

A. V. Yakovenko

THE WORLD TRANSFORMATION

I. The origins

The world is in the state of complex and protracted transformation after such geopolitical upheavals as the end of the Cold War in 1989 and the USSR collapse two years later. Due to the false conclusions drawn by Western elites, primarily American ones, who proclaimed their “victory in the Cold War”, which served as the basis for the previous ideologized policy, the changes were delayed at the very start. The primitive hope on automatically expanding the sphere of Western domination to the rest of the world was of significant importance, despite the fact that only processes of self-destruction and decay occur automatically (the collapse of the Soviet Union was a vivid illustration of this).

In the Western community, there has been no attempt to soberly assess the qualitatively new situation in the world and develop a new strategy for it. The general chorus of triumphalism drowned out, for example, the voices of those in the USA, who believed that the “normal time” had come, and America could shut NATO down, leave Europe and mind its own business.

In line with the idea of automatism and as a “safety net” for the case of the “failure” of democracy in Russia, in 1994, it was decided to expand NATO to the East, but without inviting Russia that became a successor state to the USSR, including as a nuclear state, to join the alliance. This decision was made despite concerns that such alienation of Russia would become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The unsupported message that Russia would never be able to regain its status as a global power and maintain its nuclear missile capacity at the proper

level, prevailed. Zb. Brzezinski postulated that this would not happen if Ukraine retained its independence: thus, Ukraine, which declared neutrality upon gaining independence, became an important factor of the Western policy of deterring Russia.

The new state of the world was defined as a “unipolar moment” with the presence of a “single superpower”. Given the assumed temporary nature of this state of affairs, no attempt to formulate some vision of the final outcome of the launched geopolitical transition has been made. H. Kissinger, in his “Diplomacy” of 1994, suggested that there would be several leading powers in the world with the United States as “*primus inter pares*”. And in his book “Leadership” of 2022, he already directly expressed regret that the multipolarity practiced by R. Nixon had not become a “reliable school” of American diplomacy.

George Kennan, the founder of the USSR deterrence strategy, regarded the decision as “the most fatal” for the entire period after the end of the Cold War. The subsequent development of the situation proved his point: a new round of the confrontation between the West and Russia was initiated. Moreover, the verbal assurances given to the Soviet leadership about the non-movement of NATO and its military infrastructure towards the western border of the USSR/Russia in terms of the ideological and other confrontation along the West-East line to have been ceased was violated.

By the end of the Cold War, the West had faced a number of problems that would make themselves felt later, but then they were almost unnoticed amid the euphoria of the alleged lack of alternatives to Western values and development models. It can be assumed that due to this, the West has gained a second wind, but at the cost of the relaxation of the elites, whose discipline, including intellectual one, was previously provided by the imperatives of the bipolar confrontation. The United States, together with other Western countries, emerged from the protracted crisis of the 70s via the path of neoliberal economic

policy – Reaganomics and Thatcherism, which reproduced capitalism of the early 20th century in the qualitatively different environment of social policy that resulted from two world wars. Over time, this change in the economic policy will be regarded as a rupture of the post-war “social contract” and “the betrayal of democracy”.

In the USA, since the 1980s, the process of dismantling the Glass-Steagall Act, which, based on the experience of the Great Depression, imposed clear restrictions on the activities in the banking and financial sector, was launched and completed by 2000. This reform laid the foundation for the phenomenon that became known as the “financialization” of the economy: the financial sector, which had previously served the real economy, assumed a commanding position, providing – in the combination with other services – 80 % of the USA GDP.

In 1971, at the height of the Vietnam War, Washington unilaterally abolished the gold standard, which radically transformed the Bretton Woods system and created conditions for the uncontrolled dollar-printing. In 1973, as the consequence of the Arab oil embargo caused by the October War in the Middle East, the price of oil increased fourfold. And in 1974–75, the United States reached the agreement with Saudi Arabia on the sale of oil in dollars (which created artificial demand for the currency) and on the Kingdom’s privileged access to American securities.

