

Methexiology and Geostrategy
Dr. Nicolas Laos
Athens, March 29, 2016



The geostrategy that stems from my methexiology is focused on a ‘geocultural’ arc whose historical pivots are the following:

(1) the British world, particularly, the English city of York (whose ancient name was Eboracum), in which, in 306 AD, Constantine the Great (known in the Eastern Orthodox Church as Saint Constantine the Great, Equal-to-the-Apostles) was acclaimed as Roman Emperor by his army;

(2) the Greek world, whose culture (especially the Greek language and the Greek philosophy) became the predominant culture in the Roman Empire under Emperor Constantine the Great, who, in 324 AD, transferred the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to the Greek East, precisely, to Byzantium (thus, Constantinople became known as the ‘New Rome’);

(3) the Russian world, since, in the Middle Ages, it adopted Byzantine spirituality, its language and several other significant aspects of its culture were formed by Byzantine scholars, and, after the fall of Constantinople (the ‘New Rome’), in 1453, it undertook to prolong the thousand-year Christocentric Byzantine civilization into the modern era, wherefore Moscow is sometimes called as the ‘Third Rome.’

Moreover, under certain geocultural conditions, this ‘Constantinian’ geocultural arc could be extended to include New York, a cosmopolitan U.S. city founded on the glory of the ancient English city of York.

However, as regards the inclusion of New York in my notion of the Constantinian geocultural arc, I should stress that the founders of the U.S.A. had good intentions, but they were insufficiently educated to understand the intrigues of conceptual thinking (which are often more complex and more important than political intrigues), and they were too opportunistic to resist the temptation of giving primacy to the ‘urgent’ and ‘immediate’ over the ‘significant.’ Thus, Charles Thomson—who was one of America’s most important founders and the Congressional Secretary from 1774 to 1779—wrote a detailed history of the events that took place during the American Revolution and of the men who had been celebrated as heroes across the newly-founded U.S.A., but, ultimately, he decided to destroy his manuscript by arguing as follows: “Let the world admire the supposed wisdom and valor of our great men,” and he added the following: “I shall not undeceive future generations” (Charles Thomson as recorded

by Dr Benjamin Rush, quoted in F. Tupper Saussy, *Rulers of Evil: Useful Knowledge about Governing Bodies*, HarperCollins, 2001, p. 125). Indeed, even the self-esteem of the social establishment of the newly-founded republic of the U.S.A. was largely dependent on the opinion that particular members of European elites, such as Alexis de Tocqueville and Marquis de Lafayette, had about the American Revolution.

In addition, to a large extent, the ideology of the American Revolution itself can be ascribed to an English Whig political theorist and activist called Thomas Paine, whose pamphlet entitled *Common Sense* (1775–6), actually, became the most important philosophical/ideological underpinning of the U.S. Declaration of Independence. Not only was Thomas Paine a Whig political activist, but he was also promoting a peculiar Whig ‘theology.’ In his book *The Age of Reason*, Paine endorsed a radically positivist attitude on the basis of which he discarded the Bible and openly stated that he was contending against the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Through rationalism, Paine attempted to elevate his intellect, specifically, his “common sense,” to an ontologically sufficient criterion of truth. Hence, ultimately, the U.S.A. was politically and intellectually dominated by the principles and mentalities of the English Whigs and of Puritanism, which is a positivist distortion of Christianity. In the late twentieth century, the U.S.A. became the vanguard of a liberal globalist ideology that not only aims at substituting the great cultural traditions of humanity with a particular liberal monologue, but it also undermines people’s ability to appreciate high culture, thus, actually, dehumanizing humanity in the name of and through liberal humanism.

On the other hand, my notion of the Constantinian geocultural arc calls for reclaiming Romanity and classical metaphysics and rediscovering European civilization in order to save both the West and the rest of the world from modern West’s complacent nihilism. Modern West’s complacent variant of nihilism should be distinguished from Nietzsche’s and other Western scholars’ tragic variant of nihilism, because the first corresponds to and manifests spiritual insignificance, whereas the latter is inextricably linked to the modern subject’s quest for meaning.

