



Putin on the new world order: Russia reaches out to all states

Description

RUSSIA: Like every year, Putin gave a keynote speech at the Valdai Club. He settled accounts with the West and its policies and at the same time reached out his hand to all states of the world.

Every year, the Russian president's Valdai speeches are a geopolitical highlight for friend and foe alike, because Putin speaks at length about his views on the current state of international politics and then takes questions from the experts in the room for hours. This year again, the discussion lasted over four hours.

Here I translate the opening speech of President Putin, in which he settled accounts with the “values” of the West and showed where they lead. For Putin, it is obvious, the dominance of the West is already history, in Putin's eyes the West is fighting for its survival. In the next few days, I will translate and publish selected questions and Putin's answers to them from the panel discussion that followed Putin's speech.

Today we begin with his speech, in which he calls for global cooperation and mutual respect, and offers the world an alternative to the Western-centered world order. What particularly impressed me about Putin's speech is how he addresses people in the West, reaching out to them in the knowledge that many people there also disagree with what their governments are doing.

Start of translation:

Dear participants of the plenary session! Ladies and gentlemen! Friends.

I got a little glimpse of the discussions that took place here in the past few days, they were very interesting and informative. I hope that you have not regretted coming to Russia and talk to each other.

It is good to see all of you.

At the Valdai Club, we talked more than once about the changes, the serious, major changes that have

taken place and continue to take place in the world, about the risks associated with the dismantling of global institutions, the erosion of the principles of collective security, the replacement of international law with so-called rules – I was going to say rules drawn up by anyone, but that is probably inaccurately expressed it is not at all clear who drew them up, what these rules are based on, what is in them. (Translator's note: Putin is referring to the "rules-based world order" proclaimed by the West – you can find more information about what is behind the term [here](#)).

Obviously, there is only an attempt to establish a single rule so that the powerful – we are talking about power now, I am talking about global power – can live without any rules and do whatever they want, get away with whatever they want. In fact, these are the rules we are constantly told about.

The value of the Valdai discussions lies in the fact that the most diverse assessments and forecasts are made here. How correct they were is shown by life itself, life, the strictest and most objective examiner. It shows how true the contents of our discussions have been in the past years.

Unfortunately, events continue to unfold according to the negative scenario that we talked about more than once at our previous meetings. Moreover, these events have developed into a comprehensive systemic crisis, not only in the military-political sphere, but also in the economic and humanitarian spheres.

The so-called West-this is meant in a figurative sense, of course, because there is no unity there-is understandably a very complicated conglomerate, yet it can be said that in recent years, and especially in recent months, this West has taken a number of steps toward escalation. Strictly speaking, it always relies on escalation; that is not new. These are the instigation of the war in Ukraine, the provocations around Taiwan, and the destabilization of global food and energy markets. The latter, of course, was not intentional, there is no doubt about that, but due to a series of systematic mistakes by those very Western governments that I mentioned earlier. And as we see now, the destruction of the pan-European gas pipelines was added to that. This is unimaginable, but we are nevertheless witnessing these sad events.

Power over the world is exactly what the so-called West has been betting on. But this game is certainly a dangerous, bloody and, I would say, dirty game. It denies the sovereignty of countries and peoples, their identity and uniqueness, and ignores the interests of other states. At least when it does not explicitly deny those interests, however, that is exactly how it is done in practice. No one, except those who formulate the said rules, has the right to develop their own identity: Everyone else must submit to these rules.

In this context, I would like to remind you of Russia's proposals to its Western partners on confidence-building and the development of a system of collective security. Last December, they were once again simply brushed aside. (Translator's note: The details of Russia's proposal to the West for mutual security guarantees can be found [here](#)).

But in today's world, it is hardly possible to sit anything out. He who sows the wind will, as the saying goes, reap the storm. The crisis has indeed become global; it affects everyone. There is no need to be under any illusions.

Mankind now has two main options: either to continue piling up the problems that will inevitably crush us all, or to try to find solutions together, albeit imperfect but effective solutions that can make our

world more stable and secure.

You know, I have always believed in the power of common sense, and I still do. So I am convinced that sooner or later both the new centers of the multipolar world order and the West will have to start talking about a common future at eye level, and the sooner the better. And in this context, I would like to point out some very important points for all of us.

Today's events have pushed the environmental issues to the side. It may be strange, but I want to start with this. Climate change is no longer at the top of the agenda. But these fundamental challenges have not disappeared, they have not evaporated, they are growing.