In the 1980s, the process of globalization began actively developing in the form of creating global value chains through the liberalization of capital flows and technology transfer, but above all, the transfer of traditional real sector industries to developing countries, including China, Southeast Asian countries and Turkey, with their cheaper workforce. However, new industries, such as information technology, did not compensate for the relevant loss of jobs in Western countries.

Thus, the historical West, which overcame its internal bipolarity following World War II, opted for the inertial policy of ensuring its global dominance under the slogan of “promoting freedom and democracy”. The institutional framework of the Western hegemony, the Bretton Woods system, has not been revised either, as it has not become inclusive due to the continued Western control over it. They had no foresight to co-opt promising non-Western powers, such as Russia, China, India and Brazil, into their system, including the G7, based on the principles of equality. This would drastically change the nature of the entire international system. The United States relied on the transformational capacities of globalization, believing that capitalism would automatically encourage other countries, including China, to become their allies and recognize “American leadership”.

As events have shown, the price of this “second wind” of Western hegemony and Anglo-Saxon capitalism – a new version of globalization and neoliberal economic policy – guaranteed the instability of both in the medium term.

II. What went wrong in the Euro-Atlantic

The process of NATO’s expansion was accelerated and was associated with Eastern and Central European countries to join the European Union. Russian concerns were ignored: the Founding Act of 1997 and the Rome Declaration of 2002 did not remove them. The established Russia–NATO Council did not actually function as a body where every member participated in its national capacity. Moscow also had to deal with the Western countries’ collective opinion in the soon-to-be-formed G8, which ceased existing in early 2014, because of Crimea and Sevastopol to join Russia. The West stubbornly defended the de facto NATO-centricity of the European security architecture, preventing the institutionalization of the OSCE, which still has not had its own

charter, but could become the genuine regional collective security system implementing the principle of its indivisibility, as meant by Chapter VIII of the UN Charter.

Moscow's hopes for the counter-movement by the West, including its ideological disarmament and the development of relations based on equality, reciprocity and consideration of each other's interests, were not destined to come true. In 1999, there was NATO's aggression against Serbia. Despite positive signals from Russia (its reaction to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack in the United States and its assistance in the NATO operation in Afghanistan), the alienation grew. In the spring of 2003, at the UN Security Council, Russia and the Anglo-Americans disagreed over the alleged possession of WMD by Iraq. As the result, the Americans and their allies invaded Iraq without the UN Security Council's approval.

The President Vladimir Putin's state visit to the UK in June 2003 can be considered the peak of positive relations between Russia and the West. In the autumn of the same year, the British granted asylum to B. Berezovsky and A. Zakaev, although their appeal in this regard could have been considered indefinitely.

On February 07, 2007, the President of Russia delivered his famous Munich speech that became the warning to the West about Russia to continue following the path of sovereign, independent development and resisting attempts to restrict it. In April 2008, at the NATO summit in Bucharest, it was decided that in future, Georgia and Ukraine would become members of the alliance, despite Russia's objections. On August 08 of the same year, the pro-Western regime of Mikhail Saakashvili, with the tacit consent of Washington, unleashed aggression against South Ossetia, killing Russian peacekeepers. This resulted in recognizing the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia by Russia. The Caucasian crisis was resolved through the mediation of the French President

Nicolas Sarkozy within the framework of the OSCE, the mission of which recognized a year later Tbilisi's responsibility for unleashing the armed conflict.

At the end of 2013, the Ukrainian crisis was unleashed, to have been provoked by the problems of the country's association with the European Union, which refused to discuss in the trilateral format its consequences for the entire complex of trade and economic relations between Ukraine and Russia. On February 22, 2014, in Kiev, a coup d'état took place, and the pro-Western opposition took power, with the military suppression of the Donbass regions to start, because of their refusal to recognize the new government and their declaration of the DPR/LPR independence. The use of the army against Donbass continued within the ATO (anti-terrorism operation). The Ukrainian Armed Forces were defeated twice – at Ilovaisk in 2014 and at Debaltsevo in February 2015, when the quadrilateral agreements were concluded in Minsk (with the participation of the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France and Germany), for resolving the internal civil conflict in Eastern Ukraine. They were approved by the UN Security Council and provided for establishing the special status for the territories of the self-declared DPR/LPR.

