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Eurasia is a sleeping giant that, once it finally wakes up, will be able to dictate its own rules to the US and its allies.

The world is not only tired, but exhausted, at the very end of its civilizational vitality, and all this is a consequence of almost eighty years of American global terror and hegemony. The US has arbitrarily and arrogantly granted itself a right that it perceives as sacred and inalienable, which is the freedom to intervene politically, economically, and militarily anywhere on the planet that it clearly considers its possession. In this American worldview, all other nations are merely a means to American ends, a source of cheap resources, cheap labor, cannon fodder, or if they refuse to fit into the Pax Americana, they become enemies that must be wiped off the face of the planet by any means available. How else to explain the unofficial but fundamental postulate of the American foreign policy philosophy, which implies that every American president must lead the USA in at least one major military intervention, or in at least one war, be it a hybrid war like the one being waged against Iran and China, a proxy war like the one being waged through Ukraine against Russia, or is it total war like the one against Iraq? Since the end of World War II, in which the US was last on the right side of history, in the name of false democracy, false human rights, bizarre crypto-satanic ideologies, and a twisted vision of “political correctness”, the US has launched 19 wars and is responsible for over 12 million human victims. However, the story does not end there because the US does not show the slightest intention to give up the continuous implementation of violence against other nations, their states, and peoples.

Henry Kissinger once warned: “To be an enemy of America can be dangerous, but to be a friend is fatal.”. Oh yes, Europe that groans unitedly under the American boot knows this very well. The semblance of democracy in the European Union is provided by American agents of influence, and elites raised by overseas power centers, but it is an open secret that the European nations are left without sovereignty and control over their fate. The bigger and more famous a European nation is, the sadder the story of the state in which it finds itself today. Germany, once a proud power respected by friend and foe alike, a nation built on the foundations of strict military discipline, order, and work, was occupied way back in 1945 and is apparently still under American occupation because it is no longer able to defend its vital interests that it seemingly voluntarily, completely subordinated to the American ones, and thus from the position of former world power, it descended to the role of an oppressed vassal. France, once primarily a cultural and civilizational, but certainly also a military power, today is only another territory fully controlled by Washington, just one in a series of numerous other, insignificant, docile, and meek countries in which the greatest civilizational achievements are LGBT parades and unscientific, anti-natural dogmas of liberal gender ideologies. Great Britain, the once all-powerful, vast empire on which the sun never set, today functions merely as the 51st state of the USA, and practically has the same degree of sovereignty as, for example, the state of Maine. And when we see such difficult but certainly deserved fates of the former colonial powers, then what can the rest of the world hope for? What could even undisputed superpowers such as Russia and China, or regional powers such as India and Iran, expect from any cooperation with the American “brave new world”? What good could the states of Central and South America expect from the US and its vassals, and finally, what could the developing nations of Africa and Asia hope for? The United States of America wants to completely rule the planet, and destroy all nations, their religions, and cultures by Americanizing them, feeding them sick ideologies, and reducing all individuals to slaves devoid of any political consciousness. If the still free nations of the planet allow the US to isolate them one after the other, impose sanctions on them, and ruin them from the inside with long-term psychological and hybrid war, in the end, they will all be easily crushed one after the other.