As regards material/geopolitical power, Russia is the most important political pivot and pillar of the aforementioned Constantinian geocultural arc. From the spiritual perspective, Greece is the most important cultural pivot and pillar of the same geocultural arc. However, during the twentieth century and during the first two decades of the twenty-first century, neither Russia nor Greece managed to accomplish such roles, and, instead, they both submitted to modern Western world-conceptions; namely, Russia, initially submitted to Marxism-Leninism, and, subsequently, after the fall of the Soviet Union, it embraced a type of liberal nationalism, while Greece, from its establishment as an independent nation-state in 1830 (according to the Protocol of London) until the beginning of the twenty-first century, remained a consistently submissive Anglo-Saxon/NATO geopolitical pivot in the Eastern Mediterranean and a peripheral capitalist country totally dependent on the great economic powers of the Euroatlantic geoeconomic zone.

Furthermore, there are three major obstacles to the actualization and full development of the aforementioned ‘Constantinian’ geocultural arc, namely:

- (i) what I would call the Franco-Germanic factor and the ‘Black International,’ which operate primarily through the European Union and the penetration of the U.S. intelligence network with a Pan-Germanist ‘fifth column,’

- (ii) the Zionist/Neoconservative factor, and
- (iii) the Turanic/Turkic factor.



The Franco-Germanic factor and the 'Black International'

A major political obstacle to the actualization and full development of the aforementioned Constantinian geocultural arc is due to what the prominent English political analyst and journalist Christopher Story (the pen name of Edward Harle) has called the “European Union collective,” and to “the penetration of the CIA and its affiliates with the German/Himmler scientists and intelligence officers who were brought over after the de-Nazification program was scrapped in 1946” (Christopher Story, “EU Corruption,” speech delivered in London: “Lawful Rebellion” Conference, The British Constitution Group, BBC5 TV, October 31, 2009; see: <http://christopherstory.org/category/in-memoriam-christopher-story/>). Not only did the Germans take over the Western Roman Empire (including the See of Rome) and the British Isles during the Middle Ages and the Hanoverian period, but also, contrary to conventional belief, in World War II, the Allied Powers did not really win the war. According to Christopher Story, the Allies “finished Hitler off,” they “personalized the war,” and, thus, when Hitler ceased to exist, they thought that they won the war (Ibid). However, that was not the case. In 1941, at the Wannsee Conference, the Nazi intelligentsia realized that Germany might lose the war, and, therefore, they sent their most intelligent analysts to Madrid, where, in 1942, they set up what they called the “German Geopolitical Center,” whose purpose was to strategize about what would happen if Germany did not win World War II. Thus, the German Geopolitical Center developed a long-range deception strategy that was originally set out in a seminar document entitled “European Economic Community,” published in 1942, in Berlin (Christopher Story, *The European Union Collective: Enemy of Its Member States*, London: Edward Harle Ltd, 1997).

After the Second World War, Hans Globke—who had been co-author of the Nuremberg racial laws and of the new laws of the Greater European “Reich” in the countries occupied by the Nazis during World War II—became minister of the Chancellery in German Chancellor Adenauer’s government. Under Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, Globke controlled major aspects of political life in post-war West Germany, from West Germany’s Secret Service to the continuation of the plans of the German oil and drug cartel to conquer Europe through the European Economic Community (EEC), which later became the European Union (EU). Moreover, another prominent Nazi, Walter Hallstein, was a keen advocate of a federal Europe and one of the architects of the European Coal and Steel Community, and he became the first President of the Commission (that is, the executive body) of the EEC (he held the office from 1958 to 1967). Walter Hallstein was a prominent law professor in Nazi Germany, and, on January 23, 1939, he gave a speech on common European law under German leadership, in which he argued that “one of the most important laws [in occupied European countries] is the ‘Protection Law of German Blood and Honor.’”

The Nazis’/Pan-Germanists’ major weapon against Britain is the “European Union collective,” and their major weapon against the United States is the German-Frankish infiltration of the U.S. intelligence network and foreign-policy establishment. In particular, Henry A. Kissinger, who served as National Security Advisor and later concurrently as Secretary of State in the administrations of Presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford, has played a key role in the penetration of the U.S. intelligence network with a Pan-Germanist ‘fifth column’ and in the substitution of German-Frankish political theories and mentalities, such as *Realpolitik*, for the U.S. Founding Fathers’ ideational principles and goals (Ibid; according to Christopher Story, Henry Kissinger was instrumental in persuading President Ford to dismiss William E. Colby as the CIA director of intelligence in favor of George H. W. Bush, who was affiliated with the Deutsches Verteidigungs Dienst (German Defense Service), known by the acronym DVD, which is the German ‘black agency’ based in Dachau).

