

# The Peace of Westphalia and the Yalta Conference: Similarities and Differences

Verbatim Record of the Question-Answer Program of February 17, 2025

---

**Moderator:** *Good afternoon, Valeriy Viktorovich!*

**Valeriy Viktorovich Pyakin:** Good afternoon!

**Moderator:** *Good afternoon, dear viewers, audio listeners, and comrades in the studio! Today is February 17, 2025. In the previous episode of Question-Answer, the main topic was dedicated to the meeting of the leaders of the three countries of the anti-Hitler coalition — the USSR, the USA, and the United Kingdom — in Yalta, at the so-called Yalta Conference, which took place 80 years ago. And in connection with this, Georgiy sent us the following comment: “Valeriy Viktorovich, were the rules any different before the Yalta Conference? They were exactly the same. Russia was being targeted for destruction during the foreign intervention, just as it was during Hitler’s invasion. What has changed? Only that more destructive types of weapons have appeared. But that has been the case throughout all of human history, ever since the stone axe.”*



**Valeriy Viktorovich Pyakin:** Yes, watching and seeing are two different things. And failing to see the difference between the Westphalian system of international relations and the Yalta system is, in general, a commonplace occurrence not only among ordinary people but also among political scientists (political oafs), and even politicians tend to view it narrowly, focusing only on technologies. And when you ask them to explain — why was it necessary to rename the system if the principles remained the same as those formulated under the

Westphalian system? Why was it necessary to build an entirely new framework? — the response you hear is: “*Well, it was yet another redivision of the world.*” But, excuse me — there have been many redivisions of the world.

Understanding the difference between the Westphalian system of international relations and the Yalta system is possible only when one understands: what a state<sup>1</sup> is, what national and supranational governance are, how an empire differs from a state, and how the process of globalization unfolds on planet Earth. **The process of globalization consists of the concentration of governance over the planet’s productive forces; this process cannot be prohibited or canceled — it is objective. However, the governance of this objective process is subjective.** The way it unfolds is determined specifically in pivotal historical epochs. So why was the Westphalian system suddenly abolished and replaced by the Yalta system? To answer this, we must first understand what the Westphalian system of international relations and the Yalta system actually represent.

We all know that the Westphalian system emerged as a result of the so-called Thirty Years’ War when the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire signed an agreement with diverse states. However, these were not fully-fledged states in the modern sense; they were imperial estates — some were state-like entities, others were city-states, and some were religious. In other words, the imperial estates varied in nature. So what? Why did a decision made essentially within the Holy Roman Empire suddenly establish an international system? Had there been no wars or treaties before that? Of course, there had been.

Before the Peace of Westphalia was signed in 1648, there had been numerous wars, and these wars were indeed long-lasting. The Thirty Years’ War itself lasted three decades, but some historians place it within a broader cycle, linking it to the Eighty Years’ War that took place in Europe. And even before that, there were other wars, including the Hundred Years’ War, which actually lasted 116 years, and treaties were also concluded as a result of that war. But why did they not establish an international system? Moreover, in 1494, Portugal and Spain signed the so-called Treaty of Tordesillas, by which they divided spheres of influence across the entire planet Earth and defined the framework of their relations. This treaty was approved by Pope Julius II. One might think that the issue of international relations had been settled once and for all. Yet, nearly 200 years later, the question arose again.

And if we look at what followed the Peace of Westphalia, can we really say that the principles proclaimed in these peace treaties, which marked the beginning of the Westphalian system of international relations, were never violated? After all, consider this: Yes, **the primacy of national interests** (which applies to states), **the principle of balance of power, the priority of nation-states, the principle of state sovereignty, the right to demand non-interference in internal affairs, the equality of states, and the obligation to uphold signed treaties** — all of these principles seemingly continue to apply. But haven’t we seen, throughout the entire history of humanity, that in international practice, all these principles have been repeatedly violated? They were violated even after the Peace of Westphalia was signed, laying the foundation for the Westphalian system of international relations. Just 40 years after these rules were established, the so-called Nine Years’ War broke out, which some historians consider the first *world war*, since nearly all state entities of

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-1-gosudarstvo>

the time participated, and fighting extended to North America and India — earning it the designation of a *world war*. Then came the Great Northern War, which resulted in the emergence of the Russian Empire. There were also the War of the Spanish Succession, the War of the Austrian Succession, and the Seven Years' War — which Churchill called the first *world war* — followed by the French Revolution and the revolutionary wars, and then the rise of the French Empire and the imperial wars of Napoleon I. So, throughout human history, it has been revealed that the principles outlined in the Westphalian system serve mostly as guidelines, but they never actually changed the international system — everyone simply continued to act according to their own will.

In this regard, there is a specific debate: some argue that the Westphalian system remained in effect until 1814–1815, when Napoleon was finally overthrown, while others believe it lasted until the First World War, setting different boundaries for its duration. But even if we accept that the Westphalian system remained in effect until the First World War, that means the world existed within some kind of new system of relations before the formation of the Yalta system of international relations. So what actually happened?

After all, in all the wars I have listed, there were plenty of reasons to establish a new system of international relations based on the treaties concluded among different states as a result of these wars. States were divided, and new borders were drawn — just as they were in the Yalta Agreement and the Peace of Westphalia... By the way, in the Westphalian settlement, borders hardly shifted at all. Yet, they shifted significantly during the Nine Years' War, the Seven Years' War, and especially the Great Northern War — which led to the emergence of the Russian Empire. The emergence of the Russian Empire was a highly significant transformation that should have been formally recognized as shaping the global system of international relations. Yet, for some reason, it was not.

Well, we have repeatedly discussed how, before the revolution, Russia played a secondary role and was not taken seriously — even though it had become an empire that no one in the world could ignore. Yet, until the October Revolution of 1917, all supranational forces simply exploited Russia, using it for their own interests. This is exactly what happened during the Patriotic War of 1812 when, in Russia's interests, there was no need to destroy Napoleon, while in Britain's interests, Russia had to fight against Napoleon. Alexander I did just that — fighting against Napoleon and bringing the country to the brink of state collapse. It was left to Nicholas I to rescue the state from complete catastrophe.

So then, what exactly are the Westphalian and Yalta systems at their core? For a complete understanding, we have the three-volume work “War. State. Bolshevism,” which explains everything: what a state<sup>2</sup> is, what national and supranational governance are, the special type of state known as an empire, the methods of waging wars<sup>3</sup>, and the way out<sup>4</sup> of the ongoing cataclysm. Without understanding the processes described in these books, it is very difficult to grasp the depth of these processes.

If, after the Peace of Westphalia — whose exact end is unknown, as there is much debate

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-1-gosudarstvo>

<sup>3</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-2-voyna>

<sup>4</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-3-bolshevizm>

on this — we continuously observe repeated violations of its principles, then we should ask ourselves several questions: If these treaties established a specific world order but within the framework of the Holy Roman Empire, then why should they be universal for everyone? Who was supposed to follow them? And if they followed them, why did they do so? And if they truly followed them, then why were the Westphalian system's core principles — such as state sovereignty, respect for national interests, diplomacy, and others — constantly violated? Why did the world undergo constant redivision? The answers to these questions reveal that the Westphalian system defined something other than these formal parameters, which were repeatedly violated. That's why, failing to understand this, some argue it ended in 1814–1815, while others claim it lasted until 1914. But if it ended in 1914, what came after it? And if it really ceased to exist, then how does it differ from the Yalta system of international relations?

It's actually quite simple. This is about the principles of globalization on planet Earth. Until the emergence of a great state — the number one superpower, the USSR — globalization followed an exclusively Western model. As stated in the Bible<sup>5</sup>: *"You shall rule over many nations, but they shall not rule over you."* In Russia, however, globalization was carried out according to the principles of the Russian world, where people were friends, comrades, and brothers to one another. The nations integrated into the empire were granted equal rights and opportunities — not only to preserve their national cultures but also to develop them. This fundamental difference between the two civilizational approaches must always be kept in mind when discussing the Westphalian system of international relations and the Yalta system.