One of the most dangerous consequences of ecological imbalance is the decline of biodiversity. And now I come to the main issue we have all come together to discuss: Is the other diversity – cultural, social, political, civilizational – less important?

Simplification, erasure, of all differences has practically become the essence of the modern West. What is behind this simplification? First of all, the disappearance of the creative potential of the West itself and the desire to limit, to block the free development of other civilizations.

Of course, there is also a direct economic interest here: By imposing their values, their consumer clichés, their standardization, our opponents are trying – I'll call them that carefully – to expand the markets for their products. In the end, it's all very primitive. It is no accident that the West claims that its culture and worldview must be universal. Even if they don't say it directly – although they often do – but even if they don't say it directly, they act like it and insist that their policies in reality insist that these very values must be accepted unconditionally by all the other participants in international life.

Here is a quote from the famous Harvard speech by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Back in 1978, he noted that the West was characterized by a "persistent blindness of superiority" – all of which is still happening today – that "supports the idea that all areas of our planet should develop according to and be dominated by current Western systems." That was in 1978, and nothing has changed.

Over the last half century, this delusion that Solzhenitsyn was talking about – it's openly racist and neocolonial – has simply taken on ugly forms, especially since the emergence of the so-called unipolar world. What would I like to say about this? Confidence in one's own infallibility is a very dangerous condition: it is only one step away from the desire of the "infallibles" to simply destroy those who do not please them. As they say, to "cancel" them, to abolish them. Let us at least reflect on the meaning of the word.

Even at the height of the Cold War, at the height of the confrontation between systems, ideologies, and military rivalries, it never occurred to anyone to deny the existence of the enemy's culture, art, and science. No one would have thought of that! Yes, there were certain restrictions in the spheres of education, science, culture and, unfortunately, sports. Nevertheless, both the Soviet and American leaders were clear at the time that the humanitarian sphere should be approached with tact, studying and respecting the adversary and learning from him, in order to maintain a basis for solid, fruitful relations, at least for the future.

And what is happening now? The Nazis went so far in their day as to burn books, and now the Western "promoters of liberalism and progress" have gone so far as to ban Dostoevsky and Tchaikovsky. The

so-called “Cancel Culture” – the culture of abolition – but in reality – we have talked about it many times – the actual abolition of culture robs everything alive and creative and does not allow free thinking to flourish in any sphere: not in the economy, not in politics, not in culture.

Today, liberal ideology itself has changed beyond recognition. If classical liberalism originally understood the freedom of every person as the freedom to say and do what one wants, liberals began to say as early as the 20th century that the so-called open society has enemies – that is, the open society has enemies – and that the freedom of these enemies can and must be restricted or even abolished. Meanwhile, it is even so absurd that any alternative view is called subversive propaganda and a threat to democracy.

Everything that comes out of Russia is “Kremlin machinations”. But look at yourselves!

Are we really that omnipotent? Any criticism of our opponents – any! – is perceived as “Kremlin machinations”, as “hand of the Kremlin”. Such nonsense. How far have they gone? Just use your mind, think of something more interesting, present your point of view in a more conceptual way. You can’t blame everything on the intrigues of the Kremlin.

All this was prophetically predicted by Fyodor Dostoevsky back in the 19th century. One of the characters in his novel *The Possessed*, the nihilist Shigalyov, described the bright future he envisioned as follows: “Leaving boundless freedom, I open boundless despotism” – which, by the way, is where our Western opponents have come. Another character in the novel, Peter Verhovensky, joins him in declaring that treachery, snitching and espionage are needed everywhere, that society has no need of talents and higher abilities: “Cicero’s tongue will be cut out, Copernicus’ eyes will be gouged out, Shakespeare will be stoned.” That is where our Western opponents are going. What is this but the modern Western Cancel Culture?

These were great thinkers and I am honestly grateful to my staff who found these quotes.

What can be said about them? History will certainly put everything in its place and will not cancel the greatest works of the universally recognized geniuses of world culture, but those who have decided that they have the right to dispose of this world culture as they see fit. The vanity of these people, as they say, goes beyond the scope, but in a few years no one will remember their names. But Dostoevsky will live on, as will Tchaikovsky and Pushkin – as much as some may wish otherwise.