The question that arises is whether there is a way to stop the global tyranny of the US, put an end to the infamous American hegemony, and establish a new world that will breathe and develop freely and be able to effectively and decisively oppose American blackmail, intimidation, sanctions, insidious hybrid wars, and direct military interventions? That the thought of the final end of American hegemony is not just a concept from the realm of fiction, but something that will inevitably happen was best guessed by former propagandists of global rule of the American style of liberal democracy, such as Francis Fukuyama for example. In his work “The End of History and the Last Man”, Fukuyama, an American political scientist, economist, philosopher, and writer, expressed the hope that the American political system would become a pattern that all other nations would adopt, making it a dominant global phenomenon. Back in 1992, Fukuyama uncritically idealized America’s pseudo-democracy which, as we all know today, is, in its true essence, a plutocracy of alienated Zionist and Anglo-Saxon elites and a (not so) cheap two-party show that exists only to maintain the illusion of political freedom. With his work, Fukuyama inadvertently inspired the notorious American warmongers and war criminals from the 1990s and 2000s and gave them an ideological justification for aggressive expansion in the name of liberal democracy in a similar way that Nietzsche once inspired the Nazis with his ideas of the Übermensch. After almost thirty years of scientific work, Francis Fukuyama seems to have finally faced the terrifying consequences of his theses. In an article for the prestigious The Economist, from November 2021, Fukuyama repentantly sees the error and admits that the US has already lost the hegemonic status it once had, and that is unlikely to ever regain it. However, he goes a step further, arguing that the US should no longer strive for hegemony status, but should instead rediscover the meaning of its national identity and purpose at home. The end of American hegemony and tyranny is therefore looming, but it will not happen spontaneously, nor will the repentant appeals of former prophets of American hegemony contribute to it. On the contrary, it will take a lot of brains and brawn to bring the world back to a state of healthy and dynamic balance.

Since politics has always been the art of the possible, only those who can really do it will be able to confront American global terror in a way that, for the first time ever, will be truly effective and produce lasting and stable solutions. This means that in order to survive, opponents of American hegemony, no matter how different they might be, will have to overcome all old conflicts, rivalries, misunderstandings, and disagreements and for the first time really unite in a new military-political bloc, because American military power is still terrifying and should never be underestimated. Russia, China, Iran, India, Pakistan, Turkey, and other regional powers and sovereign nations have experienced American aggression in various ways, ranging from blackmail, extortion, and threats, through economical and other sanctions, attempted coups, color revolutions, hybrid and proxy wars, full-scale military conflicts, all the way to threats of preemptive nuclear strikes — a doctrine that is American favorite means of intimidation. American hegemony, of course, does not tolerate any competition, and the existence of a multipolar world in which other superpowers and regional powers show a willingness to decisively defend their full sovereignty, vital geopolitical interests, and zones of influence, is something that the US will never come to terms with. On the other hand, unless American rivals find a way to finally join forces in nothing less than a new military-political bloc, they will be destroyed one after another and the destruction of one American opponent will automatically lead to the weakening of the other. Nowhere is this mutual geopolitical connection more evident than in Eurasia. For example, any weakening of Russia would directly lead to a strong threat to the security of China. We all know that the USA and its European vassals, united in the criminal North Atlantic Alliance, are waging a proxy war against Russia through Ukraine. The Americans want that war to last as long as possible, not only to the last Ukrainian but to the last European if necessary, because the goal is the economic and consequently, military weakening of the Russian Federation and eventually, its collapse, which would lead to the disintegration of the former powerful Empire. The Americans want nothing less than full control over the resources and wealth of Siberia and thus NATO military bases would spring up on Chinese northern borders and China would be designated as the next victim.

Russia and China have cordial and allied relations that are growing stronger day by day, but the already mentioned domino effect, that is, the weakening of one Eurasian nation as a consequence of the weakening or destruction of another, does not only apply to mutually friendly nations. Absurdly, the weakening of Pakistan and its destruction as a sovereign nation would be felt with full force by Pakistan’s old rival India, because it would suddenly have far greater security risks and challenges on its borders that it would no longer be able to cope with. Likewise, no matter how much Saudi Arabia longs for the destruction of Iran, the fall of a rival Muslim state would overnight turn it into an American colony that would completely lose its national sovereignty, religious and cultural identity and become the deplorable nation that Iran itself was before the Islamic Revolution. Therefore, precisely this complicated but clear logic of geopolitical causality in Eurasian areas, and the fact that Eurasian powers are still actively resisting American pressure, predestined Eurasia as the birthplace of new geopolitical and military integrations, the rise of an alternative civilization and a new world of equality. That is why the question arises, how is it possible that the Eurasian version of NATO has not yet been formed? A strong Eurasian military-political bloc, which, unlike NATO, would really be of a defensive nature, is simply necessary, not only for Russia, China, India, Iran, and other Eurasian powers but for all of humanity. This unborn alliance would not be an army of subordinate vassals led by a single superpower, as is the case with the North Atlantic Alliance, but rather an alliance of truly equal nations that would pool their military and economic potential to not only secure their sovereignty and right to exist but also to jointly strengthen in every possible aspect: material, scientific, cultural and spiritual. The Great Eurasian geopolitical merger, the counterpart or, more precisely, the antipode of NATO, is a logical step that many are waiting for, and that is why we must find out the reasons why it has not yet happened, explain why such a political bloc is necessary and why it must happen as soon as possible.