III. In the rest of the world

While in the Euro-Atlantic, due to the Western politics, the bipolarity of the Cold War was reproduced, the rest of the world was laying the foundations of the multipolar architecture of international relations. Moscow wagered on the multipolar world order even in the late 90s, on the basis of the sober assessment of promising trends in the world development in the period after the end of the Cold War. This thesis, as well as the postulates about network diplomacy and the multi-vector foreign policy, became part of the intellectual justification of Russia's independent foreign policy, as well as of the state strategic planning.

Contradictions of the Western politics first led to the dotcom crisis of 2000, and then, in the autumn of 2008, to the mortgage crisis in the United States, which triggered the Global Financial Crisis. Following the events, the G20 summit format was established, which previously met at the level of finance ministers and Central Bank governors. At its first summit in November 2008 in Washington and at subsequent meetings of the leaders, agreed decisions were made, aimed at overcoming the crisis phenomena. These efforts did not develop significantly, because soon after the first fears passed, the United States and its European allies embarked on the path of “the quantitative easing”, which was in reality money-printing at the virtually zero bank interest rate. The crisis did not disappear and its root causes were not eliminated. Over time, political issues entered the agenda of the G20.

As part of the emerging multipolar architecture of international relations, in 2006, the BRIC format that included the leading non-Western countries – Brazil, Russia, India and China – was established. Its first summit was held in Ekaterinburg in 2009. With the accession of South Africa in 2011, it turned into the BRICS transcontinental association, and with the accession of six more countries – Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Iran and Ethiopia in 2024, and Indonesia in 2025 – into “the eleven”. At the Kazan summit in October 2024, it was decided to grant partner state status to 13 countries, of which Bolivia, Cuba, Belarus, Uzbekistan, Malaysia, Kazakhstan, Uganda, Thailand and Nigeria have currently accepted the invitation. Two dozen more countries have expressed their interest in cooperating with the BRICS.

In the context of the Ukrainian conflict, which was regarded both in the West and in Russia as existential – between the historical West and historical Russia, the Russian side was forced to admit the existence of deep, civilizational contradictions with the West. In the Foreign Policy Concept dated March 31, 2023, approved by President V.V. Putin, Russia is considered as an “original state-civilization” among similar others, such as China and India. Overcoming

the cognitive limitations of the Soviet period and the Eurocentrism of the initial stage of modern Russia's existence, the Russian government refined the idea of multipolarity as having cultural and civilizational foundations, reflecting the cultural and civilizational diversity of the world, which was suppressed by the West for five centuries, and affirming the equality of value systems and models of development of various cultures and civilizations.

In parallel, the processes of regionalization developed as the response to the global architecture that did not meet the requirements of the time. The reform of the United Nations, including its Security Council, dragged on for two decades and had little prospects because of the West's unwillingness to recognize multipolarity (it was anathematized as "the undermining" under the Western dominance). In any case, the UN has become a hostage to the Western politics, which has often paralyzed its charter activities. At the levels of the practical, trade, economic, monetary and financial world order, the West continued to cling to its dominance.

In the wake of the Ukrainian crisis, the Western capitals started using the thesis of a certain "rules-based order", which implied a certain "liberal world order", allegedly resulting from the settlement after the end of the Cold War (technically, there was nothing like that, which became one of the main sources of modern problems in the world politics and the world development). In fact, this thesis denied the entire post-war world order with the central role of the United Nations and the set of universal (collectively concluded and binding on all states) instruments of international law.

As the result, the short-sighted and selfish politics of the Western elites, which could not abandon the way of existence that allowed them to charge geopolitical rent from the rest of the world, led the world politics and the world development to a dead end. The catalyst for the comprehension of the new state of the world was the Ukrainian conflict provoked by the West in the hope of resolving the "Russian question" once and for all. Striving for avoiding a

conflict and preventing Ukraine's entry into NATO, and restoring the military and political neutrality previously enshrined in its constitution, on December 15, 2021, Russia proposed relevant draft agreements to the United States and NATO, the key provisions of which were immediately rejected by the West. In the conditions when the alliance had already begun military development of Ukraine's territory, Russia was forced to launch the Special Military Operation (SVO) in Ukraine. Demilitarization and denazification of Ukraine, as well as prevention of its entry into NATO, were stated as the SVO goals.