Finally, I should stress that my methexiology provides its advocates with powerful intellectual weapons against what I call the ‘Black International,’ that is, an international network of fascist/Nazi ideologues, movements, and terrorists. The distinguishing characteristics of this ‘Black International’ are the following: (i) belief in authoritarian political hierarchies; (ii) espousal of a variant of (Indo-)Aryan neo-mythology; (iii) endorsement of various pseudo-scientific theories of geopolitical and historical determinism inspired by the German geopolitician Karl Ernst Haushofer, the British geopolitician Sir Halford John Mackinder, and Oriental cyclical models of time; (iv) radical collectivism; and (v) a Manichean mentality. In fact, some of the first members of the Western political and economic elites who joined the aforementioned ‘Black International’ during the first three decades of the twentieth century and during World War II were the following: Rudolf Hess (who was appointed Deputy Führer to Adolf Hitler in 1933, and he served in this position until 1941, when he flew solo to Scotland in an attempt to negotiate peace with the United Kingdom during World War II; see: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/history/world-war-two/8547899/Rudolf-Hess-flight-to-Britain-approved-by-Hitler.html>), the Italian fascist politician Benito Mussolini (who started in politics in 1917 with help of £100 weekly wage from the British intelligence agency MI5;

see: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/oct/13/benito-mussolini-recruited-mi5-italy>), a fascist/Nazi branch of the UK establishment personified by such powerful British peers as Sir Oswald Mosley, Lord Redesdale, the Duke of Westminster, the 22nd Earl of Erroll, the Marquess of Graham, the Duke of Buccleuch, Lord Londonderry, etc. (see: <http://www.express.co.uk/expressyourself/126784/Hitler-s-aristocratic-admirers>), and a fascist/Nazi branch of the U.S. establishment personified by the automobile manufacturer Henry Ford (who was financing Adolf Hitler's nationalist movement in Munich, and, in 1938—after Hitler had achieved power with the aid of U.S. and German business cartels—Henry Ford received the Grand Cross of the German Eagle, a Nazi decoration for distinguished foreigners), the banking and oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller Jr. (who, during World War II, owned a controlling interest in the Standard Oil corporation, in which the next largest stockholder was the German chemical company I. G. Farben, through which the Standard Oil corporation sold huge quantities of gasoline and lubricants to Nazi Germany), etc.

During the Cold War, NATO and the CIA used members of the aforementioned 'Black International' in order to create and manipulate far-right 'fifth columns' and terrorist groups in Europe and Turkey in the context of so-called stay-behind operations; such as the following: Auxiliary Units (United Kingdom), Attack on the WSA (Luxembourg), Operation Gladio (Italy), Lochos Oreion Katadromon and Operation (Red) Sheepskin (Greece), OWSGV (Austria), Plan Bleu, La Rose des Vents, and Arc-en-ciel (France), SDRA8 and STC/Mob (Belgium), ROC (Norway), Bund Deutscher Jugend – Technischer Dienst (Germany-West), Kampfgruppe gegen Unmenschlichkeit (a secret stay-behind organization of West-Berlin against the GDR during 1948–59), Özel Harp Dairesi (Turkey), Projekt-26 (P-26, Switzerland), Arla gryning and Informationsbyrå (Sweden), etc. In the post-Cold War era, forces of the same 'Black International' were manipulated by Western intelligence agencies in the context of various subversive operations in:

Russia (where a fascist 'fifth column' competes with a liberal 'fifth column' in the context of a 'staged' political fight that impedes Russia from undertaking its role as an heir to the Eastern Roman Empire and from articulating and implementing a new, alternative strategy for Europe and the world, in general),

Ukraine (where, in 2013 and 2014, the U.S.-supported Ukrainian fascist/neo-Nazi political party "Right Sector" played a major role in the Euromaidan uprising, which culminated in the ousting of Ukrainian President, Viktor Yanukovich, and the establishment of a strongly pro-E.U. and pro-U.S. Ukrainian regime),

Norway (where, in 2011, the Norwegian fascist Anders Behring Breivik executed a terrorist operation in the spirit of Gladio's "strategy of tension"; for further details, see: http://www.investigatingtheterror.com/articles/Anders_Breivik___Gladio_Copycat_.htm), etc.