If we look at Europe up until the mid-19th century (or even the late 19th century), we see a patchwork of a vast number of states. When governance is based on the principle of force — *"you shall rule over others"* — the borders of a state are determined by the tip of the sword, reaching only as far as the power of one ruler or another extends. This is precisely why European states were, and still are, relatively small. Russia, on the other hand, by uniting peoples based on the principle and idea of a shared future, has built and continues to build a state on a different foundation — one that does not suppress its nations but preserves and develops them.

So, until 1917, Russia remained largely unnoticed on the global stage. Meanwhile, Europe was constantly shaken by wars — both before and after the Peace of Westphalia. But what was the essence of these wars? The essence of these wars was the seizure of resources. **As stated in the book War<sup>6</sup>: "War is a set of measures aimed at seizing foreign energy, natural, and human resources" (this definition comes from the Conception of Public Safety).** Therefore, if you seek to acquire as many resources as possible, you must first accumulate forces before attacking your neighbor and plundering them. In other words, the entire Western world operated on the principle: *"Rob your neighbor, or else your neighbor will rob you first — and rejoice in it."* And so, they constantly waged wars, time and again.

Why were the principles of a new world order proclaimed after the Thirty Years' War? The

---

<sup>5</sup> The Western world is conducting globalization according to the Old Testament–Biblical conception formulated in Deuteronomy and Isaiah.

<sup>6</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-2-voyna>

reason is that the Thirty Years' War led to a sharp decline in the population. For example, in southern Germany, only a third of the population survived the Thirty Years' War. As a result, various clan-corporate groupings lost their incentive to continue fighting because there was nothing left to fight over — that is, if you don't have the opportunity to get any resources, then waging war is pointless for you. These clan-corporate groupings needed to ensure that there was always a certain level of resource stability. They had to establish some form of relationship among themselves to prevent the complete depletion of resource potential. This way, in the event that one state absorbed another, it could still seize its resources.

Figuratively speaking, the globalization of that time followed a simple principle — one that has been well known in Russia since the 1990s and widely depicted in cinema: gang wars. When gangs begin dividing territory, they eventually realize a simple truth: if they continue looting recklessly (*"The Reds come and loot, the Whites come and loot — where is a poor peasant to go?"*), then soon there will be no future potential for plunder. To preserve their resource potential, gangs are forced to negotiate among themselves: how to structure their relationships with one another (among rival gangs) and regulate the resources they exploit. At the same time, gangs rarely merge into a single entity. They maintain their confrontation potential and remain ready to tear each other apart at the first opportunity to seize the territory of a competing gang.

The same situation occurred when the Peace of Westphalia was signed — it was built on these very principles. It was necessary to establish certain relationships among what were essentially gang-like groupings in a way that ensured the sustainability of their resource potential, which they relied on for survival. However, the desire to tear each other apart never disappeared — it remained intact. This was a conceptual unity based on the principle: *"You shall rule over many nations, but they shall not rule over you."* They constructed precisely this system of relationships, and nothing opposed it.

Why was this system established through the Peace of Westphalia? Couldn't it have been created, for example, after the Hundred Years' War? A war that, by the way, unfolded in stages.

And why did it unfold in stages? We often discuss how, every hundred years, a united Europe gathers to march against Russia — only to receive from Russia exactly what it deserves in return. That is, before waging war on Russia, Europe requires a century-long preparatory period. The same was true for the Hundred Years' War: to conduct it in three stages, pauses were necessary — allowing a new generation to grow up, economic life to recover, and military potential to be financially supported, which could then be used for future wars.

And there were extremely serious wars taking place. For example, before the Westphalian system was established, the Wars of the Red and White Roses in England nearly wiped out the entire governance corps — the nobility. As a result, England was forced to transition to the gentry system, effectively replenishing the noble corps to maintain governance.

In these conditions, the need to refine the way relationships were managed became increasingly urgent — to prevent clan-corporate wars from leading to complete self-destruction. The reason this was only formally codified in the mid-17th century —

specifically in 1648, within the Holy Roman Empire through treaties among imperial estates, and why it became a model for international relations — lies in the following: all previous wars had been fought within the framework of a still-dissolving clan-tribal society. In other words, while societies had become feudal, warfare<sup>7</sup> was still conducted according to the concept of tribal society — based on tribal principles. Why? Because technological limitations dictated this approach. However, during the Hundred Years' War, artillery had emerged, bringing a qualitative change to warfare. By the 17th century, warfare had finally aligned with the social systems of European nations. But this new warfare, along with advanced weaponry, led to unreasonably high civilian casualties, destroying the very resources wars were fought over. This meant no bread, no goods, no industrial or artisanal products — nothing, because these wars were still waged according to the destructive logic of clan-tribal society. This is why in southern Germany — where civilian casualties were the highest — only a third of the population survived. These losses were further compounded by epidemics and famine, naturally. The casualties were immense. **Thus, the Westphalian system of international relations established the principles of relationships among — related through a shared governance conception — social systems.**

And that is why, despite continuous wars, the Westphalian system lasted until October 1917. (If someone prefers, they can argue it lasted until 1914 — but in this case, a difference of three years is insignificant from a purely chronological perspective. However, in terms of understanding governance processes, it is fundamentally important.) Why? Because a state emerged that pursued a different conception of globalization — it structured its relationships with integrated entities in a fundamentally different way. This was more or less tolerated as long as “socialism was being built within a single country” and remained localized, while this country was surrounded by hostile forces behind the “Iron Curtain,” fenced off by them, and not exerting significant influence on international relations. Because at that stage, the Soviet Union was focused primarily on survival.

Yes, the Soviet Union — Soviet Russia — was highly active in global politics. By doing so, it created certain points of tension, such as in Turkey, which managed to survive within its existing parameters only thanks to Soviet Russia. The Western colonial powers, on the other hand, had planned to dismantle it completely. As a result, we created for them a “*suitcase without a handle*” — *too heavy to carry, yet too valuable to abandon*. But through this process, we were able to win the Civil War, repel foreign intervention, and restore Russia's territorial integrity. While not entirely to the extent of the Russian Empire, we managed to reclaim a significant portion.

By 1945, it had become evident to everyone that the influence of the Soviet Union was so significant that its very existence would inevitably lead to the implementation of its own conception of globalization — there was no avoiding it. Had Western leaders been able to ignore this fact, they would not have come to Yalta. But they fully understood that an *ostrich strategy* — pretending that nothing had changed — would be the most foolish course of action. That is why they went to Yalta — to negotiate, to establish a framework for relations with a new actor in global politics, a new force in globalization, based on fundamentally

---

<sup>7</sup> The term corresponds to the Russian “способы ведения войны,” emphasizing how wars were fought based on prevailing social systems and available technologies at different historical stages.

different conceptual foundations.

If the Westphalian system regulated relations within a homogeneous conceptual environment — among its clan-corporate groupings — then, in this new situation, it became necessary to establish relations with a state that pursued a different conceptual policy and built life on Earth according to a different conception. The West never had the capability to completely destroy Russia — if they had, they wouldn't have had to invade Russia every hundred years, only to retreat in defeat each time. However, as long as Russia was trying to follow the Western path — seeking the West as its leader — Western powers could still engage with it, using Russia's potential to remove obstacles to their own globalization process. For instance, this is exactly what happened with Napoleon, who was essentially *created* for one purpose: to destroy Russia. But in reality, what was being destroyed was a rival to Western globalization — France. Because it was France that was the leader of globalization before the French Revolution. And only after the French Revolution did France become a secondary power.

**Thus, the difference between the Westphalian system of international relations and the Yalta system is fundamental. To reiterate: in the Westphalian system, relationships were established among homogeneous, conceptually related entities of state governance. The Yalta system, on the other hand, defined relations between two antagonistic systems in terms of their conceptions of globalization.** Fully understanding that total confrontation between these two systems would lead to the collapse of civilization on planet Earth, these relations were built accordingly.