The West's hope for a blitzkrieg of rearmed and nationalized Ukraine, combined with the most severe sanctions pressure on Russia (about 30,000 restrictive measures were imposed, including sectoral and financial ones, and the foreign exchange reserves of the Bank of Russia in the amount of USD 350 billion were frozen) proved to be untenable. The conflict has turned into a protracted one, and the situation on the battlefield began developing in favor of the Russian Armed Forces. Under pressure from London and Washington, Kiev abandoned the Istanbul Agreements drafted and initialed in April 2022 and preferred to continue fighting. In September of the same year, referendums on joining Russia were held in the Donetsk, Lugansk, Zaporozhye and Kherson Regions of Ukraine, and these new regions became part of the Russian Federation, which was enshrined in its Constitution.

The West's foreign-policy catastrophe was the actual refusal of non-Western countries and the rest of the world to join the Western sanctions against Russia. The West's pressure has only revived the mindset of developing countries against neocolonial methods of their exploitation. The transitional bipolarity has developed in the world: the West and about 50 countries that associate themselves with it, on the one hand, and the rest of the world or the Global Majority/the Global South (about 140 states), on the other hand. Russia and all other BRICS countries associate themselves with the latter, which has become a key instrument for self-organizing the Global Majority and

representing its interests in the Group of Twenty. The G20 has turned into the main forum for communication between the two groups of states due to the lack of UN reform and the collective West's blocking of the World Organization's actions in the relevant areas of its activity.

The West did not hide the fact that the defeat of Ukraine would mean the defeat of the West, which was actually involved in the hybrid, or proxy, war against Russia. This included massive supplies of weapons and ammunition, as well as the provision of services by the American space grouping for the real-time transmission of relevant intelligence data and the guidance of the supplied weapons systems to Russian targets. The J. Biden's Administration proclaimed the task of inflicting the "strategic defeat" on Russia, meaning the failure to achieve the SVO goals.

The most important new element of the emerging geostrategic situation was the clear prospect of Russia's military victory over the West, which significantly affected the moral and psychological atmosphere in the world. In parallel, Russia proved the resilience of its society and economy to the Western pressure, and its ability to mobilize appropriate forces and resources. In 2024, economic growth in Russia was 4.1 %, while in the USA it made 2.6 %, and the EU average was 0.9 %. Herewith, the Western countries' economies were affected by the "sanctions boomerang" – rising energy costs and withdrawal from the Russian market, which led to the recession in Germany and the United Kingdom, and also provoked a round of inflation in the USA, with the increase in the Fed rate to more than 5 percentage points. In parallel, economic contradictions between the United States and the EU, which turned out to be dependent on the supply of American expensive shale LNG, emerged. Energy prices in Europe turned out to be three to five times higher than those in the United States, which stimulated the transfer of the production to America. This situation that turned Europe into the source of the United States'

reindustrialization was fixed by the American Law on Reducing Inflation in 2022.

The need to explain the resilience of the Russian economy to the West's pressure prompted the IMF to recalculate GDP of the world's leading countries by purchasing power parity (PPP) in 2023. This gave a real picture of the balance of power in the global economy: Russia has become one of 4 leaders, after China, the United States and India.

IV. Problems of the Western countries

As the result of the elites' inertial politics, in the Western society itself, contradictions grew. There were signs of the crisis of liberalism and the liberal idea itself, which contained the seed of egalitarian totalitarianism. Against this background, the thesis of "national liberalism" (F. Fukuyama), which resembled German National Socialism, was put forward. The Democratic Administration of J. Biden headed the ultra-liberal revolution based on marginal segments of the population, dependent on the state's social support (this, combined with the mail vote because of COVID, is believed to have rigged the results of the 2020 elections, in which D. Trump received 11 million votes more than in 2016).