The Zionist/Neoconservative factor

Whereas Torah Judaism is focused and founded on the concept of holiness and on the universality of the Biblical faith in Jehovah, Zionist Judaism, submitting to modernity, is focused and founded on the modern Western concept of nationalism. The term 'Zionism' was coined in 1893 by Nathan Birnbaum, but Theodor Herzl (1860–1904), an Austrian Jew born to a bourgeois Budapest family, is the acknowledged

founder of Zionism, and, in 1896, he published his seminal book *The Jewish State*, where he argued that the cure for anti-Semitism was the establishment of a Jewish state on the model of modern Western European nation-states. Thus, Zionist Judaism signals a major change in the ethos of Judaism, and, in the 1940s, it gave rise to the Zionist State of Israel, which was founded on the modern Western theories of nationalism, *Realpolitik*, and pragmatism, which contradict Biblical metaphysics.

In the context of his nationalist and pragmatist mentality, Theodor Herzl, in his book *The Jewish State*, did not hesitate to argue that anti-Semitism helps to build a new kind of Jew that complies with the ethos and the political strategy of Zionism, and he even went as far as to argue that Zionists should manipulate anti-Semitism in order to force traditional Torah Jews to embrace the Zionist ideology. Whereas Torah Judaism is founded on the revelation at Sinai (Exodus 19), Zionism is an attempt to build a Jew without Torah and a modern Western European type of Jewish state, as Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, historian at the University of Ben-Gurion has pointed out (see: <https://bgu.academia.edu/AmnonRazKraKotzkin>).

The modern ruling Western elites supported Zionism in order to integrate traditional Torah Judaism into Western modernity and in order to apply a divide-and-rule policy in the Middle East in accordance with the Sykes–Picot Agreement (1916), by diffusing nationalism as a generative social order throughout the Arab world, thus, giving rise to several Arab nation-states, and by creating a Zionist Jewish nation-state. However, after the foundation of the Zionist State of Israel (1948) and especially after the foundation of the Israeli intelligence agency “Mossad” (1949), the West’s Zionist policy became a boomerang, because the State of Israel developed into a very powerful nation-state which, throughout the second half of the twentieth century, pursued and, to a large extent, achieved a high level of political autonomy vis-à-vis its Western patrons. Thus, already in the 1950s, James J. Angleton, chief of the CIA’s Counterintelligence Staff from 1954 to 1975, alerted the U.S. intelligence community about its systematic infiltration and manipulation by Mossad agents.

The infiltration of Zionism into the U.S. political and military infrastructure had its greatest impetus during the Ronald Reagan and the George H. W. Bush administrations, when Zionists—especially a particular group of Zionists known as Neoconservatives—with close ties to the Mossad had influential offices in the Pentagon; for instance: Richard Pearle (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy from 1981 to 1987), Paul Wolfowitz (Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Regional Programs from 1977 to 1982, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from 1982 to 1986, and Under Secretary for Defense Policy from 1989 to 1993), Douglas Faith (Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Negotiations Policy from 1984 to 1986), etc. (see: Scott McConnell, *Notes of an Ex-Neocon*, New York: Algora, 2016).

As a result of the infiltration of a Pan-Germanist ‘fifth column’ and of a Zionist ‘fifth column’ into the U.S. political and military infrastructure, the U.S. social establishment has gone through a long period of ideological and cultural manipulation and ‘reprogramming,’ it has significantly departed from the ethos and the goals of the U.S. Founding Fathers, and it has lapsed into a type of complacent nihilism underpinned by *Realpolitik*, opportunism, and repudiation of ontology. For a scientifically rigorous analysis of the mentalities (particularly, of a peculiar Judeo-Evangelical alliance) that

underpin the implicit imperialism and authoritarianism that characterize the post-Cold War U.S.A., one may refer to the following book: Célia Belin, *Jésus est juif en Amérique: Droite évangélique et lobbies chrétiens pro-Israël*, Paris: Fayard, 2011.