For decades, the US has been trying to prevent any possibility that the American rivals would ever unite. That is being done with a skillful foreign policy whose basic guiding idea has always been the old Roman motto “divide et impera”. All over the world, the USA carried out quiet coups d’état and brought their puppet regimes to power with considerable success, practically wherever and whenever it was possible, which caused, for example, the countries of the European Union, especially the former members of the Warsaw Pact, to completely lose the ability to conduct truly independent foreign policy. Does anyone believe that countries like today’s Poland really pursue policies that are in the best interest of their citizens? For example, is Poland’s open war with a nuclear superpower such as Russia really of the greatest benefit to ordinary Poles, who would certainly be the first to feel the tactical nuclear strikes that the Russian Federation refrains from in its Special Military Operation against the Nazi regime in Kiev because of the large ethnic Russian population in Ukraine and the proximity of its and Belarusian borders? Of course, there is never real independence of the American vassals, but rather the insidious and silent American occupation of European and other countries and the complete abolition of their sovereignty. First, the arrival of American agents of influence in power is financed, and then rigorous control over the media is established. When that happens, American control over a certain nation becomes a permanent, unchangeable state that could hypothetically be changed only by a revolution or a coup, but there is absolutely no will for such things because the US already has full control not only over the media space of the occupied country, but also over its the army and security forces.

However, superpowers such as Russia and China, or regional powers such as Iran, Turkey and India, have shown high resistance to American attempts to provoke color revolutions and coups in them that would bring quisling forces to power. That is why the biggest opponents of American hegemony, if it was already impossible to occupy them from the inside, should be turned against each other at any cost by secretly buying political influence. The least transparent of all such cases involves covert US agents of influence, who can operate for decades within their nations, reach high government positions, and remain undetected until their dirty work is completed. In a slightly more transparent variant of buying political influence, one regional power would be offered certain economic, trade or military privileges and numerous other benefits, a bunch of false promises and loose alliances if, in return, its government agreed to serve as an American tool against another regional power. So Saddam Hussein, at American persuasion, attacked Iran in 1980 and started a senseless war between two Muslim nations, both dominantly Shia and culturally very similar, in which over a million people died completely unnecessarily. With the fratricidal war against Iran, Iraq was permanently weakened, and soon after, with American diplomatic trickery and false promises, it was drawn into the war against Kuwait, which served only to give apparent legitimacy to American military interventions against Iraq and the total destruction of the former fourth largest military power in the world.

