
Geopolitics: Yalta 2.0 or the Suicide of the West

By: Mauricio Escuela

12/01/2026



Vladimir Putin has just offered an analysis of why the West continues its warmongering policies. Russia is a country that, over the last few decades, has had to learn a bitter lesson, one that cost it the status of the USSR and forced it to rebuild everything from scratch. This process of resurgence occurred during Putin's presidency. The West not only failed to comply with the agreements not to expand militarily, but had also opted for the Balkanization of the Russian Federation. The mosaic of peoples, solidly linked for centuries, became the target of operations to whitewash terrorism and the use of dirty force as measures of political destabilization. The tangible examples are there. The Chechen war was an event from which Russia had to learn and implement a global vision of its power if it wanted to survive as a nation.

Now, what does that have to do with the fact that the United States, under Trump, is implementing what they call the corollary of the Monroe Doctrine? The failure to expand the Western agenda in Ukraine, the stalemate of NATO-backed forces, gave way to a kind of Vietnam 2.0 for the West. The clash that was thought to wear down Moscow, leading to its humiliation, has had serious consequences for globalists. The United States knows that there's a huge portion of the planet—Asia and Africa—that has simply slipped from its grasp. It's no longer the trading partner with advantages and privileges. China, with its economy, and Russia, with its geopolitical military pressure, have formed a tandem that the United States is not in a position to stop, and if it tries, the cost becomes existential for the corrupt elite that governs the West.

It was the Western world's opportunity to absorb Russia, and its failure to capitalize on it—due to clumsy and unsuccessful policies—that opened the door for the geopolitical game to reopen in the third decade of the 21st century, as the clock of history marks the decline of the old order. What we are witnessing is a discussion of the Yalta agreements, which governed the world for decades. Alaska, with the verbal meeting between the two great leaders, was an attempt to bring about a truce in what appeared to be an irreconcilable difference. On the one hand, the United States wants to expand solely through force, since it offers no advantages as a trading partner. On the other hand, Russia is China's military battering ram, seeking to soften American aggression. Spheres of influence are shifting, and it's no coincidence that the meeting took place on one of the borders where these opposing worlds converge. Russia is just a few kilometers from Alaska. Moreover, the state was once part of the

former empire of the Tsars. More than that, a treaty was already in place in the past whereby, through payment, the Americans acquired those lands. The genealogy of empires surrounding Alaska is extensive and deep.

Putin doesn't want to leave the Russians a country like the one Yeltsin bequeathed them. The United States doesn't want the Yalta world to be redefined based on the geopolitical concept of the BRICS. In this struggle, Trump emerges, representing a kind of overacted Monroe Doctrine. In reality, when James Monroe championed his policy, he was referring—in part—to the United States' opposition to the constant incursions of European powers into the American continent. This opposition at the time the doctrine was launched was—if you'll pardon the expression—only doctrinal; the Americans were not in a military or material position to confront, for example, England, which had in fact been present in all the wars of independence against Spain in the southern part of the continent. It wasn't until late 19th and early 20th centuries that the United States exercised such discretionary power in the Americas, coinciding with the convergence of geopolitical forces in the region and its rising naval power. On the one hand, England was preoccupied with Germany's naval development and couldn't focus its attention on the Americas; on the other, London saw Washington as a culturally similar nation with which it maintained excellent trade relations. The balance of trade favored British capital, making it in their interest to maintain peace in the hemisphere. It was in this context that the United States intervened in Cuba and its war of independence.

The Monroe Doctrine, therefore, is not a uniform concept; rather, throughout history, the Americans have interpreted it according to their understanding of the balance of power. The truth is that the current conclusion refers to the need for reintegration in the southern part of the continent due to the withdrawal from other regions. The withdrawal from Afghanistan, with the shameful images of a plane fleeing amidst the chaos, went around the world and was a spectacle that illustrated a new era of equilibrium in which the United States accepted its defeat in Kabul. The new Trump Doctrine is an extreme and even exaggerated—grotesque—interpretation of what James Monroe presented at the time. Not only because it's unrealistic in terms of real and tangible policy, but also because it generates geostrategic movements that are not in the best long-term interests of the United States.