And again, the West did not even attempt to hide their hostility toward Russia, nor did they suggest that accepting certain rules would put an end to their anti-Russian activities. No. Just like under the Westphalian system, their states continued to compete among themselves, violate treaties whenever convenient, and declare war on one another under any pretext. However, the very framework of their relationships prevented them from eliminating the resource base that fueled competition among their states. The same applied here: a new system had to be established because a new actor had emerged — one that was conceptually and ideologically entirely antagonistic to the existing actors in the global hierarchy of states, and with which they needed to define the parameters for mutual relations. This is precisely what the Yalta system developed.

The attempt to push the Soviet Union back behind the “Iron Curtain” — which was already undertaken in 1946 — quickly led the West to realize the failure of such an approach. They soon understood that the Soviet Union was building a new system of international relations, which was reflected in the emergence of socialist-oriented countries, the formation of the socialist commonwealth in Europe, and ultimately, the collapse of the colonial system. Of course, they could not accept this. After all, they had always waged war against Russia, as the question correctly pointed out. But that is their conceptual essence — waging wars to enslave others and seize their resources. Just look at the Crusades. Look at the countless wars waged against Russia. In 1854, they launched yet another war against us — the one known in Russia as the Crimean War, but in the West as the Eastern War.

**Thus, the development of a new system of relations between conceptually antagonistic systems was the essence of the Yalta Agreements.** When I say that **we are**

**still essentially operating within the Yalta system of relations**, it means one simple thing: **the disappearance of the Soviet Union from the political arena did not eliminate the system itself**. China remained. Vietnam remained. Cuba remained. The countries that fought for their liberation from colonial rule remained. New states emerged. These very states are the ones that, within the Yalta system, continue to resist the colonialist West, which had established its system of relations for itself and among itself as far back as the Peace of Westphalia in the 17th century.

But look — the West still does not operate within the framework of these formally declared principles. These principles are proclaimed as goals, yet the only thing that compels any Western entity to abide by a treaty is the strength of the party with whom they signed it. When the Soviet Union existed, they respected treaties with the Soviet Union. But once the Soviet Union disappeared and Russia began to rise again, the West's resource insufficiency became apparent — particularly in the United States of America. And what happened? Immediately, Trump declared: *"We'll take back the Panama Canal. We'll take Canada. We'll take Greenland. We'll deal with Mexico. The entire Western Hemisphere is ours — stay out of it, we'll handle everyone here ourselves."* This essence immediately revealed itself. If they are in constant confrontation and a state of war among themselves over resources — if they have never even adhered to the principles they themselves declared back in the 17th century — then what kind of treatment can Russia expect? To them, Russia has always been nothing more than a resource appendage of the West.

**And when the Soviet Union emerged — the number one superpower — building an alternative world order, it became necessary to establish rules for coexistence on planet Earth with this alternative world order. This is what the Yalta system truly represents.**

**The Westphalian system is essentially a set of rules governing the conduct of different gangs operating within the same territory, each occupying its own section.** The Yalta system, to use a similar analogy, served to prevent kulak gangs from entering certain areas where territorial units were stationed to combat banditry. That is, these gangs needed to negotiate terms of conduct with entities they couldn't currently fight. At the same time, those entities had no immediate interest in waging war against the gangs — either because they were geographically distant, engaged in different activities, or because certain relations provided mutual benefits. **That was why the Yalta system was necessary. To reiterate, it is fundamentally different from the Westphalian system: while the Westphalian system operates in a conceptually homogeneous environment, the Yalta system functions between two ideologically antagonistic systems that have developed a way to coexist.**

**And the Yalta system is still alive today because the legacy of the Soviet Union has not disappeared.** Even Russia itself is experiencing a revival, and the whole world watches with hope for the resurgence of Russia. **As a result, the question of revising international relations naturally arises — that is, the balance of power is already shifting.** Whereas the West was once dominant, it is now in a state of significant decline. Moreover, the West now faces a new problem — the very countries it once colonized now have excessive populations relative to their struggling economies. This surplus population harbors one primary aspiration — to relocate to the prosperous West. And the principle is simple: *"You*



*were our colonizers, and now you are obligated to provide for us.”* This is precisely what drives the behavior of migrant communities today.

But this process is also being deliberately encouraged by the global “elites.” Why? Because they are shifting the center of governance concentration from Europe to Iran and China. As a result, European states and European nations must be reformatted. Through the influx of new populations, new languages, new peoples, and new states are expected to emerge. **One way or another, the task of establishing new principles of international relations between state entities arises — to prevent civilization from collapsing on planet Earth.** This is exactly what the Yalta system ensured. This is exactly what the Westphalian system ensured — each in accordance with the technological level of societal development of its time. At the time of the Westphalian system, there was a particular level of development, a certain population size, and specific technologies, so international relations had to be structured accordingly to preserve the environment necessary for human existence. Later, new technologies emerged, along with a new global entity that was fundamentally antagonistic to the already existing ones, so new rules for interaction had to be developed. This is what was established.

The way state borders were divided and the way the postwar map was drawn play an absolutely secondary role. What truly matters are the dialogues — both those that were transcribed and those that were not (I mean that many dialogues between the leaders were not officially transcribed) — that determined the acceptable parameters — what one system could or could not do against the other system. The same was true for the Westphalian treaties.

But what about the principles formally established by the Westphalian system? Take, for example, the primacy of nation-states, or the principle of state sovereignty. Why not follow them? Let’s strive toward that. But how many states actually possess full sovereignty? And is the priority of nation-states truly upheld everywhere? Clearly, there is still a long way to go. These principles serve merely as guiding beacons.

That is how this system works. But, I repeat, fully understanding everything I have just explained is only possible if one knows:

- How a state is formed
- How an ordinary state differs from an empire
- What national and supranational governance are
- What conceptual and ideological power is
- And much, much more

All of this is thoroughly covered in our three-volume work “War. State. Bolshevism.”

# Trump's Call to Putin

Verbatim Record of the Question-Answer Program of February 17, 2025

---

**Moderator:** *Another question from Stas. "On February 12, Putin had<sup>8</sup> a telephone conversation with his American colleague, Donald Trump. The heads of state paid special attention to resolving the situation in Ukraine and also discussed the Middle East agenda, Iran's nuclear programme, and the development of bilateral economic relations. They talked about energy, artificial intelligence, and other topics. Putin invited his American colleague to Moscow. Valeriy Viktorovich, does this mean that the pro-American lackey "elites" will finally understand their master has abandoned them? And that the negotiations they were counting on — the signing of Russia's capitulation, as you have repeatedly said — have failed?"*

**Valeriy Viktorovich Pyakin:** No, the pro-American lackey "elites" won't understand. Their slave mentality dictates that the master is always right. Right now, they are simply in a bit of a stupor: *"Who is the master now? And how are we supposed to build new relationships?"*

So, what has happened? Let's briefly analyze the situation with Trump. Right now, Trump is in a great hurry for one simple reason — if he slows down even slightly, he won't have time to accomplish much. The thing is, his opponents are working to completely disable him, rendering him incapacitated, just as they did during his first term. Yes, Trump has now entered the game at a different level. Yes, he is currently dealing with his opponents. But they, too, have prepared for him. In anticipation of Trump's return, the Biden administration moved to consolidate all pro-American puppet governments worldwide in order to ensure that they would not shy away but instead actively work against Trump in support of the very forces that oppose him within the United States. Their thinking remains unchanged: *"We'll outlast Trump for four years, and then everything will go back to how it was."*

In this context, it has now come to light<sup>9</sup> — thanks to Elon Musk's efforts<sup>10</sup> in auditing<sup>11</sup> various<sup>12</sup> organizations<sup>13</sup> — that several hundred billion dollars were funneled into Europe and across the world through various ministries and organizations (some estimates even suggest up to a trillion dollars was funneled) to fund and consolidate all anti-Trump forces in Europe. Moreover, it has been revealed that the Biden administration allocated over a billion dollars to various American NGOs engaged in anti-Trump activities.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/76259>

<sup>9</sup> <https://t.me/svezhesti/128073>

<sup>10</sup> <https://t.me/coolnews1/21713>

<sup>11</sup> <https://t.me/svezhesti/127038>

<sup>12</sup> <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/23127245>

<sup>13</sup> [https://t.me/rian\\_ru/281193](https://t.me/rian_ru/281193)



Trump fully understands that if they consolidate now — if they unite against him as a single, organized front — his governance could collapse. His entire governance is already hanging by a thread. That's why he is pushing forward with such urgency.