Isn’t the lesson that Saddam Hussein eventually paid with his head a good enough example of how all alliances with the US end and what they really serve? Isn’t what Ukraine is going through today an even better example of how all the alliances that the puppet regimes make with the US serve only American interests and soon or later lead to the bloody downfall of their vassals? Ukraine had the status of a privileged nation in trade relations with Russia, something that it would surely never have with the US or the EU. If the Americans in a the CIA lead coup, to power in Kiev had not brought the brutal Nazi junta which, in order to deliberately provoke Russia, started an ideologically inspired slaughter of the ethic Russian civilian population, the two countries would still have cordial good-neighborly relations today. How many such lessons do the nations of Eurasia need to finally decide on permanent liberation from the American malignant influence? In fact, the problem was never the peoples of Eurasia themselves, but the agents of influence brought to power, or supported by the US and its allies. It is precisely such traitors to their nations, all those who work in favor of American interests instead of in favor of their own countries, that must be permanently removed from the political scene of Eurasia. When it is noticed that a political leader whether in Eurasia or elsewhere, by coming to power rose too high above his people and country, that overnight he acquired enormous private wealth, took control of the media and national resources, built a private army and security services, and all this with more or less open Western support, there can be no doubt that he is a typical American quisling. The problem is that in order to eliminate such pests, the power of influence is needed, which could only be possessed by a military-political bloc whose might exceeds the combined strength of the USA, NATO and American vassals. Otherwise, the regimes in which the Americans invested billions of dollars to bring them to power cannot be removed from the political scene by any legal political means, and such countries permanently remain in the American zone of influence.

Whichever direction the analysis of the geopolitical situation in Eurasia takes, in the end, the conclusion will inevitably be reached again that the urgent creation of a Eurasian military-political bloc is necessary. Some of the most obvious reasons why such an alliance has not yet been created are the old conflicts and rivalries that are still simmering today. Even a cursory analysis indicates that the pillars of Eurasia are Russia, China, India and Islam because these four powers can provide the critical mass that will eventually lead to a great Eurasian geopolitical fusion. The alliance between China and Russia is a key and first step; however, both sides have so far avoided the idea of creating a concrete joint military-political bloc and rather emphasized the importance of creating a multipolar world as a way to oppose American hegemony. The problem with the doctrine of the necessity of creating a multipolar world is that it is not yet a precisely defined philosophy, which could easily be translated into solid military-political alliances in which each participant would clearly know their rights, obligations and benefits. No, just propagating nebulous multipolarity surely cannot be enough. Let’s recall for a moment that part of the traditional Russian geopolitical doctrine is the firm belief that Russia has only two allies: the Russian Army and the Russian Navy (today the list is much longer because there are also the Russian Aerospace Forces, the Russian intelligence services, units for cyber-warfare, etc.). Peter the Great created the Russian Empire precisely on the foundations of his convictions about Russian self-sufficiency, and this simple military philosophy still has many admirers in Russia today.

China, on the other hand, as an ancient civilization that has existed for around 5,000 years, has a similar level of high self-confidence and belief in self-sufficiency, and cultivates a way of geopolitical thinking that encourages all forms of international cooperation, including the military one, but which does not cry out for the conclusion of military alliances similar to the North Atlantic Alliance. Therefore, both Russia and China believe that each superpower can individually, independently and effectively oppose American hegemony and are not seriously contemplating about entering a joint military alliance that would entail the level of obligations that NATO members have. To be quite honest, there are also other moments in this story such as a certain amount of mutual mistrust of historical origin, current rivalries and unwillingness to share spheres of influence. However, these are negligible obstacles that can easily be overcome by open discussions and compromises, and by clearly defining the principles of alliance. The willingness of China and Russia to enter into the project of building a very concrete military-political alliance would be the cornerstone of the creation of a broader Eurasian military-political alliance. It is necessary for both nuclear superpowers to overcome the dangerous illusion of self-sufficiency because the US can still, like a torrent, penetrate all the geopolitical cracks of the Eurasian space, and use every weakness of Russia and China in order to turn their natural allies, such as Kazakhstan, into new obedient American vassals. Neither Russia nor China can tolerate American influence in the Eurasian regions that border them, and only with joint forces can they prevent the spread of aggressive American hegemony in Eurasia. In addition, the absence of a solid military-political alliance between China and Russia could eventually turn into a dangerous lack of mutual trust that, with American interference, could even lead the two Eurasian superpowers to serious conflicts. Therefore, Russia and China have no other choice but to reconsider their current policy of mutual relations and resolutely set out on the path of creating a really staunch military-political alliance.