The Western model of globalization, neocolonial at its core, was also built on standardization, on financial and technological monopolism, and on the erasure of all differences. The task was clear: to strengthen the unconditional domination of the West in the world economy and politics, and to this end to put at its service the natural and financial resources, the intellectual, human and economic capacities of the entire planet, under the guise of the so-called new global interdependence.

Here I would like to recall another Russian philosopher, Alexander Zinoviev, whose centenary we will celebrate on October 29. More than 20 years ago, he said that for the survival of Western civilization at the level it has reached, “the whole planet is necessary as a habitat, all the resources of mankind are necessary for this.” That’s what they’re calling for, that’s exactly what it is.

At the same time, the West created a huge advantage for itself in this system from the very beginning, because it developed the principles and mechanisms – like now those principles that are constantly

talked about and that are an incomprehensible “black hole”: what that is, nobody knows. But as soon as not the Western countries, but other states began to benefit from globalization, and we are talking here, of course, primarily about the large Asian states, the West immediately changed or completely abolished many rules. And the so-called sacred principles of free trade, economic openness, fair competition, and even the right to property were suddenly completely forgotten. As soon as something became profitable for them, they immediately and spontaneously changed the rules during the game.

Or another example of changing terms and meanings. Western ideologists and politicians have been telling the whole world for many years: There is no alternative to democracy. However, they talk about the Western, so-called liberal model of democracy. They reject all other variants and forms of democracy with contempt and – I would like to emphasize this – arrogance. This behavior was formed a long time ago, still in colonial times: All are considered second-class people, while others are exclusive. This has been going on for centuries, until today.

But today, the absolute majority of the world community demands exactly that:

democracy in international affairs, and it does not accept any forms of authoritarian dictates by individual countries or groups of states. What is this, if not the direct application of the principles of people’s power at the level of international relations?

And what is the position of the “civilized” – in quotation marks – West? If you are democrats, you should welcome this natural striving of billions of people for freedom – but no! The West calls this the undermining of the liberal, rules-based order and launches economic and trade wars, sanctions, boycotts, color revolutions and carries out all kinds of coups.

One of them led to the tragic consequences in Ukraine in 2014 – they supported the coup and even told how much money they spent on it. Actually, they are just insane, they are not embarrassed by anything. They killed Suleimani, an Iranian general. You can stand by Suleimani as you like, but he is an official representative of another country! They assassinated him on the territory of a third country and said, yes, we assassinated him. What is this anyway? Where do we live? (Translator’s note: All those who do not remember the incident can find details [here](#)).

Washington continues to habitually refer to the current world order as American-liberal, but in reality this infamous “order” is increasing chaos every day and, I might add, is becoming more and more intolerant even of Western countries themselves, of their attempts to show any independence. Everything is suppressed to the root and sanctions are imposed on its own allies – without any shame! And they accept all this with their heads down.

For example, the proposals of the Hungarian parliamentarians in July to anchor in the EU Treaty a commitment to European Christian values and European culture were not even perceived as a front, but as direct hostile sabotage. What is this? How is this to be understood? Yes, some may like it, others not.

In Russia, over the course of a thousand years, we have developed a unique culture of interrelations between all the world’s religions. There is no reason to cancel anything: neither Christian values, nor Islamic or Jewish values. The other world religions are present in our country. We simply have to treat each other with respect. In some regions of our country, I have experienced firsthand, people celebrate Christian, Islamic, Buddhist and Jewish holidays together and do so gladly, congratulating each other

and rejoicing together.

But not in Europe. Why not? At least they could have talked about it. It is amazing!

All this, without exaggeration, is not even a systemic crisis, but a doctrinal crisis of the neoliberal American model of world order. They have no ideas of creating anything and of positive development, they simply have nothing to offer the world except the preservation of their domination.

I am convinced that real democracy in a multipolar world presupposes first of all the possibility of each people – I would like to emphasize this, each society, each civilization – to choose their own way, their own social and political system. If the U.S. and the EU have this right, then Asian countries, Islamic states, Persian Gulf monarchies, and the states of other continents certainly do as well. Of course, our country, Russia, also has this right, and no one will ever be able to dictate to our people what kind of society we should build and on what principles it should be based.

The direct threat to the political, economic and ideological monopoly of the West is that alternative models of society could emerge in the world – more effective ones, I would like to emphasize – more effective, brighter, more attractive than the ones we have today. And these models will evolve, that's inevitable. By the way, American political scientists and experts are writing about this directly as well. Governments don't really listen to them yet, but they can't overlook these ideas in political science journals and discussions.

