

Russia, Ukraine & the World-IV: Continental Empires & Sea Powers - Russians' Fake Friends & Only Enemy

Россия, Украина и мир-IV: Континентальные империи и морские державы - фальшивые друзья и единственный враг россиян

Or how the Romanov collapsed only to the benefit of Serbs' and Greeks' Evil Elites

Или как Романовы рухнули только в пользу злых элит сербов и греков

Contents

- I. Prof. Huntington's entirely misunderstood Book
- II. The Serbian Delusion of Russians
- III. The Clash of Civilization? A Mirage come True
- IV. Spirituality & Universalism: Divine Earth vs. Unholy Sea
- V. Civilized Continental Empires vs. Barbarian Sea Powers
- VI. Continental Empires, Sea Powers, and Divisive Traps
- VII. The 'Greek Orthodox' Delusion of Russians

Содержание

- I. Совершенно неправильно понятая книга профессора Хантингтона
- II. Сербское заблуждение русских
- III. Столкновение цивилизаций? Сбывшийся мираж
- IV. Духовность и универсализм: Божественная Земля против Нечестивого Моря
- V. Цивилизованные континентальные империи против варварских морских держав
- VI. Континентальные империи, морские державы и разделительные ловушки
- VII. 'Греческое православное' заблуждение русских

Since the conflict in Ukraine affects the entire world, it is essential at this point for me to shift the focus and shed light on two issues that should attract the attention of the Russian leadership, because these thorny matters can turn out to be disastrous traps. When a major readjustment of the world's strategic balance takes place, it is essential for a rising alliance of nations not to fall into colonial traps set before 200 years in order to ensure continuity of the Western world's prevalence.

The worst trap that can be set to the rising challengers of the international status quo is the deceitful appearance of a fake friend, i.e. a colonially fabricated state, which

appears to be friendly, familiar or able to become a trusted partner of the emerging competitor. But in reality, due to the fact that this state is fully instrumentalized, controlled and maneuvered by the colonial powers, it inevitably functions as a real energy-consumer, mindblower or even ultimate destroyer of the aspiring super-power.

In fact, for the faithless crooks, who rule the colonial countries of the West, it is easy to use religion to make a purposefully fabricated and duly instrumentalized state simulate the 'friendly' force and, in the process, generate calamitous engagements for the emerging power.

I. Prof. Huntington's entirely misunderstood Book

Prof. Huntington's overwhelmingly notorious and extremely fallacious book on the purported Clash of Civilizations (1996) was -thank God- quite early known to me; the same is valid for the evil intents and purposes that are hidden behind it. One has to recall however that the book had become first famous as a lecture in 1992 and as an article in 1993.

I quite often remember the wonderful, long discussions that I entertained about it in Istanbul (between 1993 and 1997) with my excellent -alas, deceased- Turkish friends, namely the famous film director Halit Refig (Halit Refiğ; 1934-2009) and the leading Kemalist intellectual and economist Prof. Erol Manisali (Erol Manisalı; 1940-2022).

Although they were fully aware of the dangers that such a nefarious book entailed for Turkey (and for many other countries, by the way), I always believed that my friends underestimated its impact, because they did not read the deceitfully written book in the proper manner. The same conclusion is also valid for Francis Fukuyama's apparently nonsensical but definitely revelatory book about the End of History (1992). Most of the people worldwide have misunderstood these two books, which have functioned like the pillars Boaz (בֹּזַח) and Jachin (יָכִין), ushering us into the era of the Mankind extermination.

Still today, many Russians and many other countries' natives fail to realize how these two books, as vicious tools in the hands of immoral and heinous rascals, shape and will shape the world, until the moment someone, who achieved to access their true, mystically embedded and secretively encrypted meaning, manages finally to fully outmaneuver them. I am therefore irrevocably convinced that, for this to be done, one needs to read these two blasphemous books in reverse.

Look now at the unprecedented extent of the feat: although Ayatollah Khomeini issued a fatwa (1989) against Salman Rushdie's Satanic Verses (1988), a book that did not herald the eradication of Islam and the extermination of Mankind, the supreme guide (رهبر معظم ایران / rahbar-e moazam-e Iran) of the unfortunate nation (and his successor Ayatollah Ali Khamenei) failed to issue two new fatwas for the above mentioned books, which were written by far more ulcerous enemies of the Islamic religion and the Muslim nation.