The agenda of the LGBT community and transgenderism, including those in violation of parental rights, were officially promoted. The policy of positive discrimination, with its focus on ethnic and sexual minorities, with the history rewriting, destructing monuments and undermining traditional American identity (here the catalyst was the movement "Black Lives Matter!"), was brought to the point of absurdity. In parallel, freedom of speech and all the dissent were suppressed, including those at universities. The authorities have declared freedom of speech and common sense to be the "agenda of the right". The cosmopolitan elites' politics has come into conflict with the interests of the population's majority, rooted in their countries, history and traditional values.

The relevant polarization in society was most acutely felt in the United States, where people talked about “culture wars” and an “identity crisis”.

V. The world transformation: main areas and prospects

It is obvious that the ideological era in history is only now coming to its end, which coincides with the long 20th century, starting in 1914, when the complex crisis of Western society was resolved on the path of war. It took the Russian Revolution of 1917, the interwar period with its fascism and aggressive nationalism, and the World War II, which can be considered in total as the second Thirty Years' War in Europe. Following its results, including the need for responding to “the Soviet Union's challenge”, Western society stabilized through creating the socially oriented economy and the large middle class, which expanded the basis of well-being and ensured sufficient consumer demand.

The Republican Administration of D. Trump marks the endgame of the post-Cold War period with its inertial policies of Western elites. It was a protracted transition to multipolarity as a natural state of international relations reflecting the cultural and civilizational diversity of the world. It has been suppressed by the West for centuries and asserts the equality of value systems and development models of various cultures and civilizations, including the Western one. The United Nations, including its Security Council, have to be accordingly reformed, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights must be rewritten on an inter-civilizational basis. Otherwise, one can expect a new universal international organization to be established by the non-Western world as the necessary conditions are prepared.

Meanwhile, the main burden of regulating interstate relations will fall on regions and macroregions within developing and advancing regionalization. The new global governance format will be recreated from the regional level. This

trend will be also economically justified because of developing de-globalization, due to the fact that global value chains cannot be sustainable in the face of geopolitical and other turbulence. Most likely, they will be confined to national borders or within the framework of regional cooperation structures. Intercontinental processes are also possible, for example, within the framework of the BRICS, if and when the participating countries manage to agree on them.

Much will depend on which strategy the West chooses for this endgame. But in any case, it will be about reducing the West's status to another region and another civilization among others. It can also be assumed that the historical West, as we know it, will cease to exist, and its member countries will enter the corresponding geographical layouts – European/Eurasian, North American and East Asian.

The decline of the West's global hegemony is an unprecedented phenomenon in history (if one does not draw conditional parallels with the collapse of the Western Roman Empire and Byzantium). Therefore, various options for the Western elites to respond are possible, up to building closed military-political and trade-economic structures-fortresses. These were intended to be the projects of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership and the Transpacific Partnership, which were abandoned by D. Trump in his first presidency.

So far, it is possible to judge that from the West, the Trump's strategy will prevail, as far as it can be judged from the first months of his second presidency. It has internal and external dimensions that respond to relevant challenges, be it the state of American society and the international positioning of the United States in the qualitatively new global environment. Conditionally, we can talk about the change of the liberal-globalist paradigm to the conservative and nationally focused one, as indicated by Trump's key program slogan "Make America great again!" (MAGA) and the principle "America first!".

Internally, “the (traditional) family returns to the centre of American life”, at the federal level, only two sexes and the union between them are recognized. This destroys the entire liberal agenda, including the “green” one, of the last 30 years. Trump’s Administration has also made it clear that they will insist on the similar transformation of the politics of other Western countries and support ideologically related political forces and movements in them. In this regard, the speech of Vice President J.D. Vance at the Munich Security Conference in February 2025 was significant. Trump and E. Musk made relevant statements on particular episodes of European politics, including attempts to ban the Alternative for Germany in Germany and withdraw Marine Le Pen from the game in France.