Development must take place in the dialogue of civilizations, based on spiritual and moral values. Yes, different civilizations have different understandings of man, his essence. They are often only superficial differences, but all recognize the supreme dignity and spiritual essence of man. And this common foundation, on which we can and must build our future, is of the utmost importance.

What do I want to emphasize here? Traditional values are not some fixed postulates to which everyone must adhere. No, of course they aren't. They differ from so-called neoliberal values in that each of them is unique because they come from the tradition of a particular society, its culture and historical experience. Traditional values, therefore, cannot be imposed on anyone – they simply have to be respected by respecting what each nation has chosen over the centuries.

This is our understanding of traditional values and this approach is shared and accepted by the majority of humanity. This is logical, because the traditional societies of the East, Latin America, Africa and Eurasia form the basis of world civilization.

Respect for the peculiarities of peoples and civilizations is in the interest of all. It is also in the interest of the so-called West. By losing its supremacy it is fast becoming a minority on the world stage. And of course, the right of this Western minority to its own cultural identity, I would like to underline, should be guaranteed, it should certainly be respected, but, I underline, on an equal footing with the rights of all others.

If the Western elites believe that they will be able to introduce in the minds of their people, their societies, new, in my opinion, strange trends like dozens of genders and gay parades, so be it. Let them do what they want! But they certainly don't have the right to demand that others follow the same path.

We see that Western countries have complicated demographic, political and social processes. This, of course, is their internal affair. Russia does not interfere in these matters and has no intention to do so – unlike the West, we do not interfere in foreign backyards. However, we assume that pragmatism will prevail and dialogue between Russia and the genuine, traditional West, as well as with other centers of equal development, will make an important contribution to the construction of a multipolar world order.

I would like to add that multipolarity is the real and in fact the only chance for Europe to restore its political and economic subjectivity. Sure, we all understand, and in Europe it is directly talked about: Europe's legal subjectivity today is – how shall I put it carefully so as not to offend anyone – very limited.

The world is inherently diverse, and the West's attempts to squeeze them all into a single scheme are objectively doomed to failure, and nothing will come of it.

The arrogant pursuit of world domination, of dictating or maintaining leadership by dictation, is leading to the decline of the international authority of the leaders of the Western world, including the United States, and to a growing distrust of their ability to negotiate as a whole. One day they say one thing and the next day something else; they sign documents and the next day they refuse to honor them; they do whatever they want. There is no stability in anything at all. How the documents are signed, what has been talked about, what can be hoped for, is completely unclear.

Whereas in the past only a few countries allowed themselves to argue with America, and it almost seemed like a sensation, today it is common for many countries to reject Washington's unfounded demands, even though it still tries to push everyone around. This is a completely misguided policy that simply leads nowhere. Let them, that's their choice too.

I am convinced that the peoples of the world will not turn a blind eye to the politics of coercion, which has discredited itself, and the West will have to pay an ever higher price every time it tries to maintain its hegemony. If I were in the place of these Western elites, I would be thinking seriously about this prospect, as some political scientists and politicians in the United States themselves are doing, as I said earlier.

In the present conditions of violent conflict, I will say some things directly. Russia, as an independent, distinct civilization, has never seen itself as an enemy of the West and does not see itself as such. Americanophobia, Anglophobia, Francophobia, Germanophobia are forms of racism as well as Russophobia and anti-Semitism, as well as all forms of xenophobia.

It must be clearly understood that, as I said before, there are two Wests, at least two, maybe more, but at least two: the West of traditional, mainly Christian values, freedom, patriotism, rich culture, and now also Islamic values, because a significant part of the population of many Western countries professes Islam. This West is close to us in some ways, in many ways we have common, even ancient roots. But there is also the other West: aggressive, cosmopolitan, neocolonial, a tool of the neoliberal elites. Russia will certainly not accept the dictates of this very West.

I will always remember what I had to experience in 2000, after being elected president. Remember the price we paid for the destruction of the terrorist nest in the North Caucasus, which the West practically openly supported at that time. All adults here, most of you in this room, understand what I am talking

about. We know that this is exactly what happened in practice: financial, political, and media support. We have all witnessed that.