Nonetheless, the same deep regret and absolutely deprecatory evaluation should be expressed as regards today's Sunni muftis, imams and theologians, who fail to assess

the true nature of the world in which they have been hitherto allowed to live. All these fools, instead of making sense of the terribly disastrous plots that have been mounted against all Muslim nations, seem to be happy enough to perpetually live in the rhythm of the famous song 'Let's forget about tomorrow' (initially sung as 'Forget domani' by Katyna Ranieri in the 1964 film *The Yellow Rolls-Royce*), hypnotizing their misfortunate followers, while also incapacitating all the Muslim states.

Where does Russia stand in this regard?

As a matter of fact, the two ominous books contain approaches and considerations, world views and conclusions that do not bode well for the Russian Federation, the Russians, and Orthodox Christianity. Notions of all these elements we are able to already detect in the ongoing conflict that the Russian administration correctly and accurately named 'Special Operation' (специальная военная операция), and not 'war'.

But do they understand that only the outcome of a conflict is the kaleidoscope of all intents and purposes? As I have never discussed with any of them personally, I don't venture to respond; however, it is true that when the magistrates and the potentates of a country fail to accurately evaluate the numerous dimensions of a conflict that their enemies invent or ponder over, they sooner or later end up with a defeat. The ensuing debacle can at times be of colossal proportions like the fall of the Romanov dynasty (1917), which was undeniably the top achievement of Russia's best friends (namely England and France) during WW I.

For the time being and on the basis of his recent articles and interviews, I have the feeling that Dmitri Medvedev has a very correct and very accurate perception of the Ukrainian conflict's multilayered dimensions; but did he read the aforementioned impious books in reverse? This is crucially essential to ask now, because the Russian Federation faces indeed an existential threat at a moment the Russian leadership has not yet decided to threaten the very existence of Russia's enemies. This situation -in and by itself- creates already a problem.

Threats are not always visible; sometimes, invisible threats emanate from a state's ostensible friends. This is so, because sea powers (the likes of England, France and the US), being indisputably inferior, can never win over continental empires in a true and honest military confrontation. That is why they customarily resort to cheating; they thus undertake all types of ruse, deceit, and plot. Their external relations and international involvement constantly and systematically require an outstanding array of theatrical practices.

Their secret masters have actually trained, educated and guided the academic, intellectual, political, economic, and military leadership of all those states to act accordingly. Unfortunately, those who fail to read texts in reverse cannot possibly understand, being thus predestined to inevitably lose and disappear. The epitome of the colonial decision-making, practice, policy, diplomacy and intrusion is the maxim 'all the world's a stage' (from William Shakespeare's 'As You Like It': Act II Scene VII Line 139). General introductory reading:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clash_of_Civilizations

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_End_of_History_and_the_Last_Man

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halit_Refi%C4%9F

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erol_Manisal%C4%B1
https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erol_Manisal%C4%B1
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boaz_and_Jachin
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Satanic_Verses
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satanic_Verses_controversy
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Satanic_Verses_controversy#Fatwa_by_Ayatollah_Khomeini
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruhollah_Khomeini
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_Leader_of_Iran
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ali_Khamenei
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forget_Domani
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/On_conducting_a_special_military_operation
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_the_world%27s_a_stage

II. The Serbian Delusion of Russians

Nicholas II failed to save his throne and prolong his dynasty, because he naively accepted the external appearance of certain situations and he failed to unveil the trap set by the scheming Western European powers, i.e. the Serb-Russian alliance or, if you want, the Alliance of Orthodox Nations. To defend his fake friend, namely the French puppet named 'King of Serbs', the last Romanov terminated his illustrious dynasty. This does not mean that in 1914 the King of Serbia (Peter I of Serbia/ Пётр I Карагеоргиевич; 1844-1921) said lies to the Russian ambassador, Baron Nicholas Genrikhovich Hartwig (Nikolaus von Hartwig/ Николай Генрихович Гартвиг; 1857-1914: assassinated by means of magical invocation on the 10th July, i.e. 12 days after the murder of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo). No! Peter I of Serbia did not pretend to be a friend of Russia, while being an enemy.