The course has been set for the reindustrialization of America, the source of which is Europe in recession caused by the Ukrainian conflict among other things. The main goals are balancing the federal budget (it has been running a deficit for the past 24 years) and foreign trade by reducing expenses, primarily on social needs, reducing business taxes (from 21 % to 15 %, despite the fact that in his first presidency, Trump reduced them from 35 %), tariff policy (tariffs should compensate for the lack of federal VAT) and introducing “the golden card” for wealthy foreigners. In total, the goal is creating in the United States the most favorable conditions not only for doing business, but also for living. Moreover, it is necessary to return to the coordinate system of the 19th century, when major powers prevailed, but with the significant head start for America itself, which is transforming the international trade and economic system for itself, using its advantages and privileges in the current one. Destroyed Europe can also become a source of white emigration to the United States, which will reverse the trend of turning white America into a minority.

Trump’s statements on Canada and Greenland suggest that the new Administration’s plans include territorial expansion, which may result in the possession of the United States comparable to Russia’s access to the Arctic with

its promising natural resources to become available due to global warming. In principle, the Arctic can become the most important area of bilateral cooperation. Unlike his European allies, Trump proceeds from the fact that warming is inevitable and has already partially taken place (at least by 1.5 degrees on average on the planet) and it is necessary to adapt to it.

Introducing new tariffs for 185 countries, equally for “allies and opponents”, announced by Trump on April 02, 2025, can be considered as total economic aggression. Its main addressees, apparently, are China and the European Union; moreover, Europe to have been impoverished in the period after the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, is deliberately being destroyed, including as a market for Chinese goods. A number of countries in Southeast Asia and Africa, where significant Chinese investments are present and through which Chinese goods can be supplied to the United States, are also being hit. Relatively small tariffs are imposed on goods from Anglo-Saxon and Latin American countries, which suggests options for integrating the Anglo-Saxons into some kind of association under the leadership of Washington and plans for consolidating the Western Hemisphere in succession to the Monroe Doctrine. Introducing the tariffs is just the opening in a tough game involving the resolution of all trade issues exclusively on a bilateral basis with each country individually.

The next step will be solving the problem of the national debt, which has exceeded USD 36 trillion (30 % are held by foreign holders, including China and Japan) and for which one sixth of the budget expenditure is already spent on annual payments. In the coming years, USD 14 trillion will have to be paid off to repay the debt, which may require introducing new borrowing instruments backed by either cryptocurrency (its disadvantage is its significant volatility) or gold: the corresponding reserve may be controlled by the Ministry of Finance. The Fed’s reform, as well as measures for reducing the financialization of the

economy, are also possible. The amount of debt repayments depends on the Fed rate

The problem of the national debt is directly related to the dollar stability. According to the IMF, the dollar share in global reserves has decreased from 71 % in 2000 to 58 % in 2024. Saudi Arabia refused to extend the 1974–75 agreements, and now sells 10 % of its oil for yuan. The Fed rate depends on the level of inflation, which is unlikely to decrease against the background of the tariff wars, and this, according to standard Fed practice, means additional emissions with the prospect of hyperinflation (10–15 %). Therefore, no one can predict whether Trump's tariff measures will give him a gain in time of a year and a half to reformat the monetary system and avoid a sharp drop in the dollar. The Fed's management seems to be resisting. The Fed rate has already blown a hole of 10 % (government bonds with previously low yields) in the US banking system. China has started dumping these bonds, and if it drops half of them (by USD 500 billion), economists estimate that their yields will jump to 6–7 % with the corresponding increase in debt payments. This turns out to be a vicious circle, when any radicalism requires even more radicalism, and the catastrophe ceases to be manageable. So far, there is no reason – and it seems that Trump does not have any, for believing that America will be able to rise like a Phoenix from the total chaos without truly revolutionary upheavals.

Having emerged after the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, American mega-funds (BlackRock, Vanguard, etc.) are turning into the instrument of foreign economic expansion, accumulating huge financial resources and, with the assistance of their government (fines, scandals, etc., which contributed to the decrease in the capitalization of the relevant banks and companies), control or blocking stakes in systemically important banks and leading companies in the EU, including Germany, and performing the quasi-governmental macro-regulatory function (for example, they keep the shale sector afloat), representing an advanced version of managerial capitalism.