Moreover, the West has not only actively supported terrorists on Russian territory, but has aided and abetted this threat in many ways. We know that. But after the situation stabilized and the main terrorist gangs were defeated, thanks in part to the courage of the Chechen people, we decided not to turn away, not to play the offended, but to move forward, to build relations even with those who were actually working against us, to build and develop relations based on mutual benefit and mutual respect with all who wanted it.

It was thought that this was in the common interest. Russia, thank God, has survived all the difficulties of this period, has persevered, has become stronger, has coped with internal and external terrorism, has preserved its economy, has begun to develop, and has improved its defense capabilities. We have tried to build relations with the leading countries of the West and with NATO. The message was the same: let's stop being enemies, let's live together as friends, let's start dialogue, let's build trust and thus build peace. We were absolutely sincere, I want to emphasize that. We were aware of the complexity of this approach, but we went the distance.

And what did we get in response? In short, we received a "no" in all major areas of potential cooperation. We have received ever-increasing pressure on us and the creation of hotbeds of tension near our borders. And what, may I ask, is the goal of this pressure? What is it? Are they just practicing a little bit? No, of course they are not. The goal is to make Russia more vulnerable. The goal is to make Russia a tool to achieve their own geopolitical goals.

In fact, this is the universal rule: they try to turn everyone into a tool in order to use this tool for their own goals. And those who do not yield to this pressure, who do not want to be such a tool, sanctions are imposed on them, all kinds of economic restrictions are imposed on them, coups are prepared against them or carried out if possible, and so on. And if in the end nothing succeeds, there is a goal – to destroy them, to wipe them off the political map. But such a scenario has never worked in relation to Russia and will never work in relation to Russia.

What else would I like to add? Russia is not challenging the elites of the West – Russia is merely defending its right to exist and develop freely. At the same time, we ourselves do not intend to become a new hegemon. Russia is not proposing to replace unipolarity with bipolarity, tripolarity, etc., to replace Western hegemony with the hegemony of the East, the North or the South. This would inevitably lead to a new impasse.

Here I would like to quote the words of the great Russian philosopher Nikolai Danilewski, who believed that progress consists not in going in only one direction, which some of our opponents urge us to do – then progress would soon cease, Danilewski said – but in "approaching the entire field that constitutes the sphere of the historical activity of mankind in all directions." And he adds that no civilization can boast of representing the highest level of development.

I am convinced that dictatorship can be opposed only by the free development of countries and peoples, that the degradation of the individual can be opposed by the love of man as creator, that primitive simplification and prohibitions can be opposed by the flourishing complexity of cultures and traditions.

The importance of today's historical moment consists precisely in the fact that before all civilizations, states and associations of states the possibility of their own, democratic, original way of development opens up. And above all, we believe that the new world order must be based on law and justice, that it must be free, distinctive and just.

Therefore, the world economy and trade must become more just and open. Russia believes that the process of creating new international financial platforms, including those for international payments, is inevitable. Such platforms should be outside national jurisdictions, secure, depoliticized, automated, and not dependent on a single control center. Is this possible or not? Of course. It will require great effort, many countries will have to join forces, but it is feasible.

It will eliminate the possibility of abuse of the new global financial infrastructure and allow efficient, profitable and secure settlement of international transactions without the dollar and other so-called reserve currencies. All the more so because the U.S. and the West, by using the dollar as a weapon, have discredited the institution of international financial reserves. First they were devalued by inflation in the dollar and Eurozone, and then they bagged our international reserves.

The switch to national currencies will – inevitably – gain momentum. This depends, of course, on the condition of the issuers of these currencies and their economies, but they will become stronger and these payments will certainly gradually gain the upper hand. This is the logic of sovereign economic and financial policy in a multipolar world.

Further. The new centers of global development already have unique technologies and scientific developments in a variety of fields, and in many areas they can successfully compete with Western transnational corporations.

Clearly, we have a common, quite pragmatic interest in fair and open scientific and technological exchange. Together, each will benefit more than alone. The benefits should go to the majority, not to individual super-rich corporations.

How does it look today? When the West sells medicines or seeds for food crops to other countries, the national pharmaceutical industry and livestock are destroyed, and basically everything in practice boils down to this: supplying machinery and equipment destroys the local engineering industry. When I was prime minister, I understood it: As soon as you open the market for a certain group of goods, the local producer has gone under and it is almost impossible for him to raise his head again. That's how relationships are built. This is how markets and resources are conquered, countries are deprived of their technological and scientific potential. This is not progress, but enslavement, the reduction of economies to a primitive level.