But we can see it clearly: Europe, which initially wavered slightly when Trump came to power — having expected Kamala Harris instead — has suddenly consolidated and turned against Trump. Trump calls<sup>14</sup> and speaks with Putin, and immediately afterward, foreign ministers, led<sup>15</sup> by Kaja Kallas, unite<sup>16</sup> to issue a collective ultimatum to Trump<sup>17</sup>: *"No matter what agreement you sign, we will not allow you to implement it. Therefore, you must take us into account."* This is a very strong ultimatum. In other words, anti-Trump forces in Europe still retain considerable control over governance. Yes, their grip is weakening. Yes, Rutte quickly lost his composure<sup>18</sup>, suddenly referring to Putin exclusively as *"Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin."*<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/76259>

<sup>15</sup> <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/23152087>


<sup>16</sup> <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/7498434>

<sup>17</sup> <https://t.me/SolovievLive/311497>

<sup>18</sup> <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/23133791>

<sup>19</sup> [https://youtu.be/QLfy\\_lfLksM?t=1087](https://youtu.be/QLfy_lfLksM?t=1087)

СОЛОВЬЁВ



Глава дипломатии Евросоюза Каллас выразила недовольство по поводу российско-американских договоренностей по Украине, которые были достигнуты без ее участия.

«Без нас за столом переговоров вы можете договориться о чем угодно, но это просто провалится из-за отсутствия реализации. Любое быстрое решение — это грязная сделка, которую мы уже видели раньше, например, в случае с Минском, и оно просто не сработает. Если Украина решит сопротивляться, Европа будет

And there he is, referring to Putin in the Russian tradition. Meanwhile, on all our TV screens, various so-called political oafs and others refer to him only as “*Vladimir Putin*.” Even Zarubin — one would think that, as the host of “Moscow. Kremlin. Putin.,” he, of all people, should consistently say “*Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin*” if he were a truly Russian person. But he is not a Russian person — he is a pro-American lackey. And that’s why, to him, Putin is just “*Vladimir*.”

But the most telling example is the behavior of Vladimir Zelenskiy, this expired U.S. proxy-president in Ukraine. The U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Bessent, arrived in Ukraine with a large team of auditors to inspect the financial activities of the Ukrainian government. Interesting, isn’t it? A commission from another state arrives to audit the government’s activities, and for Ukraine, this is considered normal. Well, that’s because Ukraine is an engineered state — it is not autonomous; it is a failed state. Once again, to understand this, read the three-volume work<sup>20</sup> “War. State. Bolshevism.”

But look at the situation. Bessent arrives<sup>21</sup> with a document and says<sup>22</sup>, “*Here, sign this*

<sup>20</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/>

<sup>21</sup> <https://t.me/fctaltai22/2368>

<sup>22</sup> <https://ria.ru/20250217/sdelka-1999779682.html>


agreement<sup>23</sup>, under which you will transfer your natural resources to the United States.”



## America has just tried to grab Ukraine's vast mineral wealth

THE AMERICAN demand was brutal. President Volodymyr Zelensky had hoped to present his offer to give America access to Ukraine's rare minerals directly to Donald Trump. When America's treasury secretary, Scott Bessent, turned up in Kyiv a few days ahead of this weekend's Munich Security Conference, Mr Zelensky then hoped he'd be talking about continued financial support. Instead, the Ukrainian president unexpectedly found himself presented with a memorandum. The proposal demanded his country's mineral wealth in its entirety. Mr Zelensky had "an hour" to agree, according to three sources with knowledge of the exchange.

Zelenskiy responds, "Jawohl! But may I do it in a ceremonial setting — in Munich<sup>24</sup>, in the presence of the U.S. Vice President J.D. Vance?" "You may." Two days later, he arrives in Munich. And what does he announce<sup>25</sup>? "I'm not going to sign it!" In other words, the behavior of various "state" figures in Europe (all of them "state" in name only) is entirely dictated by whoever has most recently given them instructions, pressured them, or made a phone call. So, when speaking with Bessent, Zelenskiy naturally obeys Trump. But as soon as Bessent leaves, the U.S. national "elites" who oppose Trump begin working on him, and suddenly, he refuses to sign the agreement to transfer natural resources.



<sup>23</sup> <https://t.me/svezhesti/128112>

<sup>24</sup> [https://t.me/rt\\_russian/230244](https://t.me/rt_russian/230244)

<sup>25</sup> <https://t.me/SolovievLive/311618>

But there's something very interesting about these natural resources. When discussing Ukraine's natural resources, Trump stated<sup>26</sup>: *"We gave Ukraine \$177 billion, which means Ukraine's debt is \$300 billion. And now it owes us \$500 billion."* Great economics! And how did he put it? *"We'd be fools not to take it."*

#### СВЕЖЕСТИ

! Трамп заявил, что Украина согласна с его оценкой долга в размере 0,5 триллиона долларов, который она должна Соединенным Штатам

«Я сказал им, что мне нужна сумма, эквивалентная 500 миллиардам долларов в редкоземельных металлах, и они, по сути, согласились это сделать. Так что, по крайней мере, мы не будем чувствовать себя глупыми. В противном случае мы глупые. Я сказал им, что мы должны, мы должны что-то получить», — сказал Трамп Fox News.

Президент США заявил, что Украина должна гарантировать сохранность вложенных американских средств. США, по его словам, потратили на помощь Киеву 300-350 миллиардов.

But there's one "small" problem: Ukraine is part of Russia. Yes, for now, it has temporarily broken away from central governance — there is a "wild field" there, and its gangs are already in the process of being pacified — but nonetheless, it remains part of Russia. Moreover, the majority of its natural resources are already under Russian military control, meaning they cannot simply be taken. And so, Trump contemplates deeply<sup>27</sup>: *"Ukraine may go back to Russia, or it may not go back to Russia."* But what is he really saying? His speech was quite lengthy, yet many — at least, I haven't heard any political analysts — failed to truly grasp what Trump was saying.


---

<sup>26</sup> <https://ria.ru/20250211/tramp-1998518850.html>

<sup>27</sup> <https://t.me/dimsmirnov175/90102>



Пул №3



Трамп – о том, что Украина может стать Россией:

На прошедшей неделе мы достигли значительного прогресса. Мы взаимодействуем с русскими, с украинцами. Надеюсь, что-то получится. У Украины очень ценная земля в плане редкоземельных металлов, нефти и газа. Я хочу, чтобы наши деньги были в безопасности, потому что мы тратим сотни миллиардов долларов. Они могут заключить сделку, они могут не заключить сделку.

Однажды они могут стать Россией или могут не стать Россией, но наши деньги там, и я хочу их вернуть. Я уже говорил им, что хочу получить эквивалент в виде редкоземельных металлов на сумму около 500 млрд долларов. И они, по сути, уже согласились на это, так что мы хотя бы не чувствуем себя дураками.

And Trump, when translated into Russian, essentially said the following: *“You see, here’s the situation — we’ve spent a great deal in this war against Russia. No, not financially — we have plenty of money. There are six times the world’s total GDP floating around the planet in cash dollars alone, scattered in people’s pockets. What we lack are real resources. Russia, do you want this territory (Ukraine) to be yours? Do you want us to hand it over to you? Then you must give us \$500 billion worth of natural resources — only then will the territory of Ukraine be yours. You destroyed it in your war against these Banderite (Benderian) gangs<sup>28</sup>, and you will be the ones to rebuild it. But in return, you must guarantee our resource stability to the tune of \$500 billion. Do you think I’m fighting tooth and nail for Greenland or for Canada just for the sake of it? No — I need resources.”*

As Musk said, *“Money is just a database for exchange of goods & services.”* He phrased it this way, **but in the Conception of Public Safety, the definition is more precise: money is the most generalized form of information about product exchange.** This is exactly the idea Musk conveyed.

