



The war of two worlds has begun – Part 4

Don't lose sight of the big game: The hegemon is fighting for supremacy against a multipolar but heterogeneous world. The US's turnaround is just one piece of the mosaic in the big game.

Peter Hanseler

Tue 04 Mar 2025

Introduction

In [Part 1](#), we discussed the strategy of the British and the Americans in the First and Second World Wars and showed that the narratives of these two major conflicts of the 20th century do not stand up to factual scrutiny. We also described the current difficult situation in which the Collective West currently finds itself. In [Part 2](#), we described the strength of the Global South, which is seeking independence

from the centuries-long corset of the Collective West and has created an organization called BRICS, which is already the largest economic community our world has ever seen. The fact that this organization was not perceived in the West until recently and therefore not taken seriously does not help the West.

Part 3 dealt with the US's turnaround towards Russia, the end of the Ukraine conflict and the efforts of the US and Russia to put their relations on a new footing.

The developments of the last few days again call for a classification and I therefore feel compelled to postpone the long-term view in order to introduce a medium-term view. The whole world is caught up in the reversal of US policy towards Russia and many are tempted to question the US's entire geopolitical strategy. I would be extremely cautious about that, because US policy has not changed at all with regard to the Middle East or South America.

In times of great geopolitical tension, it is not unusual for reversals to occur - you have to expect them. My statements on the future course of events should therefore be treated with the utmost caution, because despite my efforts to work out a fact-based and objective trend, the fundamentals can change abruptly, which would necessitate a new assessment.

I have already pointed out several times, for example, that the unstable situation in the financial markets - especially in the Collective West - could lead to huge economic turmoil at any time, which would force the parties to completely change the direction of their policies. This is the big caveat to everything I write in this series of articles and I would like to express my astonishment that the [instability in the financial markets and the astronomical debt levels](#) of this world are ignored by the vast majority of geopolitical observers. I am prepared to get on my readers' nerves by regularly drawing attention to this risk in the course of this series: it is the biggest geopolitical risk that I can identify. The question is not if, but when this risk will turn into a catastrophe, suddenly and "unexpectedly". We will certainly hear from "experts" that such a turn of events could not have been expected. Really? - This collapse will plunge entire countries into misery and cost millions of people their lives and many politicians their sanity. It is a mystery to me that so few people recognize this danger.

Apart from my major reservations about financial collapse, I would like to point out that my "knowledge" is limited. Not a day goes by that I don't learn something new, because there are more relevant facts in geopolitics than I can ever internalize in my lifetime. This is also one of the main reasons why I am wary of making apodictic statements. In this part, I will try to anticipate medium-term developments.

Medium-term outlook

No chance for Europe to continue the conflict against Russia

I described the US turnaround and Europe's hostile reactions to American peace efforts in [Part 2](#). The Europeans are trying to prolong the war and the Western media are supporting this inhumane strategy, a behavior of Europe that can hardly be surpassed in cynicism and dishonesty. President Macron and Briton Starmer, together with Friedrich Merz, are trying to keep the war alive somehow, single-handedly if necessary. We have already reported on the scandal in the Oval Office on February 28: Brief analysis: "[Zelensky destroys himself and harms his people](#)". On Sunday, March 2, 2025, Starmer proclaimed the "Coalition of the Willing". I don't know if Starmer is stupid, cynical or both. The slogan "Coalition of the Willing" was used from 2002 by then Prime Minister Tony Blair to drum up support for an illegal war - the Iraq war. Today, everyone knows what kind of war it was: a "phony war". So the reintroduction of this term is not particularly wise. This time, the coalition of the willing is not only directed against Russia, but also against the US.

