Christopher Todd Donahue, made a statement in July 2025 at the *LandEuro* conference organized by the US Army Association in Wiesbaden, Germany, to applause from the audience: "*Kaliningrad is only 47 miles wide and surrounded by NATO on all sides. The alliance is capable of 'neutralizing it from the ground in an unthinkable short time. And we have already planned and developed the neutralization of this Russian region'*".¹³ Retired British Royal Navy Commodore Steve Jermy warns that any NATO attempt to capture Kaliningrad would end in a crushing defeat, with the alliance potentially losing tens of thousands of troops. He cautions that Russian forces would destroy any military unit sent to attack the region.¹⁴

Baltika

NATO assigned the Baltic the status of a "NATO internal sea" and began to strangle Russian shipping under the slogan of combating the "shadow fleet", detaining Russian ships. In May 2026, the reputable publication *War on the Rocks* proposed to apply the "Strait of Hormuz scenario" in the Baltic – to block the sea corridor.¹⁵ The calculation is transparent: one tough inspection, when the tanker is already under the protection of a Russian corvette, and the local maritime incident turns into a *casus belli*. (A '*casus belli*' is a Latin phrase meaning an "act or event that provokes or is used to justify a war").

The Arctic

The West is assiduously turning the Arctic into a zone of tension and is considering the High North as a potential theatre of operations. *Cold Response* has amassed 25,000 troops in Norway, *Steadfast Deterrence* has made the Arctic a major theatre, and high latitudes are "practicing freedom of navigation". Norwegian Defense Minister Tore Onshuus Sandvik believes that Russia's control of the Bear Pass (corridor) off Svalbard would be a direct threat to the UK and other NATO countries.¹⁶ The British Defense Secretary John Healey declared Russia "*the greatest threat to the Arctic since the Cold War*" and doubled that the number of British troops deployed to Norway will double over three years from 1,000 to 2,000 personnel.¹⁷

Russia's position is different. "*Russia is interested in the peaceful use of the Arctic and calls for the rejection of any steps that lead to an artificial escalation of tensions in Svalbard and in this region in general*", Russian Ambassador to Norway Nikolai Korchunov.¹⁸

However, the NATO alliance should not forget that Russia has two-thirds of its naval nuclear capability stationed in the Far North, and also possesses the Northern Sea Route, which would allow for the rapid deployment of troops in the event of a conflict in the Arctic.

5. Centres of new power

A new world order can be built according to only one of two models.

The first is the "world of a civilized hierarchy", in which a few "chosen ones", who define themselves as the "intellectual core of humanity", maintain and increase the achieved level of consumption at the expense of the cruel exploitation of the rest of the world.

The second is the "world of civilized mutual assistance" or "the world of civilizational support", in which all existing civilizations are improved, preserving space for development for each nation and civilization.

If the first model is the degradation of the world with its possible destruction through a global war, then the second is the path to a peaceful future.

The old model in which the West designated itself as the sole centre of power, set the rules for everyone else, and demanded unconditional submission – has now run its course. The world is becoming multipolar, and Moscow is proposing a system that has a place for everyone, including the United States, European and other countries of the world but not at the expense of Russian sovereignty, and not on the terms of Western hegemony.¹⁹

It is no longer possible to preserve the old global order – in fact, it effectively no longer exists. A multipolar world is already a reality: it includes Russia, China, India, Brazil, and many other nations with strong economies, as well as groupings like BRICS, the SCO, and the countries of the Global South.

Possible coalitions in the future basis of world relations will include two global forces.

The first is a community of industrially developed countries, the basis of which is the countries of Western civilization. They claim the role of a world hegemon, controlling all world resources, with the destruction of the geopolitical individuality/independence – of all other civilizations.

The second is the community of countries of Orthodox, Islamic and other civilizations. Their basic principles: the domination of the spiritual over the material, the general over the particular, the individual, mutual support, are oriented towards a multipolar world order.

At this stage, Islamic and Orthodox civilizations are the main opponents of the first coalition.

The composition of the coalitions will be determined by the commitment of individual countries or, more precisely, their elites to a particular model of a new world order, which they are prepared to defend in the confrontation between these two coalitions.

At present, Russia is the main consolidation of communities of non-Western civilizations. Therefore, the elimination of Russia as a subject of geopolitics – is beneficial to the collective West for the preservation of a multipolar world and global dominance in it.

Once upon a time, there was a "Pax Romana". It was the Romans who were responsible for the absence of wars, established their own rules and values. For quite a long time, there was a "Pax Americana" – this is peace and values that are asserted by the Americans. And not only in their own country, but in a global context.

Russia offers the whole world, and not individual countries and nations, a "Pax Multipolaris" – a multipolar world that will suit not only Russia, but all other countries. The new world order should be neither a "Pax Romana", that is, a world on Rome's terms, nor a "Pax Americana" – a world arranged according to Washington's rules. Russia is not proposing to replace American hegemony with its own.

This concerns a global order in which every civilization and every state can be truly sovereign, rather than serving as a mere territory, market, or resource for a foreign elite. The United States along with other nations of Western civilization is not excluded from this model. However, it must abandon its claim to exceptionalism and its desire to live at the expense of others.

These are precisely Russia's conditions for the collective West's participation in a new world order – one based on the rejection of double standards, respect for the sovereignty of other nations, a readiness for fair agreements, and the recognition that global politics is no longer determined by a single capital.

This formula contains a fundamental difference between the Russian approach and the concept of a unipolar world. Moscow does not demand that the collective West disappear, does not propose to deprive the West of the right to its own path and its own culture. However, Russia refuses to recognize the right of a united Western civilization to decide who is allowed to be independent, which governments are legitimate, which languages to be banned, and which borders can be redrawn in accordance with the current interests of Western elites.