---

<sup>28</sup> Refers to modern Ukrainian nationalists — [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stepan\\_Bandera](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stepan_Bandera)  
“Bender” refers to Ivan Mazepa’s betrayal and subsequent flight to the fortress of Bender (Tighina) after the Battle of Poltava (1709). Ivan Mazepa was a hetman of Ukraine who sided with Sweden against Russia. — [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ivan\\_Mazepa#:~:text=The%20Swedish%20and%20Russian,the%20age%20of%2070](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ivan_Mazepa#:~:text=The%20Swedish%20and%20Russian,the%20age%20of%2070).

# "Money is a database for resource allocation"

I think I have a pretty deep understanding of what money actually is on a day to day basis because of Paypal...

...think of money as information. People often will think of money as having power in and of itself. It does not.

Just think of money as a database for resource allocation across time and space.

And then in what form should that database or data system — what form would be most effective? You're operating an economy and you need to have something that allows for efficient value ratios between products and services. You have this massive number of products and services and you can't just barter, that would be extremely unwieldy. You need something that gives you a ratio of exchange between goods and services and then something that allows you to shift obligations across time."

This is from an [interview Elon Musk did with Lex Fridman](#) in 2021. Elon has said something like this a few times. Predictably, he gets crap for it.





Elon Musk  
@elonmusk

Follow

...

The real economy is not money, it is goods & services.

Money is simply an abstract representation of real things.



DogeDesigner



@cb\_doge · Jan 30

ELON MUSK: "Money is just a database for exchange of goods & services. Money doesn't have power in & of itself. The actual economy is goods & services."



4:47 AM · Jan 31, 2025 · 32.1M Views

Money itself means nothing beyond that — but resources do. So, when some say, *"Your Gazprom is nothing. Look at Google's market capitalization and then look at Gazprom's..."* — then the crisis hit. And what happened? Did Google save the West when gas ran out? Or did industries start collapsing? Meanwhile, Gazprom directly sustained Russia — gas tangibly supports Russia's interests. In other words, real economics always matters — not the artificial, inflated, speculative economy that has been built worldwide to sustain a financial bubble, pumped up by parasitizing the entire world through the issuance of unbacked currency.

That's why, for Trump to stay in power and keep his economy running, he needs resources. But he cannot take resources from Ukraine directly. It is crucial for him that Zelenskiy signs the agreement and hands over Ukraine's resources to the United States. Then, with this worthless piece of paper (Philip's letter<sup>29</sup>), they can at least maintain a façade of legitimacy when making claims on some of Russia's resources.

In reality, Trump is acting exactly as the foreign interventionists did toward Soviet Russia after the Civil War and foreign intervention. Back then, they also said: *"During the intervention, we incurred significant costs fighting against you. We spent this many shells, this many bullets, suffered these human losses, and so on. We intended to colonize and*

---

<sup>29</sup> Philip's letter (филькина грамота) is a Russian idiom referring to a document that is either poorly written, has no legal force, or is entirely meaningless. The phrase originated from the 16th century when Ivan IV (Ivan Vasilyevich) dismissed the letters of Metropolitan Philip II of Moscow as worthless, calling them "филькина грамота" (Philip's scribble).

*carve you up, using that to recover our losses and turn a profit. But since we failed to do so, now you, Soviet Russia, must compensate us for all of it — and pay even more — so that we still make a profit.*” Trump is operating under the exact same logic — he demands to be compensated.


What did the West get from Soviet Russia? Nothing. Moreover... Yes, at that time, the Soviet Union was not yet in a position to fully dictate its will to the West. This allowed the West, to some extent, to seize our Russian island of Grumant (now called Spitzbergen). Later, during his tenure as Russia’s presiding resident — installed by the United States — Dmitriy Anatolyevich Medvedev even attempted to hand it over to Norway. Yet another attempt to deprive Russia of its resource-rich territory and surrender it to the West. But this is exactly how the pro-American lackey “elites” operate — they hate Russia. Their sole objective is to lick their master’s ass. They are slaves in their mentality, and they simply cannot break free from it.

How did Peskov report on Putin’s phone conversation with Trump? Listen to it — it’s available online, just two minutes long. He speaks about Trump with absolute reverence, as if he were a master, a true decision-maker, an independent force in governance — one who gives directives while Putin merely agrees, suggests things, and strives to carry out Trump’s will. Peskov spoke about Putin in such a demeaning way, yet about Trump with such admiration — *“Finally!”* The message was clear: *“Trump told Putin this, and Putin agreed,”* while Putin merely *“reminded, mentioned — almost as if we have some interests too.”* Meanwhile, Trump *“graciously agreed,”* and Putin *“immediately promised to fulfill everything Trump said.”* Disgusting. Simply disgusting! Once again, Peskov demonstrated an outrageous level of Russophobia, proving himself to be an absolute pro-American lackey. He cannot even conceive of Russia as a sovereign, independent state — only the will of the master matters to him. And in his comments on Putin’s conversation with Trump, he sent a clear message: *“Don’t think Putin is an independent leader. Don’t think Russia will act as a truly sovereign state. We will obey the will of our master. The master is different, but he is still American, and so we will serve him.”*

And this was immediately reflected<sup>30</sup> in the key interest rate. Do you think Nabiullina lowered the key interest rate? No.

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.cbr.ru/press/keypr/#:~:text=>



The essence of all this is as follows (returning once again to the Westphalian system of international relations and the Yalta one). Following the dismantling of the Soviet Union, the entire West — enabled by absolutely non-independent, non-sovereign policies of the “RussZion elite” (these servile, pro-American lackey “elites” whose highest aspiration in life is to lick their American master’s ass) — came to believe that the Yalta system no longer existed, and that Russia was nothing more than an ordinary colony to be looted. As a result, the Western “elites” continue to speak to Russia with condescension, while the “RussZion elite” desperately scrambles to serve them. And the way the Special Military Operation for Demilitarization and Denazification has been conducted over the past three years has only reinforced the West’s conviction that the “RussZion elite” would never dare to inflict any real harm on their Western master.

Then an American senator speaks, explaining why this agreement is necessary, and he says<sup>31</sup>: *“Do you understand the situation? We will sign these agreements with Zelenskiy, deploy American troops to Ukrainian territory, and that’s it — the war is over. Russia will not dare to touch American troops. Russia will concede all the natural resources that Zelenskiy signs over to us, because, from that moment on, they will belong to the Americans. And that’s it — no more war. We arrived, we are Americans, we control everything.”*

---

<sup>31</sup> <https://t.me/dimsmirnov175/90423>

Пул N3



Сенатор Линдси Грэм - объяснил, что продажа украинских редкоземов США закончит конфликт на Украине:

И каким образом остановить Путина? Вооружить вот этого человека [Зеленского] до зубов. Дайте ему танки, ATACMS, F-16, потому что его народ будет воевать ожесточенно и умело. А потом давайте заключим соглашение по редкоземельным минералам.

Почему? Потому что если мы это сделаем, хуже всего будет Путину, потому что Трамп будет защищать эту сделку до конца. Он будет защищать американские интересы. Думаю, что война закончится раньше, и у меня есть уверенность в том, что Трамп закончит войну так, чтобы третьего вторжения в Украину не было.

In Bogdanov's program about America, which aired on Kiselev's "Vesti Nedeli," there was a segment — perhaps incomplete, but notable nonetheless. In it, CBS interviewed a journalist who works with Ukraine, and he said: *"In Ukraine, everyone was thrilled when Trump came to power. They believed that, since he had previously imposed sanctions on Russia, he would now put it in such a position... He would order Russia to stop the war — and they would comply."*

Ukraine was completely stunned that Trump didn't order Russia to stop the war. On the contrary, he is now demanding that Ukraine take certain actions to appease Russia. This came as a total shock to them.

But the most important point made was this: *"In Ukraine, Europe, and the United States, everyone is convinced that the United States is the ultimate global authority, and if the American president gives an order, it must be followed without question. Russia is being punished for defying the U.S. president. But now, with Russia so exhausted and the arrival of a decisive Trump, it has no choice but to submit."* And in this regard, the entire pro-American lackey "RussZion elite" thinks the same way.