I would like to point out that this idea is based on completely ridiculous notions: The armies of Germany, France and Great Britain are Potemkin villages. Great Britain, for example, has more admirals than warships, a sign that it's all just for show. Of the total of 92,000 soldiers, only half are frontline soldiers and 25% of them are not ready for deployment: Starmer is therefore threatening with a good 34,000 soldiers (with a frontline of around 1,200 km in Ukraine, this means around 28 soldiers per kilometer). The British also have around 40 operational tanks. The situation is similar for the other "coalition partners". This coalition of the willing will be a bunch of poorly trained and poorly led soldiers who have no idea what war is. I refer you to [Andrei Martianov](#) on the state and leadership of NATO and its armed forces.

Donald Trump will not support such an endeavor, which will already end up in the wastepaper basket in the paper tiger stadium. His goals are different: normalization of relations with Russia and business.

Donald Trump left Prime Minister Starmer out in the cold with the sentence "Could you take on Russia by yourselves?" at the press conference on February 27, 2025. Starmer's answer: "Well, ha, ha, ha".



Russia will not accept European troops in Ukraine, Trump will not send US troops. This Punch and Judy show by the Europeans only serves to bring the Europeans to the negotiating table - with a European proposal. I am daring enough to claim that the Europeans will not send troops to Ukraine.

Zelensky continued to act clumsily when he announced yesterday that the end of the war against Russia was "far, far, away".

Donald Trump responded with the following words:

"This is the worst statement that could have made by Zelenskyy, and America will not put up with it much longer!"

PRESIDENT TRUMP

Trump also reacted by immediately stopping military aid to Ukraine - which incidentally affects all deliveries that have not yet arrived in Ukraine - including weapons and ammunition that have already arrived in Poland, for example. In this context, I find it interesting to ask whether this includes satellite navigation and surveillance aid - without this, the Europeans will not be able to wage war either, as they do not have any integrated systems themselves and are reliant on American infrastructure.

Finally, Donald Trump announced that he will give a speech today, March 4, 2025. I wouldn't be surprised if another diplomatic bomb were to be detonated: for example, the termination of NATO membership? - We'll know more tonight.

The deal between Russia and America is being negotiated behind closed doors - not in public

Donald Trump is enthusiastic and President Putin is cautious but hopeful that a deal will be reached. It seems that the two parties agree on the fundamentals, otherwise the Kremlin would not be making cautiously positive statements. We can safely dispense with the gossip in the media, especially the gossip in the Western media. For years, the Western media have been spreading propaganda without exception, which has nothing to do with reality reporting. It is now clear that the media were completely wrong with their "predictions", which were none - in their place I would probably choose voluntary death, but these whores don't even blush.

Overall, like the Russian people, I am hopeful and cautiously optimistic, in keeping with the skepticism that is an integral part of the Russian soul. The hope is that an agreement will be reached between the US and Russia and that this will put an end to the dying on the front.

This agreement will not be negotiated in public, but behind closed doors. The Europeans will come with a proposal, a proposal that will certainly make an agreement more difficult. This, and the fact that Donald Trump wants to reap the rewards of an agreement without the Europeans, is an indication that Trump will not tolerate the Europeans at the big table, but potentially at the cat's table.

More territories to Russia?

I cannot estimate exactly what this agreement will look like, because an agreement will not be limited to the Ukraine conflict. With regard to Ukraine, I assume that the four territories annexed by Russia following a referendum - Donetsk, Lugansk, Zaporizhzhia and Kherson - will remain with Russia, especially as they are now Russian territory under the current constitution of the Russian Federation. Other territories of Russian origin could be added after further referendums, as it is quite conceivable that it will be concluded that Ukrainian territories - in accordance with the principle of self-determination - will vote on their fate - [Elon Musk](#) already had such an idea [in October 2022](#).