It is almost certain that the third member of the new Eurasian alliance would be Iran because, along with Russia, it is the nation most exposed to the aggression of the Western conglomerate led by the USA. However, Iran is also a proud ancient nation that often likes to emphasize its ability to stand unaided against Western imperialism and the treachery of its Muslim neighbors ready to serve American interests for a handful of dollars. Indeed, so far Iran has managed to cope with the open hostility of the Western conglomerate on its own. But just as Ukraine has long been prepared for the role of an American proxy army to be used against Russia, so the US is preparing Israel and apostate Muslim nations for war against Iran. Regardless of Iran’s indisputable and proven military strength, it must not be forgotten that Israel has nuclear weapons and that in a war with Iran, at the behest of its American patrons, it would probably be ready to use them. The advantages that would be provided to Iran by membership in a solid military-political and certainly economic alliance with two nuclear powers would be so great that Iran could not refuse them. Iran is a natural ally of Russia and China, and as far as Iranian-Russian relations are concerned, that alliance is already functioning, but a decisive step forward needs to be made.

Finally, we come to two potentially large but not insurmountable problems of the Great Eurasian Merger (GEM). Unpredictable difficulties could exist regarding India’s membership in a strong military-political alliance together with China and Russia, mostly due to unstable, rivalrous and often hostile Sino-Indian relations, while the second disruptive factor could be the disunity of Muslim nations. All that is needed for India to find itself completely and unreservedly in a solid military-political alliance with Russia and China first of all, and then with all other willing Eurasian nations, is the awareness that Western colonialism and imperialism have never ceased to exist. The essence of neo-colonialism as a predominant western geopolitical philosophy, is that the US has taken the place of the old colonial powers and has done so in the name of that virtuous and glorious liberal democracy described by Fukuyama. The goals remained exactly the same, so if India were to fall for the American flattery, false promises and other tricks of the Americans who have long since proved that they must not be trusted, it would overnight became the Ukraine of Asia. In that case, India, as a regional power would serve in some new American hybrid and proxy wars from which, regardless of the outcome, it would emerge as an American colony. We must not lose sight of the fact that all those African, Asian and Latin American nations who were freed from the colonial rule of the old European powers only to become American colonies in modern era, bitterly mourn their old masters. It has been shown many times that life under the American boot is still the worst and deprived of even those civilizational advantages that the old European colonial powers offered in exchange for merciless economic exploitation. So, if India were to become aware of the dangers of forming any alliances with the USA (remember Kissinger’s warnings), then the American political pawns in India would certainly be pushed to the margins of political and public life, and the path to an alliance with Russia, China and Iran would become simple and inevitable. The ongoing Sino-Indian border dispute would surely prove trivial compared to the advantages of the new bloc. Also, India already has relations with Russia based on high mutual trust and understanding and that would make things much easier.

The fifth major country that would join the Eurasian military-political alliance would probably be Pakistan, which would suddenly find itself between two regional powers that had already joined it. Regardless of the fact that the US has so far managed to maintain a level of significant influence on Pakistan, in the new constellation of regional powers, Pakistan, where anti-American sentiment already prevails among ordinary citizens, would easily become part of the new military-political bloc and again, the old hostilities with India would not be the serious obstacle. The two large Muslim nations Iran and Pakistan, by joining the new military-political bloc, would open the gates to all other Muslim nations. This would very quickly lead to the final overcoming of religious and ethnic conflicts among Muslim nations, which for decades and centuries have been carefully nurtured by the colonial powers, while today it is primarily done by the USA, the UK and Israel.