Europe was in shock... Bloomberg reported<sup>32</sup> that they were stunned by Trump's

---


<sup>32</sup> <https://www.interfax.ru/world/1007699>

conversation with Putin, while Lavrov described<sup>33</sup> them as being in a state of stupor. I don't recall his exact words, but this captures the essence of what he said. *"How could this happen?! Instead of ordering Putin, instead of continuing to pressure him... Russia was so close to being completely crushed! Look at the RussZion elite — they are all pro-American lackeys, entirely pro-Western, betraying Russia's interests. Nabiullina is dismantling Russia's economy, which is why she has once again been named the world's best banker — because she follows U.S. directives better than anyone, because she is systematically destroying Russia for the sake of U.S. interests. And now, suddenly, Trump is negotiating with Putin?!"*

**В МИРЕ**  
11:13, 13 февраля 2025

**Bloomberg сообщил, что Европу заранее не уведомили о разговоре Трампа и Путина**

⌚ Есть обновление от 12:10 →  
Слуцкий заявил о ночном разговоре с американскими конгрессменами



Лавров – об уроке для Запада от Путина и Трампа:

Москва. 13 февраля. INTERFAX.RU - Телефонный разговор президентов США и РФ Дональда Трампа и Владимира Путина застал европейские страны врасплох, [сообщает](#) в четверг Bloomberg со ссылкой на источники.

"По словам двух официальных лиц, власти европейских стран ошеломил звонок Трампа и Путина - значительный дипломатический шаг, о котором не уведомили ключевых союзников", - информирует агентство.

Один из собеседников назвал разговор "изменой", отметив, что США уже уступают требованиям РФ. Другой источник утверждал, что в Европе обеспокоены якобы отсутствием в команде Трампа кого-либо "с настоящим опытом ведения переговоров с россиянами".

Судя по всему, по тому удивлению, по тому ступору, который вызвали переговоры по телефону между Трампом и Путиным, все, что происходит на Украине, все, что творит нацистский режим Зеленского, Запад стал воспринимать как должное – вот именно так надо общаться с Россией.

Поэтому, наверное, на Западе многие, начиная с руководителей Евросоюза, оцепенели, когда состоялся нормальный элементарный разговор двух воспитанных вежливых людей, которые не откидывают в сторону разногласия – их много, их немало. Но которые прекрасно понимают, что политика – это садиться и разговаривать, искать точки соприкосновения.

Мне очень жаль, что реакция Запада говорит о том, что там таких людей практически не осталось. И когда два воспитанных человека показывают, как надо заниматься политикой, надеюсь, это немножко отрезвит тех, кто это забыл и заставит перечитать учебники истории и школьные учебники политологии.

Simply due to their own shortsightedness, they failed to grasp what Trump fully understands — what the supranational governance of the world truly realized when it agreed to the Yalta Conference agreements. The subsequent Cold War, which the West launched against Russia, did not lead to Russia's destruction. It resulted in only a single temporary victory in this long war. And as it turns out, that victory did not guarantee ultimate triumph — it merely postponed inevitable defeat. It's much like all the victories the Wehrmacht achieved on its march to Moscow. Yes, for now, we are still striking the West at a level comparable to the Soviet victory outside Moscow. Yes, there is still a long road ahead before securing complete victory over the West. But it is already in sight! The West cannot sustain the production of enough ammunition to continue its war against Russia. Even if they manage to maintain the Armed Forces of Ukraine at their desired numbers, they simply have nothing left to arm them

<sup>33</sup> <https://t.me/dimsmirnov175/90306>

with — they are emptying their stockpiles. They need a break.

And it is precisely this break that all the pro-American lackey “elites” are now desperately calling for on every television channel. And the West sees it too — how the “RussZion elite” is eager to surrender Russia, to betray it.

And suddenly, Trump is speaking with Putin. But Trump understands one simple fact: while the “RussZion elite” may be concentrated in state governance, they make up only 1%. And if they continue betraying Russia, history will repeat itself — just as it did in the 17th century, when the militia of Pozharskiy and Minin drove out foreign interventionists from Moscow and restored Russia’s sovereignty and the independence of the state. And it will happen again, just as in 1917, when the Bolsheviks rebuilt the state and made it the world’s number one superpower.


Trump represents the global “elites” — they want to boil us like a frog, slowly. To do that, they need to prolong the process, reinforce the United States with resources, and maintain conceptual indeterminacy in Russia, symbolized by the double-headed eagle. **Symbols carry great meaning!** So, if your state emblem is a double-headed eagle, don’t expect conceptual determinacy in state policy. You will always find yourself in situations like this: you are at war with Hitler, yet at the same time, you sell him ammunition so he can fight against you. Just as it’s happening now — the West is waging war against us, yet we are still supplying them with resources, enabling them to produce shells and bullets that are then used to kill our people, including civilians. Because, after all, it’s profitable — it’s just business.

Never in history have warring states supplied each other with resources. If someone was caught doing this, it was considered treason — and they were executed. But today, it has become the norm. Selling weapons to the enemy? He is called a businessman. Engaging in economic sabotage? Nabiullina is called the world’s best banker. In any system — whether Westphalian or Yalta — if a state had even a shred of sovereignty, Nabiullina would have already been executed. Yet instead, she remains the head of the Central Bank, a so-called respected figure.

Precisely because the entire European “elite” was convinced that Russia was on the verge of collapse — that just a little more pressure would be enough — Trump’s sudden pivot to negotiations left them completely stunned. They had no idea what was happening and immediately began voicing their anti-Trump stance.

I repeat, the anti-Trump forces worked hard to consolidate the European “elite.” But the European “elite” is absolutely non-independent — this “elite” is absolutely controllable. Do you think the appointment of Baltic politicians to key positions in the European Union was accidental? When an audit looms and someone must answer for all the theft and for the collapse of the governed body, a scapegoat is always needed. That’s precisely why Baltic politicians have been chosen as the sacrificial lambs — those who will be publicly punished to instill fear and force the rest into submission. Especially now, when there are no independent leaders left within the European “elite.”

And here's J.D. Vance arriving — but instead of meeting with Scholz<sup>34</sup>, he meets<sup>35</sup> with Merz and Alice Weidel. And what about Scholz<sup>36</sup>? Vance's message is clear: *"Why would I meet with you? You won't be chancellor for much longer — by tomorrow, you'll be gone. We are the ones taking charge of governance."*



And in this regard, what truly matters is how the ice will break. Immediately, the President of Switzerland declares<sup>37</sup>, *"I support Vance."* Without delay, Rutte also voices<sup>38</sup> his support for Vance. And off we go.



<sup>34</sup> <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/23139433>

<sup>35</sup> <https://ria.ru/20250215/germaniya-1999512286.html>

<sup>36</sup> <https://t.me/svezhesti/127902>

<sup>37</sup>

<https://www.swissinfo.ch/rus/rus/внешняя-политика/президент-швейцарии-вэнс-выступил-в-защиту-прямой-демократии/88882826>

<sup>38</sup>

<https://edition.cnn.com/world/live-news/ukraine-russia-nato-war-negotiations-02-14-25-intl/index.html>



Президент Швейцарии Карин Келлер-Зуттер (FDP) в интервью газете Le Temps высказалась о выступлении вице-президента США Дж. Д. Вэнса на Мюнхенской конференции по безопасности. По ее словам, он говорил о «либеральных ценностях», которые она разделяет и которые необходимо защищать – в том числе о свободе и праве людей высказывать свое мнение.

16 февраля 2025 года - 12:00

🕒 3 минут

≡ **CNN** World

SI

11:48 p.m. GMT+3, February 14, 2025

## **NATO chief calls Vance's speech "philosophical," says Europe must "grow up" and increase defense spending**

From CNN's Eve Brennan

This is, in fact, an objective process. Since the entire Western “elite” is non-independent, they are left with only one choice: either they align themselves with Trump’s agenda, or they will be removed from their positions. Poland grasped this reality faster than anyone, and the idea of building “Fort Trump” immediately resurfaced<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.interfax.ru/world/1009093>



В МИРЕ

19:51, 14 февраля 2025

## Президент Польши предложил создать в стране военную базу "Форт Трамп"

🕒 Есть обновление от 19:27 →  
Вашингтон заверил Варшаву, что не будет сокращать контингент ВС США в Польше

Москва. 14 февраля. INTERFAX.RU - Президент Польши Анджей Дуда выступил с предложением разместить в стране американскую военную базу.