We have been looking for figures on population composition in different areas of Ukraine. There are no current figures; most of them date back to 2001. According to Wikipedia - so take it with a grain of salt - Russians are the largest ethnic group outside Crimea in [Donetsk](#) (48.2%) and [Makiivka](#) (50.8%) in [Donetsk oblast](#), [Ternivka](#) (52.9%) in [Dnipropetrovsk oblast](#), [Krasnodon](#) (63.3 %), [Sverdlovsk \(Dovzhansk\)](#) (58.7 %), [Krasnodon Raion](#) (51.7 %) and [Stanytsia Luhanska Raion](#)(61.1 %) in [Luhansk Oblast](#), [Ismail](#) (43.7 %) in [Odessa Oblast](#), [Putyvl Raion](#) (51.6 %) in [Sumy Oblast](#).

The degree of Russian origin in these areas is therefore not huge, but the population in these areas speaks Russian and lives in Russian. The results of the referendums on whether they agreed to be incorporated into the Russian Federation were overwhelming; over 90% in favor with a turnout of over 90% as well. See our article "[Self-determination of the peoples - the West bends the law as it sees fit](#)" from February 2023 with references.

As a result, many non-Russian residents of these regions decided that they wanted to belong to Russia. In addition to patriotic reasons, there are also tangible, practical reasons for this. Russia's infrastructure is decades more advanced than in Ukraine, salaries and pensions are many times higher than in Ukraine and people feel safe in Russia. Furthermore, the public services function flawlessly. I am speaking here as a Swiss who really knows Russia and am comparing the public sector with that in Switzerland. I would also like to point out that Ukraine's gross national product in 1991 was higher than that of Russia. Russia's economy developed positively and Ukraine's negatively. Incidentally, Russia has not the slightest interest in taking over territories whose populations do not want to belong to Russia. Russia's goal is to sustainably stabilize the western border region of the giant empire. The Western propaganda of the Baltic states, Poland and even Germany that the Russians have imperialist interests in the West is a complete fantasy that cannot be backed up with any facts.

Ceding western parts of Ukraine to neighboring states?

It is conceivable that America - in order to appease the Europeans - will allocate western areas of Ukraine to Poland, Romania and Hungary. Nobody knows whether this will be a good idea and what will happen to the rest of Ukraine afterwards.

The outrage in the West over such an agreement will be boundless, apart of course from those countries that will receive a slice of the cake. But this only has to do with the fact that today's woke and uneducated society in the West does not know that after wars, countries have regularly been cut, filleted, divided or created in order to share the spoils of war and very often new countries have emerged from them - at the expense of others.

The list is long: after the First World War, for example, Czechoslovakia, the Kingdom of Serbia, Austria, Hungary and Poland (Galician part) were formed at the expense of Austria-Hungary, which collapsed. Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania (northern and eastern part), Finland and Poland (eastern part) were formed at the expense of Russia. Germany lost Danzig and Bohemia and Moravia went to Czechoslovakia and part of it to Lithuania.

The question of whether this was fair or just is moot: It is reality and the victor distributed the spoils - it will always remain so. Incidentally, the outraged in the current conflict are not at all bothered by the fact that [Israel](#), for example, [was illegally proclaimed in 1948](#) at the expense of the Palestinians, who have been called terrorists since 1948 so as not to blush about this land theft.

Lifting of sanctions

The Americans have tangible [economic interests](#) in a settlement of the conflict with Russia - see part 2 of this series.

The logical consequence of economic cooperation between Russia and the US will be the lifting of sanctions. If this happens, I personally see no real possibility for Europe to maintain the sanctions. The dwarf rebellion that was staged in London after the fiasco in the White House, including the royal visit and meetings with other European leaders, will not change the facts. In the medium term, relations between Russia and the US will relax and normalize, as this is in the interests of both superpowers: Realpolitik.

Why only medium-term?

However, it would be completely naive to believe that this turnaround by the US will last in the long term. This turnaround is opportunistic, i.e. President Trump can use it to strengthen his country in the short term, because he is aware that good relations with Russia are currently to his advantage, as the attack since 2014 has simply failed - time for the US to consolidate on this front. They need time to do this and this peace will give them time.