The United States' allies in South America view with suspicion the way Trump is approaching them. This was already seen in the case of Panama with the crisis generated around the canal. What had been a normal relationship between two right-wing governments ended in an unpleasant altercation in which no one won. Trump acts for headlines and fame, behaving not like a head of state, but like a celebrity who needs those moments of extreme and absurd showmanship. This imbues his actions with the same nature and diminishes their impact. Superpowers like Russia ultimately benefit from the chaotic behavior of the United States. Western allies have been shifting their positions. Some remain steadfast as part of the collective West, but others—like Orbán's Hungary—are exploring the possibility of playing their own game, because they realize that Washington is leaving them in a position devoid of future and rationality.

The new Yalta that could have been discussed in Alaska is not only about spheres of influence, but also about their mobility. The new characteristic of this fluid world is that borders are not sustainable and that political projects constantly tend to virtually transcend the physical. Thus, Russia, with its concept of the Russian world—which underlies the idea of the Great Awakening by philosopher Alexander Dugin—presents us with the possibility that, in addition to the real Russia, there exists a broader Russia based on exchanges, influence, culture, and ideology. When discussing geopolitics conceptually, we must do so from the perspective of global projects, not just from what's visible or factual. China's sphere of influence is no longer limited to Southeast Asia, but encompasses the entire world, and its trading partners are now those that comprise the so-called Global South. New business conditions, with advantages and technology transfer, are what leave the United States on the sidelines and allow the Chinese to displace them. The only response is the corollary: the force of gunboats in the face of reality. But that's like England in 1845, instead of nearly capitulating to the United States—as actually happened—sending the Royal Navy to intercept American ships on high seas.

What is failing Western geopolitics is realism as a way of understanding international relations. It's being founded on the ideological and cultural foundation of a Westernized world, yet it's no longer taking into account the conditions of production and reproduction of real capital. It's this latter logic that is turning the tide in favor of BRICS, who have all the time in the world and now—in addition—count on Trump as an indirect ally, because with his policies of chaos he is driving the last remaining allies and partners into the arms of the emerging bloc. Denmark, in fact, has just declared that Trump is one of the greatest threats to its national security, which is a landmark for a NATO member. And all of this is motivated by the aggressive US campaign surrounding Greenland.

Indeed, in the analysis, decline must be considered as a variable. True power does not steal ships on high seas.

On the contrary, the persuasion of real power operates on the basis of being the best trade option. When you force someone to do something, it's because you're not in a position to divert them from their path through economic circumstances. In 1945, the United States was not only the largest market, but also the largest exporter. The world was indebted to the major creditors who lent money throughout the war and then collected with interest. Yalta emerged from this situation, as did the idea of the European Union placed under the tutelage of the United States. While it wasn't until many years later that the basic organization of the current EU emerged, Europeans have certainly not freed themselves from the occupation of part of their territory by Americans, much less from the control exerted through various mechanisms over their growth.

It has been said that Trump is Monroe 2.0, but in reality, he is Yalta 2.0 because what the president defends is the prevalence of the post-war advantages for his country. The world of 1939/1945. That is the world that is collapsing, one that no longer possesses substance except for the power of dollar-denominated banking references. The bulk of production and technology has been transferred to China, and the military game is being played from Moscow. In this chess game, Trump apparently has no better moves than to make abrupt moves against weaker nations to stir up the specter of anti-communism, which yields him good dividends in the run-up to elections, but which also does not represent a serious project for sustaining the empire.

No one, neither the Western allies nor the United States, is playing a realistic game in these final moments. In contrast, China, with its age-old patience, has opted for a policy of statements and warnings with a display of superior technological military power, as seen in the parade. Russia, more accustomed to geopolitical confrontation with the West, knows that it must push NATO's boundaries both physically and culturally. The three superpowers possess areas of strength and vulnerability, but it's the United States that has been losing control over populations and resources for years. The world is moving towards multipolarity as a way of life in the face of the aggressiveness of the dollar, used on the one hand to export US debt and on the other to sanction enemies. This path for the West no longer offers the advantages it did in 1945; on the contrary.

What can be expected from this Monroe Doctrine, which is in reality Yalta? Trump will continue to play a game that's more electoral than realistic, running away from the problem. The damage to his country will be irreversible, and therefore many things will be permanently damaged, such as relations with allies and the post-World War II system of influence. It seems that Trump is telling us that when he leaves power, everything will be left as a wasteland and the ultimate proof of his power. Megalomania and narcissism are traits of a psychopathic personality.

Translated by Amilkal Labañino / CubaSi Translation Staff