There are only two possible models for Muslim nations in the future. They will either find a common language that would lead to the highest possible degree of mutual political respect and appreciation, or from their fatal disunity and senseless mutual hatred, the biggest enemies of all Muslims: the USA, UK, Israel and the European Union will continue to profit like before. The only military-political bloc in which Muslim nations could ever unite is precisely the Eurasian bloc, because the interest of Western powers for centuries has been to incite religious and ethnic hatred among predominantly Muslim nations, which would eventually lead to the destruction of not only their states but also of Islam itself as a religion. The main goal of such Western doctrine was initially to control the sources of oil as well as other material wealth. However, over time, the destruction of Islam became the priority goal of the West, bearing in mind that this great world religion, just like Russian Orthodox Christianity or Chinese Confucianism, is the natural enemy of Western neo-colonialism, imperialism, globalism, liberal fascism, crypto-Satanism and LGBT ideologies. In addition, the teachings of Islam resolutely rejects racism and chauvinism, which are flourishing in the West, especially in American society, although they are hidden there by numerous veils of formal and enforced, but also bizarre “political correctness” with which the American establishment simply washes its hands of the factual state of affairs. Authentic Islam and true Muslims are natural opponents of American hegemony and know more than well, that they cannot expect anything good from the West. Politically aware and prudent Muslim leaders understood that there is nothing left for them but unification, and they are probably aware that such a thing is possible only under the Eurasian roof. Those other leaders of Muslim nations, that is, those over whom the US, the UK, Israel and the EU still have strong influence through business and private connections, will continue to promote Muslim disunity and Western culture in order to secure their own positions. Is there a better illustration of such a thing than last year’s Halloween celebration in Mecca and Medina? A small number of Saudis paraded around the most holy Muslim sites dressed in the costumes of devils, witches, vampires, zombies, and other freaks and monsters from American folklore. Of course, this caused the justifiable anger of Muslims around the world and once again exposed the pernicious influence of Western culture on traditional societies. Apparently, the American plan is to Americanize as many Muslims as possible and thereby pacify them, and to destroy the rest in mutual wars and conflicts.

The unification of Muslim nations would also mean the entry of the Maghreb countries into the Eurasian military-political bloc, and this would strongly redefine the initial Eurasian ideas. Former Japanese diplomat and part-time lecturer at Tama University in Tokyo, Akio Kawato in his article “Russia, Russia, Wherefore Art Thou Russia?” for the “Carnegie Endowment for International Peace”, used the term “ultra-Eurasianism” alluding that the neo-Eurasianism advocated by Dr. Alexander Dugin is an extremist ideology. So apparently it was pure sarcasm from Kawato. In fact, the progenitor of neo-Europeanism, the distinguished Russian political scientist, philosopher, geopolitical analyst and strategist, professor Dr. Dugin, is the creator of the Fourth Political Theory, which decisively rejects all the totalitarian and extremist ideologies of the past, as well as the modern liberalism of the West, which, according to Dugin, is just another in a series of totalitarian ideologies. Dugin’s obvious, more than clearly and precisely declared anti-fascism, anti-Nazism and anti-totalitarianism did not prevent Western analysts and journalists from calling Dugin himself, his closest collaborators, followers and supporters fascists. This is, again, just one more proof that the promoters of Western liberal dogmas are incapable of any dialogue or self-criticism. Unfortunately, Dugin’s enemies did not stop at insults. The Kiev Nazi regime ordered the assassination of Dugin’s daughter Darya, and it was openly and with a dose of undisguised pride, admitted very quickly after her death. In August 2022, the unfortunate Darya was killed in Moscow Oblast, when the car she was driving was blown up by explosives planted by members of the Security Service of Ukraine. Since Darya Dugina was herself a political scientist and a theoretician of neo-Eurasianism, with her death she gave this ideology its first great martyrdom, which will forever remain embedded in the idea of a new, free world. Regardless of the fact that American patrons of Ukraine publicly wash their hands of Darya’s assassination, it is highly unlikely that she was killed without permission or even direct orders from Washington.