There is no need to worry about Russia. They are taking this thaw as it is and will pack as much as possible into agreements with the US. If the Russians had trust in the US, they would have been prepared to find a solution with the US that only affected Ukraine. But there is no trust, and that is a good thing. I refer to the [six working groups](#) that are being formed on the basis of the results from Riyadh.

People have short memories. The last time spring feelings were initiated by the Americans towards Russia was not so long ago. The Georgians attacked Russia in 2008, after the Americans had installed President Mikheil Saakashvili in Georgia and equipped and trained the Georgian armed forces with American weapons, a five-day war broke out, which the Russians clearly won. The Americans got a bloody nose - just like now. Naturally, the Russians were blamed for the conflict - as they are now - until [Reuters](#) announced [in September 2009](#) that an independent EU report had concluded that Georgia had started the conflict.

The result prompted the US to launch a charm offensive against Russia in March 2009 in order to buy time. Hillary Clinton handed Sergei Lavrov a "reset button" to renew relations.



Sergei Lavrov and Hillary Clinton 2009- A new beginning that wasn't one

The Americans gained time to prepare Maidan and attack Russia again from 2014. Do the Americans really believe that the Russians have forgotten this?

Interim result

I take it from President Trump that he wants to reach an agreement with Russia regarding Ukraine. However, his interests are opportunistic in nature, because he simply cannot afford to have the Russians as an enemy at the moment. His arsenal of weapons is exhausted and if he does not make peace now, he will completely lose his influence in Ukraine. He also wants to instrumentalize the Russians for his strategy against the Chinese. This will not be successful, but the Americans will try, as they cannot find the [principle of loyalty](#) in their dictionary.

The Russians demanded to discuss a wide range of topics in Riyadh, the Ukraine conflict is only one of six topics [(1) Strategic Security and Arms Control Group; (2) Global Security Architecture Review Group; (3) Bilateral Diplomatic Relations Group; (4) Energy and Sanctions Group; (5) Ukraine Conflict Settlement Group; (6) International Affairs Group (Middle East, Arctic)]. The reason for this is banal: The

Russians do not trust the Americans and expect a repeat of 2009, i.e. they understand that Trump is merely stalling or expect this attitude from the Americans.

It is in the Russians' interest to reach a long-term agreement with the US and they are offering the US a treat in return: The bargaining chip is contracts for the mining of rare earths in Russia. These raw materials are of central importance to the Americans - they have too few and China - the world market leader - is in the process of cutting off trade with the US. This is good business for the Russians, as they have these raw materials but are not yet producing much - a joint project with the US is just what they need. At the same time, the Russians will undermine the need for a rare earths agreement between the US and Ukraine.

If an agreement is reached between the US and Russia, the US sanctions will fall.

The Europeans are staging a dwarf uprising because they have neither the military nor the financial means to do anything that could harm Russia. The only thing they are achieving is enraging their colonial master in Washington.

The Russians are waiting and Donald Trump will probably give Mr. Merz, Mr. Macron and Mr. Starmer a one-on-one dressing down in Washington. He can do that, as we saw last Friday. Whether this will happen in public is at Donald Trump's sole discretion.

An agreement between Russia and the US has a real chance of being reached - in the medium term.

Nevertheless, the Americans are behaving far less conciliatory towards China, South America, Canada, Mexico, Panama, Iran etc. (and Europe as well). This is an indication that the US is prepared to continue aggressively defending its dominance - or rather, its perceived dominance - by all means and against all those who pose a threat to this dominance.

Part 5 will then be about the big game, unless we are again overrun by events that call for another interim part.

ARTICLE TAGS:

Article Series China Europe France Germany Great Britain Russia US
Putin, Vladimir Trump, Donald Starmer, Keir Clinton, Hillary Lavrov, Sergey
Saakashvili, Mikhail European Union (EU) NATO War of Two Worlds Macron, Emmanuel
Martyanov, Andrey Merz, Friedrich Musk, Elon Vance, J.D. Zelensky, Vladimir BRICS
Collective West Coalition of the Willing