At the time, the King of Serbia was sincerely a friend of the Russian monarchy – as a person with feelings, thoughts, opinions and considerations; but he could not see, feel or detect how he functioned, placed on the European chessboard by his 'gods', namely all the various French statesmen, politicians, diplomats, military officers, agents, 'advisors', academics, intellectuals and businessmen who had created Serbia in the first place (from 1804 until the Ottoman recognition of the Kingdom of Serbia: de facto in 1867, de jure in 1878, and involving diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire were established in 1886). {I don't mention herewith the short-lived Kingdom of Serbia (1718-1739), because it was an Austrian-Hungarian fabrication.} Since Day 1, the entire Serb military, political, economic, and academic-intellectual leadership followed the path of their predecessors, i.e. the early 19th c. rebels who were duly utilized by France as expendable material against the Ottoman Empire; in fact, it was sort of 'Arab Spring operation' of those days. Thus, the entire establishment of Serbia functioned inevitably as a trap, first for the Serbs themselves and subsequently for the Russians.

It was therefore inevitable that the Serbian royal and political class foolishly believed the pro-Serbian feelings of the French criminals. However, the undeniable fact is that, exposed to many great powers, the Serbians could never function properly as a tiny, independent nation around Belgrade. The colonial trap was later strengthened with the formation of the Pan-Slavic movement, notably after the Prague Slavic Congress was first held in 1848.

Things turned worse, because various local stooges of high rank (generals, ministers and academics) were deceitfully flattered with their calamitous initiation in the filthy rites of French and English Freemasonry (and the ensuing financial benefits), and they therefore willingly worked for the interests of their masters, i.e. the French and the English colonial gangs, without understanding or imagining the extent to which they contributed to the engulfment of their country. They helped further diffuse the unnecessary, divisive and catastrophic Anti-German Pan-Slavic delusion either in Russia or in Serbia.

At the end of the whole process, Nicholas II failed to detect the masterfully prepared Serbian trap that the French had long prepared against their ally whom they so much loathed. How could it happen otherwise? So many of the last czar's prime ministers, ministers and generals were Freemasons and members of French Freemasonic lodges that they totally obscured Nikolai II Alexandrovich's sight and vision; their endless, unreserved and sophisticated lies, plots, fake promises, dissimulated proclivities, and insidious activities helped only fool the Russian monarch.

When it comes to the creation of states in Europe, what matters most is the location that these fabrications have on the European chessboard. The 'gods' (or creators) of these fake states know how to play the game of non-reversing mirrors very well, when creating these commodities. This means that they know the correct position where they have to locate their tools, which are named 'states'; this has nothing to do with 'historical nations'. Why? Because the criminal scoundrels that govern the sea powers do not want to either support or revive historically known ethnic nations; they only fabricate civic nations to which they merely provide the fake story, i.e. the absolutely false and ludicrous narrative that their stooges locally teach as the supposed 'history of the glorious ancestors'.

So, we can conclude that the French produced (or literally 'gave birth to') Serbia at a spot where it could never function as a proper ally of Russia. Why this is so we can easily assess! By establishing an alliance with the microscopic (or rather nanoscopic) 'nation' of Serbia, Imperial Russia would be forced to occasionally clash with other major continental empires, notably Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Caliphate (and later Imperial Germany), which was absurd for Russia, disastrous for Christian Orthodoxy, and calamitous for all the nations that lived in peace in the wider region.

This conclusion can be thoroughly corroborated following the consultation of the proper maps. Compare the territorial increase of Serbia from 1912 to 1918 and the territorial loss of Russia during the same period! Serbia's population increased from 2.9 million to 4.5 million in 1914 and to 12 million in 1918; the tiny Danube kingdom with an area smaller than 35000 km² in 1912 became a sizeable state with an area ca. 250000 km², i.e. slightly less than that of Italy, a major European power! Contrarily, Russia lost vast territories with the Treaty of Brest Litovsk (3 March 1918; Брестский мирный договор). This disaster occurred only due to the trap set by France and England to the Russian czars; the trap's name was 'Serbia'; Pan-Slavism was merely the Marketing campaign of the trap.