The Turanic/Turkic factor

Another major political obstacle to the actualization and full development of the aforementioned Constantinian geocultural arc is Pan-Turanism, which is an ideology that aims at creating a Turkic great geopolitical/geocultural space stretching from the Balkans in Europe, eastward across Turkey, Iran, the Caucasus, Central Asia up to and including northwest China. Moreover, Hungarian Pan-Turanists, in particular, claim that the entire Eurasian landmass between Hungary and Norway in Europe to Japan and Korea was once an empire known as “Turania.” The idea of a Turanian empire did not originate from the Ottoman Turks. In fact, the idea of a Turanian empire originated from Ármín (Hermann) Vámbéry (1832–1913), a Hungarian Turkologist and Professor of Eastern languages at the University of Budapest who worked as an advisor to the Ottoman Sultan from 1857 until 1863. Vámbéry was employed by the British Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston. Vámbéry’s expertise in languages and ethnology served the British Foreign Office, and especially Vámbéry’s racialist idea of a Turanian empire helped Western Great Powers to manipulate Turkish populations throughout Eurasia for a very long time to come. Moreover, Pan-Turanism was further developed by the Turkish nationalist Mehmed Ziya Gökalp and by the Hungarian fascist Arrow Cross Party.

Pan-Turanism is based on a methodical operation of re-invention and distortion of history (Philip Robins, *Suits and Uniforms: Turkish Foreign Policy Since the Cold War*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003). As Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938), the founder of the Turkish Republic, has argued, “writing history is as important as making history” (Ibid, p. 93). In this context, the nationalist elite of the Turkish Republic, under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, was founded on Pan-Turanism. In fact, the ideology of Kemalist Turkey consists of the following principles: (i) nation-building according to Western Europe’s theory of nationalism; (ii) rejecting Islam as the basis of ethnic and national identity and substituting Pan-Turanist neomythologies for Orientalism (since Western Europeans treated Near Eastern “Orientals” as racially or culturally inferior to Europeans); (iii) using Pan-Turanist neomythologies in order to glorify the spirit of the Eurasian steppes and to portray the Turks as heirs to almost all great civilizations. However, the truth is that the first Turks originated from a confederation of Eurasian savage and thieving nomads who expanded throughout the Asian Steppe from the third century BC until the first century AD, and whom the Chinese chronographers called Hsiung-nu, meaning the “Bad Slaves” (I. M. Franck and D. M. Brownstone, *The Silk Road: A History*, New York: Facts on File Publications, 1986).

A World Order in crisis

In October 2014, addressing the eleventh meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club, the Russian President Vladimir Putin thoughtfully described the profound spiritual deficit of the world order that was established by the U.S.A. and the E.U. in the 1990s; in fact, he argued as follows: “The Cold War ended, but it did not

end with the signing of a peace treaty with clear and transparent agreements on respecting existing rules or creating new rules and standards. This created the impression that the so-called ‘victors’ in the Cold War had decided to pressure events and reshape the world to suit their own needs and interests. If the existing system of international relations, international law, and the checks and balances in place got in the way of these aims, this system was declared worthless, outdated, and in need of immediate demolition. Pardon the analogy, but this is the way nouveaux riches behave when they suddenly end up with a great fortune, in this case, in the shape of world leadership and domination.”

It goes without saying that, at the eleventh meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club, the Russian President Vladimir Putin made accurate and vitally significant political comments about the world system, but he neither articulated an alternative world vision nor did he clarify modern Russia’s position between the cultural legacy of the Eastern Roman Empire and the spirit of the Eurasian steppes. Will Russia actively oppose the Euroatlantic elite’s “New World Order”? And, if Russia decides to actively oppose the Euroatlantic elite’s “New World Order,” will it do so as the driving force of an alliance of steppe peoples and barbaric mentalities or as an heir to the imperial Roman world and as the bearer of a Byzantino-Russian existential proposal? Putin’s speech at the eleventh meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club did not throw any light upon these crucial questions, and several intellectual and political forces within Russia operate in order to detach Russia from its Byzantine heritage and destiny and transform it either into a conformist liberal-nationalist great power or into an anti-establishment leader of an international coalition of barbaric Eurasian forces. Moreover, in Putin’s Russia, there are several influential opinion-makers who actively and openly propose the forging of an alliance between Orthodox Christianity and Shiite Islam as religious communities, not simply between Russia and Iran, thus indicating that a significant part of the religious members of Russia’s establishment have an ‘instrumental’ perception of religion and treat the different religious communities as if they were political actors and receptive to balance-of-power arrangements.