"Moscow views the United States as part of the future world and is prepared for dialogue with it, even when positions are diametrically opposed. However, such a conversation must not serve as a cover for ultimatums, sanctions, or public accusations", stated Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov at the opening of the 4th Congress of the International Movement of Russophiles.²⁰

However, dialogue does not imply that Russia is prepared to compromise on its fundamental principles. Moscow intends to uphold not just selective interpretations of international law, but the

entire body of norms enshrined in the UN Charter including the sovereign equality of states, the right of peoples to self-determination, and respect for human rights, regardless of language, religion, race, or gender.

Summary:

1. The collective West does not like Russia for challenging the financial dominance of Western elites, rebelling against the global agenda. Against sodomy imposed on the whole world under the guise of a "new normal".
2. In the West, there is a deliberate preparation of the economy, society, and military organization for an armed clash with Russia, which is designated by the collective West as a long-term threat, and to which absurd intentions to attack NATO are maniacally attributed.
3. Russia proposes to build not a "Pax Russica", but a multipolar world based on equality and respect. There is a place in such a world for everyone. But only on an equal footing with everyone else.
4. In the new world order, there is a place for the countries of Western civilization, but only on the terms of the countries of the "anti-imperialist coalition".
5. Russia's goal within the "anti-imperialist coalition" is to thwart the collective West's construction of a unipolar world and to become a global centre of power – a core for the consolidation of other "traditional civilizations".

-
- ¹ Press remarks by Commissioner Jørgensen at the informal meeting of EU Energy Ministers. *European Commission*, March 31, 2026, Brussels; https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/SPEECH_26_767
 - ² Ishaan Tharoor. Marco Rubio's Wild, Wild West. *The New Yorker*, 14 October 2026.
 - ³ Fareed Zakaria. Marco Rubio misunderstands what makes the West great. *The Washington Post*, 16 October 2026.
 - ⁴ This quote from Adolf Hitler's 1925 autobiographical manifesto *Mein Kampf*.
 - ⁵ Sivkov, K. V. Geopolitical threats to the Russian Federation. *Science. Society. Oborona*, 2016, No 1(6).
 - ⁶ The Russian Foreign Ministry said: "The article was prepared for publication in *Politico Europe*, but at the last moment by the decision of the editorial board the publication was cancelled". The full text of the article can be found on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia https://mid.ru/ru/foreign_policy/news/2120138/
 - ⁷ Asya Lokina. Estonian Intelligence Service: Russia will not attack NATO in 2026. *Deutsche Welle*, 12 February 2026.
 - ⁸ Putin gave a clear answer. They understood even in Kyiv: The meeting of the Russian General Staff dotted all the i's. *Tsargrad*, 03 December 2025; <https://ria.ru/20251202/putin-2059327557.html>
 - ⁹ Kateryna Chernovod. The former head of the NATO Military Committee spoke about the threat from Russia. *UNIAN*, 05 May 2026; <https://www.unian.net/world/nato-admiral-rob-bauer-vyskazalsya-ob-ugroze-so-storony-rossii-13372806.html>
 - ¹⁰ Olivia Ireland. Nato considering 'pre-emptive' action against Russia's hybrid warfare attacks. *Independent*, 02 December 2025.
 - ¹¹ Germany prepares for Russia to attack Nato in two years. *The Times*, 26 January 2026.
 - ¹² Viktor Orbán warned: European leaders have decided that Europe will go to war. *Facts*, 07 December 2025; <https://tenyek.hu/politika/2025/12/orban-viktor-figyelmeztetett-az-europai-vezetok-eldontottek-hogy-europa-haboruba-megy> Orbán Viktor figyelmeztetett: Az európai vezetők eldöntötték, hogy Európa háborúba megy. *Tenyek*, 2025. 07 december. vasárnap, Miklós; <https://tenyek.hu/politika/2025/12/orban-viktor-figyelmeztetett-az-europai-vezetok-eldontottek-hogy-europa-haboruba-megy>
 - ¹³ Jen Judson. Army Europe chief unveils NATO eastern flank defense plan. *DefenseNews*, 17 July 2025.
 - ¹⁴ Europe Can't Win a War With Russia - British Commodore Explains | Steve Jermy. *YouTube*, 14 October 2026; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E3sZg4gcnb0>
 - ¹⁵ Miro Sedlák. Could Russia follow the "Hormuz Playbook" in the Baltic and Black Seas? *War on the Rocks*, 08 May 2026; <https://warontherocks.com/could-russia-follow-the-hormuz-playbook-in-the-baltic-and-black-seas/>

-
- ¹⁶ Russia's push to control Arctic waterway presents Europe with a daunting challenge. *The Conversation*, 25 June 2026; <https://theconversation.com/russias-push-to-control-arctic-waterway-presents-europe-with-a-daunting-challenge-284808>
- ¹⁷ UK steps up defence of Arctic and High North from rising Russian threats. *Ministry of Defense*, 11 February 2026; <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-steps-up-defence-of-arctic-and-high-north-from-rising-russian-threats>
- ¹⁸ NATO countries are hatching plans for a naval blockade of Russia, the ambassador in Oslo said. *RIA Novosti*, 14 February 2026; <https://ria.ru/20260214/nato-2074329057.html>
- ¹⁹ Russia is building a new world. There is also a place for the United States, but only on our terms. *Tsargrad*, 17 September 2026; https://tsargrad.tv/news/rossija-stroit-novyj-mir-tam-est-mesto-i-ssha-no-tolko-na-nashih-uslovijah_1869767
- ²⁰ Lavrov: The United States is ready to talk, unlike Europe. *TASS*, 17 September 2026; <https://tass.ru/politika/28120425>