The wager on restoring the USA's economic and technological power, by definition, negates allied relations, including NATO, which turns into an outright business project within the framework of Trump's "transactional diplomacy". In principle, it is logical that the United States control the fate of the global hegemony of the West, since they were its masters, having absorbed other Western countries' colonial empires, including the British one, into their Pax Americana in the post-war period, and other members of the Western community quite officially recognized "American leadership in the Western world". This creates tension in US relations with the European Union, which is manifested, among other things, in the Ukrainian settlement, where Trump assumed mediation functions, stating that Biden's Administration was guilty of unleashing the Ukrainian conflict, while the European Union supports the war to be continued for another period of up to five years, when "Russian aggression against Europe is assumed", which Trump doesn't believe in.

Herewith, Trump's strategy means transiting from geopolitics to geo-economy, including in relation to restricting China. It also implies reducing the role of the military force factor: as the conflict in Ukraine has shown, the West and the United States have lost the strategic and conventional arms race, and Russia has increased its military power, demonstrating its huge mobilization potential. What motivates Trump to speak out against unleashing new wars and even for nuclear disarmament (this does not prevent Trump from increasing the defense budget and restoring the military-industrial complex as part of the industrial potential, including shipbuilding). In principle, issues of strategic arms and strategic stability in general can be resolved over time in the trilateral format – between the United States, Russia and China, of course, depending on the status of relations in this "triangle". Restoring such relations in the bilateral format between the United States and Russia (they were destroyed on the American party's initiative) is unlikely.

If Trump's plans are to be developed, the United States and Russia will enter their own special league as two truly self-sufficient resource countries and leading Arctic powers. The next line of leading global powers will be China, India, and possibly Brazil. The main areas of competition among the leading "five" will be new technologies, energy conservation and artificial intelligence that will be energy-intensive.

In general, international relations in the coming period will be characterized by the struggle and interaction of several trends developing in parallel. The key uncertainty factor will be the future of the Trump revolution, the external projection of which could result in transforming America into "a global factory", with the rest of the world as a neocolonial supplier of resources.

It has not yet known what forms the normalization of America and the divided American society will take after the Democrats' ultra-liberal experiments. Will the United States be able to exist differently from the empire, even one of the model of the 2nd half of the 19th century? In conservative America, the biopolitical instincts of globalist elites, including neo-Malthusianism, can make themselves felt, with the only difference being that the entire population is co-opted into these plans, rather than being seen as expendables along with others. In this case, Europe may pose a threat to America as a competitor in resource consumption.

Another trend is the opposition of the World majority/the Global South to these plans, primarily in the BRICS+ format, but also within the framework of the SCO, which promotes the positive agenda: creating the basis of the multipolar world order, democratizing and de-ideologizing international relations. The trade, economic, monetary and financial architecture, alternative to one controlled by the West (the Bretton Woods Institutions, the OECD, the WTO, the Basel Bank for International Settlements), will be created here. The identity politics, which expresses values of the world's leading civilizations, will increasingly set the tone: the task will be to bring them to a common

denominator in the field of international relations, given the positive historical experience already accumulated by humanity.

The third trend is replacing the arms race with what could be called a development race, in which a key role will be played by developing human resources and, in this regard, areas of social development, such as healthcare, education, science and culture, as well as creating the comfortable living environment. Russia's victory over the West in Ukraine may become a decisive factor in the general decline in the role of the power factor in the world politics. Its manifestation is possible in terms of Taiwan and the Middle East due to the lack of a just settlement of the Palestinian issue and relations between Israel and the Arab countries and Iran.

The fourth trend is disintegrating the historical West and its "products", including the collapse or significant dismantling of the EU (including that as the result of weakening Germany), the territorial and political restructuring of Europe, and its possible involvement in the processes in Greater Eurasia as the consequence of nation-focused elites' coming to power. Military "outbursts" are possible, including those between the Western countries themselves, with the participation of the United States.

The fifth trend is solving global problems (climate changes, etc.) and will be the asset of the regions, their interaction and "coalitions of those who want", with transiting in the future to truly global efforts within the framework of an updated or new global governance system.