In 2016, President Putin and Patriarch Kirill of Moscow publicly pursued a peculiar type of secularization of the official Russian Orthodox Church along the lines of the Papacy, and, thus, according to analyst Alexei Makarkin, Patriarch Kirill met Pope Francis on February 12, 2016, in Cuba, not in order to seek the real truth of Christian theology, but simply because Putin wanted that meeting for political reasons, specifically, in order to enhance the Kremlin’s foreign policy by manipulating the Russian Orthodox Church (Luhn, Alec, “‘Finally!’: Pope and Russian Patriarch Meet for First Time in 1,000 Years,” *The Guardian*, February 13, 2016; see: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/feb/12/pope-francis-russian-orthodox-patriarch-kirill-make-history-cuba-first-meeting-in-1000-years>).

Both Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and Pope Francis are deeply connected with secret intelligence agencies; the first with the Soviet secret service KGB, and the latter with the U.S. secret service CIA. According to Lt. Gen. (r) Ion Mihai Pacepa, a former three-star general in the Securitate, the secret police of Communist Romania, who defected to the United States in 1978, and according to original KGB documents known as the Mitrokhin Archive (described by the FBI as the most complete and extensive

intelligence ever received from any source), both Patriarch Alexey II of Moscow (1929–2008) and his successor, Patriarch Kirill of Moscow (who became Patriarch of Moscow and all Rus and Primate of the Russian Orthodox Church on February 1, 2009) had been directly tied to the KGB (Mitsotakis, Spyridon, “KGB ‘Christians’: Putin, Stalin, and the KGB’s History of Manipulating the Orthodox Church,” *Breitbart*, January 11, 2016; see:

<http://www.breitbart.com/national-security/2016/01/11/kgb-christians-putin-stalin-kgbs-history-manipulating-orthodox-church/>).

Pope Francis, born in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1936, Jorge Mario Bergoglio, was named the 266th Pope of the Roman Catholic Church on March 13, 2013. In 1973, he had been appointed “Provincial” of Argentina for the Society of Jesus (i.e., the controversial Jesuit Order), and, in this capacity, Bergoglio was the highest ranking Jesuit in Argentina during the military dictatorship led by General Jorge Videla (1976–83) with the support of the U.S. State Department (the then U.S. Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, played a clandestine role in the 1976 military coup: according to the U.S. National Security Archive, Kissinger’s top deputy on Latin America, William Rogers, told him two days after the coup that “we’ve got to expect a fair amount of repression, probably a good deal of blood, in Argentina before too long”; see:

<http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB185/index.htm>). The Jesuit Order supported Videla’s ruthless junta against so-called “Leftists” in the Peronista movement. In 2005, human rights lawyer Myriam Bregman filed a criminal suit against Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio (the future Pope Francis), accusing him of conspiring with Videla’s junta in the 1976 kidnapping of two dissident Jesuit priests (*The Associated Press*, “Pope Francis: A Look at the Life of the First South American Pontiff,” March 13, 2013; see:

http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2013/03/pope_francis_a_look_at_the_lif.html).

Additionally, the survivors of Videla’s policy of persecution openly accused Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio of complicity in the kidnapping of priests Francisco Jalics and Orlando Yorio as well six members of their parish (Juan I. Irigaray, “El Número Uno de la Iglesia Argentina, Sospechoso de Colaborar con la Dictadura,” *El Mundo*, November 8, 2010; see:

<http://www.elmundo.es/america/2010/11/08/argentina/1289232137.html>). In fact, Yorio himself “accused Bergoglio of effectively handing them over to the death squads” of Videla’s dictatorial regime (*Los Angeles Times*, “Argentine Cardinal Named in Kidnap Lawsuit,” April 17, 2005; see:

<http://articles.latimes.com/2005/apr/17/world/fg-cardinal17>).

Thus, both Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and Pope Francis have a long tradition of subordinating Christian spirituality to political power games and political authorities.

To the extent that Vladimir Putin merely tries to create a new Russian political ‘cocktail’ of capitalist economics, *Realpolitik*, nationalism, instrumental (and occasionally superstitious) religiosity, the former Soviet Union’s geopolitical grandeur, and Tsarist Russia’s Eurasianist fantasies, he will never achieve anything more than becoming a leader of a ‘controlled international opposition’ within the world order that was established immediately after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, or the established global superstructure’s ‘regional director’ for a part of Eurasia within the context of the BRICS.

