

Cold War II

Moscow, November 18
by Professor Philippos Tsalides

Dear Dr. Leonid Reshetnikov,
Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are experiencing a Cold War II during the last years. This Cold War is completely different from the previous one. The economic, political and geopolitical environment is different. In my opinion, the neoconservatives and those who represent the international financial system mainly drive this Cold War II.

Dollar has been the primary concern of the US. The most significant challenges to the dollar launched recently at the initiative of Russia, followed very soon by China, Brazil, India and South Africa. This initiative led to the recent agreement of the BRICS countries to create their own "International Monetary Fund".

US leadership financial elite, moving by the "unique superpower" or the "unique emperor" logic, it had no several options: the key element is the position of the dollar as the international "reserve currency", that allows US printing money. US financial elite is not willing to abandon this very important advantage. Therefore, US is buying time hoping that: 1) the discovery and mining of vast quantities of oil and gas will lead their country to the first place worldwide as a hydrocarbon producer and/or 2) with one or more technological revolutions, the US GDP will grow so rapidly as to make the huge public debt manageable. I would like to remind you that the US had retrieved in a similar position at the end of the Second World War and managed to overcome it with a frenetic economic growth and by raising the inflation (printing money).

Based on the above mentioned US financial elite logic, this conflict differs significantly from earlier. I consider that the game of the "Money Empire" is the following: first, defend its economic interests and second impose its will on the world. At the same time, American middle class is in desperation, the US industry has either lost its capacity, or has emigrated (mainly in China) and poverty shows evidence of an unprecedented spread.

The moral advantage of the West has been lost. How many conflicts can be constructed using perforated false excuses without creating wide-spread international outrage? In the era of the internet, the truth comes relatively easily to the surface. The fact that the EU adopt any American version without any evidence proves the truth and the lack of "moral advantages".

Within this international environment, US financial ruling elite is interested only in defending its economic interests. President Vladimir Putin became very soon an "**enemy**". He enjoys an unprecedented acceptance in his country. At the same time, Russia acquired the "moral advantage" in the conflict with the West. This moral advantage, mainly at the initiative of President Putin, has been expanded internatio-

nally, by establishing coalitions, since the rising powers realize that the financial elite of the West is preparing to scrounge (using the financial system that they control perfectly) the world wealth and eventually dominate the world.

I consider that the coalition of BRICS countries is based on a strong background and, therefore, is capable to prevent US aspirations, at least in a short-term period. These countries: 1) control vast areas (of land and sea) and a huge part of the raw materials on earth, 2) their productive capacity make them self-sufficient, 3) their cooperation in the military sector makes the American military power unable to impose its will, and 5) they all have decisive and flexible leadership, that allow them to take decisions very fast.

I believe that a "**new global balance**" should be established, which would prevent a conventional conflict (and perhaps a nuclear one) and, on the other hand, would allow the creation of a **multi-polar system**. Gradual steps, allowing the creation of parallel financial instruments, the redistribution of the "pie" (if it is possible) and the equal participation of all players in the "global game", can lead to such a fair and honest solution.

Before addressing the Greek-Russian relations, I would like to address two more issues:

- 1) The oil prices decline: I believe that the fall in global oil prices that is hurting Russia's economy was caused by political manipulation and, more specifically, it seems to be a Saudi-U.S. plot against Moscow.
- 2) The ISIS case: there is strong evidence of collaboration between Qatar, Saudi and Turkey intelligence services from one hand and this extremist-jihadist group, from the other hand. It seems that this collaboration ranges from military cooperation and weapons transfers to logistical support, financial assistance and the provision of medical services. In my opinion, a multi-national coalition composed by Russia, USA, Israel and Iran could very much effectively fight the Islamic State.

Regarding the Greek-Russian relations, I would like to distil some truths. The Greek-Russian relations are mainly based on the unique geopolitical position of Greece and the timeless interests of Russia related to the Mediterranean Sea. Many other factors, such as cultural, religious, historical, commercial and social-economic, from the Byzantine era until our present days, give a rare particularity to these relations.

These relations have led to very practical and remarkable results since 1974:

1. In the 1970s, during the Cold War, the Greek Government of Constantine Karamanlis gave the Soviet Union the Neorion anchorage, very close to the US military base at Souda, and,
2. Later, with the fall of the Soviet Union, Greece was, and still is, the only western country and the only member of NATO that has acquired advanced Russian air defence systems. These weapon systems are considered of vital importance for the Greek defence.

I would also like to take this opportunity to shatter a myth about Greek-Russian relations; namely that there is no a broad political consensus concerning the well being of this relationship.

If truth be told, and especially since 1974, there is indeed a very broad consensus on this issue. First, Constantine Karamanlis granted access rights to the Greek territorial waters to the Soviet Navy, followed by Andreas Papandreou who looked towards our eastern neighbour for the issue of natural gas supply. The broad political consensus on the need of strengthening the Greek-Russian relations has continued to date (with a few notable exceptions of course).

But it is even more important that this broad consensus is based on the deep feelings that Greek people hold for the Russian people: consecutive polls nowadays show that these feelings remain intact, even at a time when the international anti-Russian propaganda is in full effect.

Greece, as I said before, has every interest to keep particularly warm relations with homodox Russia and to try to play the role of a "bridge" between West and East. It has strategic reasons to do that. Although Greece is a member of the EU and of NATO, it needs to avoid unilateral foreign policy, because of its own national interests. In this context, Greece should not support the economic sanctions imposed by the EU to Russia.

Also in this context, a MoU has just been signed between our Institutes and I am quite sure that this cooperation will lead to fruitful results for both countries.

Thank all of you for your warm hospitality.
Thank you for your attention.