Technological development should not increase global inequality, but reduce it. This is exactly how Russia traditionally implements its technological foreign policy. For example, when we build nuclear power plants in other states, we simultaneously create centers of excellence there, train national personnel. We create an industry, we don't just build a plant, we create a whole industry. Basically, we are giving other countries the opportunity to make a real breakthrough in their scientific and technological development, to reduce inequalities, and to bring their energy sector to a new level of efficiency and environmental friendliness.

I would like to reiterate that sovereignty and self-development in no way mean isolation or autarky, but rather active, mutually beneficial cooperation based on fair and equitable principles.

While liberal globalization is a depersonalization that imposes the Western model on the whole world, integration, on the contrary, is about unlocking the potential of each civilization for the benefit of the whole, for the good of all. While globalism is a dictate, which is what it ultimately amounts to, integration is the joint elaboration of strategies that benefit everyone.

In this regard, Russia believes it is important to activate the mechanisms for creating large spaces based on cooperation among neighboring countries whose economies, social systems, raw materials, and infrastructure complement each other. Such large spaces are basically the basis for a multipolar world order – the economic foundation. From their dialogue grows the true unity of mankind, which is much more complex, distinct and multidimensional than in the simplistic views of some Western ideologues.

The unity of humanity is not based on the command “do it like me” or “become like us” – it is formed taking into account and based on the opinion of all and with respect for the identity of each society and nation. This is the principle on which long-term engagement in a multipolar world can be built.

In this context, it might be worth considering that the structure of the United Nations, including the Security Council, should better reflect the diversity of the world’s regions. After all, much more will depend on Asia, Africa, and Latin America in tomorrow’s world than is commonly thought today, and this increase in their influence is definitely positive.

I remind you that Western civilization is not the only one, not even in our common Eurasian space. Moreover, the majority of the population is concentrated precisely in the East of Eurasia, where the oldest civilizations of mankind were born.

The value and importance of Eurasia lie in the fact that this continent is a self-sufficient complex that has gigantic resources of every kind and enormous potential. And the harder we work to increase Eurasia’s connections, to create new ways and forms of cooperation, the more impressive progress we make.

The successful activities of the Eurasian Economic Union, the rapid growth of the authority and influence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the large-scale initiatives under One Belt, One Road, the plans for multilateral cooperation to realize the North-South Transport Corridor and other, many other projects in this part of the world are, I am sure, the beginning of a new era, a new phase in the development of Eurasia. Integration projects here do not contradict each other, but complement each other, if they are carried out by neighboring countries in their own interests and are not forcibly introduced by external forces to divide the Eurasian space and turn it into a zone of bloc confrontation.

Its western end, Europe, could also be a natural part of the larger Eurasia. Yet many of its leaders are animated by the conviction that Europeans are better than others and that it is beneath them to participate in ventures on an equal footing with others. Behind this arrogance, they do not even notice that they have been marginalized, that they are vassals – often without even a right to vote.

Dear colleagues!

The collapse of the Soviet Union also destroyed the balance of geopolitical forces. The West felt itself the victor and proclaimed the unipolar world order in which only its will, culture and interests had a right to exist.

This historic period of undivided domination of world affairs by the West is now coming to an end, and the unipolar world is a thing of the past. We are at a historic turning point, facing probably the most dangerous, unpredictable, and yet important decade since the end of World War II. The West is not capable of ruling humanity alone, but it is desperately trying, and most of the world's nations are no longer willing to tolerate it. This is the greatest contrast of the new era. The situation is revolutionary in a way: the upper class can't and the lower class doesn't want to live like that anymore, according to a classic.

This state of affairs harbors global conflicts or a chain of conflicts that pose a threat to humanity, including the West itself. To constructively resolve this contradiction is the most important historical task today.

Changing everything is a painful but natural and inevitable process. The future world order is taking shape before our eyes. And in this world order we must listen to everyone, take into account every point of view, every nation, society, culture, every system of world views, ideas and religious beliefs, without imposing a uniform truth on anyone. Only on this basis, understanding our responsibility for destiny – the destiny of nations, of the planet – can we build a symphony of human civilization.

With this, I would like to conclude and thank you for your patience in listening to my message.

Thank you very much.

by Jonas E. Alexis

Category

1. Army-Wars-Conflict Zones-Military Tech.
2. Main
3. Politics-Geopolitics-Gov.-Events

Date Created

10/30/2022