In fact, on January 23, 2016, Chinese President Xi Jinping and his Iranian counterpart Hassan Rouhani signed almost 17 agreements on economic and technological cooperation, and they announced that they will cooperate on the China-led One Belt One Road initiative. Moreover, since the beginning of 2016—after the placement of Iran’s nuclear program under Russian supervision and after the subsequent lifting of the international sanctions against Tehran—it became manifest that Russia and China promoted Iran’s full membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (see: <http://sputniknews.com/politics/20160124/1033641888/china-russia-iran-sco-membership.html>

and:

<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20160203/1034171547/iran-china-russia-dollar.html>).

The aforementioned developments and Putin’s *Realpolitik* imply that, at least, one of Kremlin’s lobbies pushes for the transformation of Russia into a ‘regional director’ of Eurasian affairs in the context of and for the sake of a global oligarchy that has realized that a kind of mutually acceptable partnership among the U.S.A., Germany, Russia, China, and Iran is imperative for the survival and further development of the established world order. In other words, after the failure of the U.S.A. to act as the single global power and manager of world affairs for a long period of time after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and after the 2008 global financial crisis, the ruling global oligarchy realized that it had to fully integrate Russia, China, and Iran into the established world order, even if that policy would necessitate the offer of some geopolitical, geoeconomic, and financial compensations to Russia, China, and Iran.

Indeed, I believe that Putin should be praised for several aspects of his domestic and foreign policy (especially for reorganizing Russia after the tragic failure of the Soviet system and after the “mafocracy” that prevailed in Russia during the Boris Yeltsin administration as well as for fighting against terrorism in Chechnya and the Middle East); but, until 2016, at least from the perspective of my methexiological geostrategy, Putin’s policy did not have any significant positive noopolitical effect, since Putin’s policy neither reclaimed Romanity as a paradigm for an alternative Europe nor proposed an alternative, better world order. Furthermore, Putin’s close personal association with the former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the fact that Putin seeks Kissinger’s advice on managing pressing international affairs, and Putin’s strategic geoeconomic alliance with the Carolingian Europe, mainly with Germany (at least until the outbreak of the crisis in Ukraine in 2013), disclose important aspects of Putin’s way of thinking and perception of noopolitics and geopolitics: in the same way that the Soviet Russia was, intellectually, a prisoner of a modern Western political theory, namely, Marxism, Putin’s Russia remains, intellectually, a prisoner of modern Western political thought, specifically, of *Realpolitik* (political realism), nationalism, statism, and capitalism. On February 3, 2016, the Russian informative website RT announced that one more meeting between Putin and Kissinger took place in Moscow, adding that Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov stated that that meeting was a continuation of a “friendly dialogue between President Putin and Henry Kissinger, who are bound by a longstanding relationship” (see: <https://www.rt.com/news/331194-putin-meets-friend-kissinger/>).

As regards political culture and metaphysics, at least in the era of modernity, Russia and the West play dialectically complementary roles, in the sense that the Russian

political regime is the ‘shadow’ of, or a ‘controlled opposition’ to the dominant Western regime; in the era of modernity, both Russia and the West, each in their own way, subscribe to modernity’s attitude toward metaphysics. For instance: during the Soviet era and the Cold War, the Russian political regime was a type of state capitalism (i.e., Leninism-Stalinism), while the dominant political regime in the West was market capitalism; in the post-Soviet era, after the political marginalization of incompetent anti-Western nationalist politicians, such as Vladimir V. Zhirinovsky, and after Yeltsin’s “mafocracy,” the Russian political regime, under Vladimir Putin, developed into a mixture of Western theories of nationalism, political realism, and market economics, politically akin to Adenauer’s Germany and Prussian socialism, while the Western social establishment moved toward a more internationalist and postmodern approach to politics and capitalism in the context of the so-called liberal globalization. However, in all these cases, both Russia and the West are spiritually founded on dialectically complementary aspects of Western modernity, prolonging Western modernity’s predominance in the world system and the political marginalization of the historical Byzantine Europe.

My methexiology underpins and leads to a different way of thinking about politics and the world order by giving priority to ontology over history and by reclaiming Romanity as a paradigm for an alternative Europe. Thus, study my book:

Methexiology: Philosophical Theology and Theological Philosophy for the Deification of Humanity, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers/Pickwick Publications, 2016; <https://wipfandstock.com>