How should we therefore read books and texts in reverse, timely spotting traps and adequately outplotting the degenerate sea powers?
General introductory reading:

<https://ww1.habsburger.net/en/chapters/191213-balkan-crisis-prelude-world-war>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_I_of_Serbia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicholas_Hartwig
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_Serbian_history
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kara%C4%91or%C4%91e>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Serbian_Uprising
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Serbian_Uprising
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serbian_Revolution
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principality_of_Serbia
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Serbia#Principality/Kingdom_of_Serbia_\(1878%E2%80%931918\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Serbia#Principality/Kingdom_of_Serbia_(1878%E2%80%931918))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kingdom_of_Serbia
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pan-Slavism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prague_Slavic_Congress,_1848
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kingdom_of_Yugoslavia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Brest-Litovsk
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_of_the_Three_Emperors
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reinsurance_Treaty
(totally naïve approaches:
<https://www.geopolitika.ru/en/1288-carrot-and-stick-a-prospective-view-on-russian-strategy-in-serbia.html>
<https://www.czipm.org/starisajt/mrk02.html>

III. The Clash of Civilization? A Mirage come True

Prof. Huntington's story is not a historical book at all; every simple reader can understand this, because it is well known that, throughout 5-6 millennia of Human History, there has never been a 'clash of civilizations'. On the 17th September 2005, writing for the portal Buzzle, I totally deplored the nonsensical effort of Turkey and Spain to establish a ridiculous organization in hypothetical, yet idiotic, opposition to the said book. The title was "The Clash and the Alliance of Civilizations: too much ado for nothing!"; the article has been widely republished, commented, quoted, referred to, and ... misunderstood. You can find this article here:
https://www.academia.edu/43000376/The_Clash_and_the_Alliance_of_Civilizations_too_much_ado_for_nothing_2005

The rather brief, 2300-word article starts from a very simple, undeniably correct, point that the quasi-totality of the readers of Huntington's story were fooled enough not to take into consideration. However, I must admit that, quite deceptively, the trap was set beforehand, thanks to the book's title itself! I therefore found it compulsory to start my article from the primordial point and to refute the falsehood, which is included in the Prof. Huntington's devilishly misleading title.

My article's first unit focused on «'Clash of Civilizations': an irrelevant and a-historical concept.».

The article's three other units were the following:
«The Divide 'East vs. West' is an Orientalist, Colonial Aberration»
«Impossibility of Clash of Civilizations in Our Era»
«There can never be an 'Alliance of Civilizations'!»

My approach was quite simple; you can never oppose something that does not exist. This is correct at all times, except you are as stupid and as the pathetic as Erdogan, who -due to his nauseating ignorance, detrimental lack of education, and sly yet mean character- fell in the trap and, quite ludicrously, added fuel to the fire - only to the detriment of his own country.

Here you have comments about my article, and my denunciation of some of them:
<https://www.setav.org/en/a-collective-initiative-for-universal-peace/>
<https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/38512682/a-collective-initiative-for-universal-peace-seta>

Quotation from an article of mine in which I denounced Samuel Huntington's Nonsensical Theory on the 'Clash of Civilizations'
https://www.academia.edu/51065896/Quotation_from_an_article_of_mine_in_whi

Quotation from an article of mine in which I deplored Erdogan's Ludicrous Political Theater named 'Alliance of Civilizations'
https://issuu.com/megalommatis/docs/quotation_f

Quotation by a leading Syrian Jihadist (2007): Denunciation of Pan-Arabism and Islamism as End Times' Colonial Tools
<https://www.slideshare.net/MuhammadShamsaddinMe/quotation-by-a-leading-syrian-jihadist-2007-denunciation-of-panarabism-and-islamism-as-end-times-colonial-tools>

Why do I claim that there have never been any clashes of civilization anytime, anywhere, and under any circumstances whatsoever?

Civilization is commonly defined as a high "stage of human social and cultural development and organization" or "any complex society characterized by the development of the state, social stratification, urbanization, and symbolic systems of communication beyond natural spoken language (namely, a writing system)"
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/civilization>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civilization>

People, societies, nomads, states, hordes, tribes and armies never made war one upon the other, because of 'civilization' or due to difference of civilization; even in cases as per which (through a racist viewpoint - and this is absolutely impermissible for humans to accept) «barbarians waged war on a supposedly 'civilized' kingdom», the war never occurred because the barbarians envied the supposedly 'civilized' kingdom or the latter wanted to 'civilize' them. What was at stake was either of spiritual-religious-moral nature or of economic motives; in many cases, it was a matter of survival. However, this means that there was never a truly speaking 'clash of civilizations'.