"Именно во время предыдущего срока Дональда Трампа было увеличено военное присутствие США в Польше. Тогда я улыбнулся и сказал, что это будет своего рода Fort Trump в Польше, но сегодня после этого разговора я могу сказать без улыбки: я глубоко верю, что Fort Trump действительно будет построен в нашей стране", - заявил Дуда в пятницу после встречи с министром обороны США Питом Хэгсетом, его цитирует агентство PAP.


This is how Trump is working to preserve his system. Instead of relying on sanctions, he is shifting toward tariffs<sup>40</sup> — because while sanctions push Russia and other countries out of the dollar-based economy, tariffs serve to strengthen the U.S. while economically weakening the taxed country. This is precisely the strategy the United States employed throughout the 20th century. However, this approach is only effective if you are the world's hegemon.

What is a tariff, after all? When you impose a tariff on a foreign product, it raises its price in your domestic market. If your domestic market lacks a cheaper domestically produced alternative, this directly impacts the well-being of your citizens. Today, the United States is practically deindustrialized. To reindustrialize, the United States has historically relied on tariffs. However, in the past, tariffs always impacted suppliers exporting goods to the United States. In other words, to keep their products affordable for American consumers, suppliers — such as China — absorbed the costs by reducing profit margins, cutting worker's wages, or making other financial adjustments to stay profitable while continuing exports to the United States.

The situation is fundamentally different now — the United States can no longer force anyone to trade at a loss. The collapse of the system is ongoing. That's why securing resources is so crucial for Trump at this moment. And if he manages to strike a deal with Russia... He always talks about deals. But why should the United States have any say in our relations with Ukraine — Russia's territory, now temporarily rebellious? Why should the United States have any stake in our relations with Germany or France? We are an independent state and

<sup>40</sup> <https://t.me/dimsmirnov175/90218>

must act as a sovereign one. Yes, our so-called elite is neither independent nor sovereign. Recently, one of our deputy ministers was even officially designated<sup>41</sup> a foreign agent because, while holding office, he actively betrayed Russia's interests. And this was a deputy foreign minister! So, what is the West supposed to think when treason against Russia occurs at such a high level?



So, what did Putin say about the negotiations? He made it clear<sup>42</sup> that we must address the root causes of the crisis — and Ukraine is not the root cause of the crisis. The real root cause of the crisis is the collective West's aggression against Russia, particularly NATO's expansion eastward. That is the root cause of the crisis, and that is what we will discuss.




<sup>41</sup> <https://www.interfax.ru/russia/926957>

<sup>42</sup> <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/76259>

Putin also stated<sup>43</sup> that we will discuss the Ukrainian problematic. We are not going to debate whether Ukraine will exist as a state or not — that is none of their business. Whether Ukraine ultimately becomes part of Russia or remains in some other form for a time is not their concern. So, what exactly does “the Ukrainian problematic” refer to? “The Ukrainian problematic” refers to the involvement of foreign states in the war they are waging against Russia through Ukraine. That is the real Ukrainian problematic — a discussion about the policies of those states that dared to interfere in Russia’s internal affairs.

I repeat: we will not discuss Ukraine’s future with anyone — that is for us to decide. What we will do is settle the issue with all the states that dared to interfere in Russia’s internal affairs and violate Russia’s territorial integrity, using these Ukrainian gangs as a tool. In this situation, dialogue must occur, and negotiations must take place. Putin has already explained everything in sufficient detail, basically.

Unlike Peskov, Putin is a conceptually powerful and fully sovereign gosudar of Russia, pursuing a conceptually determined, sovereign, and independent policy for Russia. This is something both Trump and the supranational governance understand. They recognize that Russia cannot simply be crushed, which means that, at this stage, negotiations must take place regardless of the costs it entails. Of course, they are playing the classic “good cop, bad cop” routine: while Kellogg declares<sup>44</sup>, “*We will impose sanctions on Russia, we will do this, we will order Russia to do that,*” Witkoff counters with<sup>45</sup>, “*We will negotiate, we will seek a framework for trust.*”



The image is a screenshot of a news article from the New York Post. The header is red with the 'NEW YORK POST' logo in white. Below the header, there are navigation links: 'US News', 'Metro', 'Long Island', 'Politics', and 'World News'. The main headline is 'Trump ready to double down on Russian sanctions, US envoy to Ukraine Keith Kellogg says'. Below the headline, it says 'By Caitlin Doornbos' and 'Published Feb. 6, 2025, 5:21 p.m. ET'. There is a red speech bubble icon with the number '49'. Below the article, there is a section titled 'СВЕЖЕСТИ' (Freshness) with a red exclamation mark icon. The text in this section is in Russian: 'Делегация США сегодня отправляется в Саудовскую Аравию для переговоров с представителями России, есть надежда на хороший прогресс'. Below this, there is another line of Russian text: 'Спецпосланник Трампа Уиткофф также сообщил, что на первом этапе речь пойдет о «строительстве доверия» с Россией.'

And when we state unequivocally that we have no intention of discussing Ukraine with the

<sup>43</sup> <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/76259>

<sup>44</sup> <https://tass.ru/ekonomika/23153161>

<sup>45</sup> <https://tass.ru/ekonomika/23153161>

West in any way, Kellogg immediately retorts: *“The West will be at the negotiating table!”* But what business does the West have being there? First, we will settle our bilateral relations with the United States, and only then will we resolve the Ukrainian problematic with everyone else — no problem. If they refuse to engage, so be it. Russia will be a sovereign state again, no matter how desperately the pro-American lackey “RussZion elite” tries to prevent it — with Elvira Sakhipzadovna Nabiullina as their frontman.

So, they will achieve nothing. They don’t understand that they are completely non-independent; they are slaves, they are mentally enslaved by the West. That’s why they fail to grasp their master’s moves. Meanwhile, the master fully understands that in order to preserve civilization on planet Earth, it is necessary to negotiate with Russia. For now, Russia is still in a state where it cannot yet fully and conceptually assert its domestic and foreign policies with absolute determinacy — so now is the time to negotiate with it. But Russia will not make concessions.

That’s why they were so desperate to remove Putin and install Medvedev, whose only dream was to lick foreign ass — and for that, he was willing to surrender Russia. Just recall the war of 08.08.08 and his Medvedev-Sarkozy format<sup>46</sup>: it was only thanks to Putin that the genocide of the Ossetian people was prevented. Medvedev had already struck a deal — he betrayed our peacekeepers in an instant. Meanwhile, Sarkozy was in tears, pleading with Putin not to deploy soldiers, to give NATO time to organize and send its troops into the Caucasus, severing the region from Russia and kick-starting NATO’s expansion there into the Caucasus. Medvedev was fully on board with this plan. By the way, there’s a highly revealing documentary about these events, made in their immediate aftermath.

That’s the situation.

**Moderator:** *That’s all for today.*

**Valeriy Viktorovich Pyakin:** Well then, all that remains is for me to say goodbye and remind you that many things are incomprehensible to us not because our minds are weak, but because these things do not fall within the circle of our concepts. In the past, being able to read, write, and count was enough to establish oneself as an educated person and a responsible citizen. Today, however, one must also understand how complex social supersystems — such as states — are governed. When you step onto the street without knowing the rules of the road, you risk being hit by a car or finding yourself in another dangerous, even catastrophic, situation. But if you know the rules of the road, you can calmly avoid such dangers.

Therefore, if you know how states are governed, you will always be able to build your own life in a way that minimizes the impact of crises caused by ineffective state governance. Moreover, by building your life this way, you will also contribute to shaping broader state processes, steering them toward greater alignment with your aspirations for peace, prosperity, and a promising future. After all, only a strong state can ensure a peaceful and secure future for us and our children.