The core of Dugin’s teachings could be described in a very simplified way, as the idea of uniting the Eurasian nations through the preservation of proven, conservative and traditional values of their cultures and religions. Dugin’s neo-Eurasianism is an ideology of building brotherhood and trust among Eurasian nations because he is not a fascist but a conservative philosopher and a humanist. Dugin’s neo-Eurasianism automatically implies a complete rejection of American hegemony and imperialism, and all Western dogmatic, perverted, anti-natural ideologies that could be called crypto-satanic. However, Kawato in the aforementioned article questions whether China is even part of the proposed Eurasian integration, apparently wishing for a negative answer. The answer to this question is that not only is China an inseparable part of united Eurasia, but so are all other Eurasian nations, including all Muslim nations and the nations of the Maghreb. This brings us to a term that is different from the one used with undisguised sarcasm by Kawato, and which, if we wanted to build on his pun, could be called hyper-Eurasianism, but this time , not in a pejorative sense. Spillovers of Eurasian integrations from Eurasia itself to other parts of the world, since this is the only way to stop American imperialism and global terror, could then be called hyper-Eurasianism and it must be given a chance, whatever we end up calling it. If in the beginning, Eurasianism was an ideology that redefined Russia itself as a nation that evidently, back in the days of the Russian Empire, ceased to be an exclusively European, Slavic and Orthodox Christian nation, in the near future it could happen that first African and then even Latin American nations join Eurasian integration.

The good thing is that with the establishment of the Collective Security Treaty Organization, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the foundations of the future Eurasian military-political bloc, which would represent an adequate response to NATO and other military alliances led by the USA, have already been laid. The CSTO was created on May 15, 1992 on the foundations of the Commonwealth of Independent States as the remnants of the USSR. Three years later CSTO was registered in the Secretariat of the OUN, which gave it a full international legal dimension. The current membership of the CSTO, which in the West is sometimes called the “Russian NATO”, although this alliance is definitely not that, consists of Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. We are therefore talking about an alliance that until now primarily gathered the countries of the post-Soviet space. The objectives of the CSTO are set on very sound and rational principles such as maintaining peace, international security and stability, and members are offered collective security, preservation of independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty. In addition, membership in the CSTO implies military and political cooperation, the fight against terrorism and extremism, and the prevention of modern slavery and trafficking in narcotics and weapons. However, the CSTO inherited some unresolved smoldering conflicts from the past such as the very serious one in Nagorno-Karabakh. Another problem is that despite the fact that CSTO membership is not expensive, nor does it impose excessive obligations on its members, the interest of other Eurasian countries to join it is not great. It could be said that not enough has been done on the marketing of CSTO or that the concrete advantages and benefits of membership in this organization are not clear enough to potential members of this alliance. The CSTO clearly demonstrated its strength during the bloody riots in Kazakhstan in January last year, but it somewhat failed in the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. The credit for that certainly goes to Armenia itself. The biggest weakness that the CSTO has shown so far is that it has failed to protect its members from malignant American influence because. For example, there are American laboratories in Armenia and Kazakhstan where biological weapons are researched and developed. Membership in the CSTO should represent such a level of obligations that prevents any kind of military cooperation with rival military alliances and their members but unfortunately this is not happening.

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization was established in June 2001 in Shanghai by the leaders of China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan based on the ideas of political, economic and security cooperation. India and Pakistan joined the SCO in June 2017, and Iran will do so this year in April at the earliest. In June last year, Belarus applied for membership in the SCO, and Mongolia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Cambodia, Nepal, Turkey and Sri Lanka also expressed interest. The goals of the SCO are strengthening stability and security, fighting terrorism, separatism and extremism, drug trafficking, but also establishing cooperation in the fields of economy, science and culture. The SCO worked on improving the mutual military cooperation of its members, on the exchange of intelligence data and the fight against terrorism. It is clear that the ideas about cooperation promoted by CSTO and SCO overlap, however, the two organizations are very different from each other. The CSTO is much more similar to NATO due to the existence of its Key Article 4, which implies that “if one of the States Parties is subjected to aggression by any state or group of states, then this will be considered as aggression against all States Parties to this Treaty”. On the other hand, the SCO, although it was also conceived as a Eurasian equivalent of NATO, has not yet become that and functions more as a forum and council that actively promotes the improvement of mutual cooperation at different levels, but its membership is far more numerous than that of the CSTO and is not limited to the post-Soviet space.