---

<sup>46</sup> <http://www.kremlin.ru/supplement/201>

However, the greatest problem of modern society is that people do not know how complex social supersystems are governed. Such knowledge is presented in only one source — the works<sup>47</sup> of the Internal Predictor of the USSR.

And for the current moment, for the situation we face today, we have already prepared in advance a three-volume work titled “War. State. Bolshevism.”

- This work outlines the fundamental principles of state organization — what a state is, what an empire is, what a “state-constructor” is, what an engineered state is, and what a historical state is. These topics are explored in detail in the first volume, “State.”<sup>48</sup>
- The second volume, “War,”<sup>49</sup> examines the methods of waging wars, including how the objectives of seizing foreign natural, energy, and human resources are achieved through non-military means. It explores the conduct of trade wars, cold wars, and, most significantly, how our “invincible and legendary, having known the joy of victory in battle, and beloved Red Army,” suddenly collapsed without a single fight — brought down by betrayal. The bulk of the second volume is dedicated to how the West prepared for war against Russia and how preparations for the First World War began after the Patriotic War of 1812.
- Right now, the world is experiencing a serious and bloody cataclysm; Russia is being drenched in blood. That is why the third volume, “Bolshevism,”<sup>50</sup> is dedicated to finding a way out of this bloody vortex. In Russia, the solution has always been found in the unique historical and cultural phenomenon of the Russian people — in Russian Bolshevism. Russian Bolshevism saved Russia during the Time of Troubles in the 17th century, it saved Russia during the Time of Troubles of the early 20th century, and it is Russian Bolshevism that is saving Russia now, as the Time of Troubles of the early 21st century unfolds. It is precisely for this reason that all of Russia’s enemies — from Hitler to the so-called Russian pro-American lackeys, regardless of what they call themselves — harbor such hatred for Russian Bolshevism and such love for fascism. But the ideologue of Russian fascism, Ilyin, once said, *“The Russian people are historically Bolshevik, and therefore we will not succeed in imposing fascism in Russia unless we change the culture of the Russian people.”* This is exactly why cultural wars are being waged — to reformat our people’s culture in order to impose fascism, and turn Russia into a raw-material appendage of the West. The pro-American lackeys — the so-called “RussZion elite” in Russia — have even established a state-funded propaganda center for fascism at a state university. And now, the war against fascism is in full swing: the Great Patriotic War continues, and on the battlefields of the Special Military Operation for Demilitarization and Denazification, our brothers are fighting for Russia’s sovereignty, repelling fascist aggression. Meanwhile, the fascist pro-American lackey “elites,” the devotees of Ilyin, are stabbing our army in the back. They dream of seeing Russia colonized, fascism imposed in Russia, and Russian culture eradicated altogether — for them, the people are simply not what they ought to be. For Ilyin, the people were always the wrong

---

<sup>47</sup> <https://zaznob.in/raboty-avtorskogo-kollektiva-vnutrennij-prediktor-sssr/>

<sup>48</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-1-gosudarstvo>

<sup>49</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-2-voyna>

<sup>50</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-tom-3-bolshevizm>

kind, despite his self-proclaimed status as a “great admirer” of the Russian people.

Let me repeat: for this bloody and turbulent period — both to understand it and to navigate it with minimal bloodshed — we have prepared the three-volume work “War. State. Bolshevism.” This is complemented by another work, “State Symbols and State Sovereignty.”<sup>51</sup> Just as a serviceman’s uniform and insignia reveal his branch and rank, a state’s symbols — primarily its flag — reveal its nature, its place in the global hierarchy of states and its capabilities. And once you understand this, the arguments of many political analysts will seem laughable, because simply by looking at a flag, you can immediately grasp a state’s potential and its degree of subordination within global processes. I often say that Iran will become the center of governance concentration for the Euro-Asian wing of the Global Predictor, even though many focus solely on Iran’s internal problems. After all, the center of governance concentration is being established in Iran precisely because Iran retains remnants of the imperial culture inherited from the Persian Empire. However, because its level of statehood remains weak, it has a corresponding flag. But once Iran gains potential, its flag will change accordingly.

As a supplement to the three-volume set “War. State. Bolshevism,” our partners have published a collection of analytical notes titled “Fleet Is Being.”<sup>52</sup> These analytical notes, covering topics such as the Constitution of Russia, the Central Bank, the WTO, and other critical issues, will help you better understand the nature of our state’s position in the modern world.

In addition, our partners, along with the first and second editions of the book “War. State. Bolshevism,” have published an additional volume<sup>53</sup> containing the materials that were later incorporated into the third edition, which is now available in print.

Additionally, our partners are publishing a series of books titled “The Library of Conceptual Knowledge.”

- A volume, “On Economics,”<sup>54</sup> has been published, explaining how an economy should function and how to determine the role of each governing entity in the economic sphere.
- A volume, “On Imitative and Provocative Activity,”<sup>55</sup> has been published. Today, one of the major problems is that public opinion leaders often turn out to be different from who they claim to be. How can you tell whether the public opinion leader you trust is engaging with you honestly or attempting to deceive you and lead you astray? This is precisely why the collection “On Imitative and Provocative Activity” was released.
- The third volume, “Sufficiently General Theory of Governance,”<sup>56</sup> serves as the foundation of the Conception of Public Safety.

---

<sup>51</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/gosudarstvennye-simvoly-i-gosudarstvennyy-suverenitet>

<sup>52</sup> [https://fct-altai.ru/files/Books/O\\_mire\\_krivykh\\_zerkal\\_Fleet\\_Is\\_Being\\_original.pdf](https://fct-altai.ru/files/Books/O_mire_krivykh_zerkal_Fleet_Is_Being_original.pdf)

<sup>53</sup>

<https://vp-sssr.ru/works/voyna-gosudarstvo-bolshevizm-dopolnitelnyy-tom-k-1-mu-i-2-mu-izdaniyam>

<sup>54</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/ob-ekonomike>

<sup>55</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/ob-imitacionno-provokacionnoy-deyatelnosti>

<sup>56</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/dostatochno-obshchaya-teoriya-upravleniya>

- The next volume, “Ay da Pushkin!,”<sup>57</sup> explores the conceptual depth of Pushkin’s works.
- Next comes the volume “Matrix Is Different from ‘Matrix’,”<sup>58</sup> which explores the application of matrix governance in complex social supersystems.
- Also, a book “On How to Live in a Human Way” has been published. It delves into the true essence of Stalinism — what Stalinism really is, beyond the myths propagated by the mass media, but rather the real Stalinism, as expressed both in actions and in its theoretical legacy.
- And the next volume<sup>59</sup>, published by our partners, is a reissue of a collection of analytical notes from 1923 on world fascism. In other words, fascism was defined and theoretically developed as early as 1923. Yet today, when people attempt to theorize, saying, *“In Italy, this is fascism, while in Germany, it is national socialism, and these are different things,”* the reality remains that both were manifestations of fascism — each adapted to national specificities. This becomes evident when reading the book, which was written even before the Nazis came to power in Germany. Even then, everything was clearly laid out in these analytical notes on world fascism. That is why our fathers and grandfathers knew exactly whom they were fighting against, which is why they referred to the enemy forces as German-fascist rather than national-socialist. The term “fascist” signified the unification of all fascist forces around Germany.

Read these and other works by the Internal Predictor of the USSR, become conceptually powerful, defend your interests and those of your family, and through that, defend the interests of the state — ensuring future prosperity, a peaceful sky above your head, and happiness for yourself, your family, and your children.

Goodbye! I’ll see you next time!

**“QUESTION-ANSWER” OF 17.02.2025**  
**from: [www.fktdeutsch.wordpress.com](http://www.fktdeutsch.wordpress.com)**

---

<sup>57</sup> “Well Done Pushkin!” <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/ay-da-pushkin>

<sup>58</sup> “Not Every Matrix Is the Same” <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/matrica-matrice-rozn>

<sup>59</sup> <https://vp-sssr.ru/works/mirovoy-fashizm>