There is an old Chinese saying that is usually attributed to the founder of Buddhism, Siddhartha Gаutama: “Your worst enemy is your best teacher.” If we apply his ancient teachings to the current geopolitical situation in Eurasia and the rest of the world, we must admit that the CSTO and SCO members can learn a lot from their greatest adversary — the North Atlantic Alliance. Yes, NATO is an aggressive organization, a fake system of collective security, which actually represents a strengthened military fist of the USA, but from its coherent and functional military-political organization a lot can be learned. Also, the very existence of NATO and other military organizations under the control of the USA is sufficient reason for the creation of an opposing military bloc whose organization and internal discipline will have to surpass that of its Western rivals in every respect. Therefore, everything that the CSTO and the SCO have offered so far, no matter how fundamentally it is based on correct principles, is insufficient to curb the global tyranny of the USA and its obedient, puppet states. The enemy is not only the best teacher from whose mistakes and successes you can learn a lot, but the enemy must never be underestimated, especially when you take into account the fact that the USA has all over the world, demonstrated its ability to destroy entire countries and leave them looted in the chaos of anarchy. That is why the initiative from Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan, from June 4, 2014, to merge the CSTO and the SCO into one new military-political organization is a proposal that must be implemented as soon as possible. The CSTO and SCO countries must as soon as possible merge into a new organization that will militarily protect all its members in the same way as the members of NATO are guaranteed by its Article 5.

However, in order for Eurasian NATO to succeed, it is necessary to build an entire alternative civilization that would rapidly build parallel international institutions. Existing international institutions are, in practice, clearly subordinated to American influence, although they were built on the principles of equality. That is why it is necessary that all existing international organizations from the UN to the World Trade Organization get their Eurasian alternative as soon as possible. Eurasia needs not only a solid military-political bloc, but also its own version of the United Nations, its own international trade organization, its new single currency to free itself from dependence on the worthless dollar, its new Olympic Games and all other sporting organizations and competitions, and even the Eurasian Internet completely separate from the existing one. Eurasia should certainly have its own new space agency and join forces to explore and conquer the Solar System and its resources. Finally, although the second language of the author of this text is English, even the use of the English language as one of the official languages of the future Eurasian military-political bloc could be questioned since the English language is one of the proven tools of American cultural dominance. In the long run, English could be replaced by Spanish for example, which is equally easy to learn and the world’s fourth-most spoken language.

That new, absolutely necessary Eurasian military-political as well as economic union, unlike NATO, which is clearly dominated by the USA, will have to offer all its members true equality, and a package of clear benefits that imply a full degree of security and military protection, including there joint nuclear umbrella, joint nuclear forces, joint highly mobile forces for quick interventions, joint forces for the fight against terrorism, extremism, separatism and color revolutions, joint defense against cyber-terrorism, active joint defense against numerous varieties of hybrid war, but also much more than that. In its package of privileges, the Eurasian bloc would have to offer its members a package of great economic opportunities, for example, access to a huge common economic space with a customs union, active cooperation in the fields of science and education, access to new technologies and strong cultural exchange. The new Eurasian alliance would have to skillfully and dynamically balance between the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other members and gradual mutual political and any other harmonization. The benefits of membership in the Eurasian bloc, for the smaller states of Eurasia, which in many cases are still under the strong influence of the USA and the European Union, must be many times more favorable than anything the West could ever offer, and would have to be so significant that would render all old territorial disputes and other misunderstandings insignificant.

Eurasia is a sleeping giant that, once it finally wakes up, will not only become completely immune to all possible American blackmail, dictates and threats, but will be able to dictate its own rules to the US and its allies, and if necessary, isolate them and impose sanctions on them in the same way that the Western powers have done it to the rest of the world. The appeal to create such a military-political block as soon as possible is not only a logical next step, but above all, it is a question of the survival of the Eurasian nations, and the leaders will have to find a formula to achieve it as soon as possible, despite all the challenges and difficulties. The Great Eurasian Merger would be a huge game changer!