Religious wars are of very diverse nature, and quite often they are fought only for material benefits and royal prestige, but they never constitute 'wars' (or a 'clash') of civilization. This is so because, in any historical period, religion constitutes only a small fraction of the civilization of a nation; this means that if you describe a 'clash of religions' as 'clash of civilizations', you will end up in an over-generalization without

purpose. And as it is very well known, many times religious wars occurred between people who had the same civilization.

Then, why did Prof. Huntington give a so bizarre title to his book?

This is exactly what only astute and perspicacious readers can assess; in other words, this is up to those who can read the text in reverse. It is again the same game of non-reversing mirrors; Prof. Huntington projected onto the past what he guided experts, statesmen, military officers, diplomats, politicians, academics, intellectuals, agents and others to create in the future.

In other words, he made all of his gullible readers (involving heads of state, premiers, ministers, ambassadors, professors, and others) 'see' in the past something that never existed, because he merely fabricated a mirage (or Fata Morgana) that he placed in the future.

In other words those, who are properly instructed as to how to read and implement the book contents, will produce a situation (namely the clash of civilizations) that the idiots (like Erdogan and many other heads of state, prime ministers, etc. all over world) will -very mistakenly- view as the comeback of an earlier state of affairs. But, as I said as early in 2005, no clash of civilization has ever existed in the past.

Then, the answer to the earlier question is very simple:

Prof. Huntington did not give a bizarre title to his book. The clash of civilizations that he wrote about is merely the clash of civilizations that he wanted to generate in the future in a way to trigger numerous wars in many parts of the world to the benefit of his financiers. To do so, he fooled most of his readers that the clash of civilizations had already taken place whereas this is not the case.

IV. Spirituality & Universalism: Divine Earth vs. Unholy Sea

Once deeply and fully comprehended, Prof. Huntington's book is a harmless amount of paper waste that anyone can use for whatever purpose one may choose; recycled is better than read.

All the same, I have to state that governments, administrations, establishments, military academies, diplomacies, academic institutions and mass media all over the world must take into account, when they define their decision-making, the fact that the outright majority of bureaucrats, magistrates and officers in the UK, US, NATO and other Western countries have already been formed and educated in the darkness and the negativity of this prejudicial book. A primary task for governments in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Central-Eastern Europe is therefore to outmaneuver the evil plan encrusted in the lines of the scheming professor's traveler's companion to the Hell.

If World History is studied in the light of Spiritual Ontology, the definition of the major continental empires as creative forces of the Earth will help explorers and investigators realize the true but deceitful nature of the modern world and identify sea powers as destructive forces of the Sea. Today's major powers in Asia, namely

China, Russia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Turkey, and Iran, are in reality the offspring of the main historical empires that successively developed illustrious civilizations whose achievements are still unmatched by the Western sciences and technologies. The same is valid for several outstanding states in Africa and Latin America. For all of them, it is surely imperative to explore the methods of creative governance that their forefathers employed and to follow in their footsteps.

Continental empires are expanding structures that reflect human societies in their creative dimension. History, as we know it, was formed exclusively by continental empires; to them the various seas were (and could only be) the periphery, which would eventually be used in a positive and creative manner. The Achaemenid Empire of Iran offered a groundbreaking example in this regard; by re-opening the Ancient Suez Canal (also known as the Canal of the Pharaohs), the Iranian imperial authorities offered themselves another transportation means in order to ensure communication between the satrapy of Egypt and Fars (: Persia), Iran's mainland and imperial headquarters. This was a creative innovation indeed. About: https://www.academia.edu/43492808/Darius_the_Greats_Suez_Inscriptions_Birth_Certificate_of_the_Silk_Roads

To make a striking contrast between the virtuous continental empires and the evil sea powers, I have now to offer a dramatic comparison; when the Iranians intended to further pursue the expansion of their already vast empire and to invade Egypt and Cush (Napata in Ancient Sudan, i.e. the historical Ethiopia), they undertook (under Kambujiya/Cambyses; reigned 530-522 BCE) a land invasion of the Valley of the Nile – and not an overseas maritime expedition. The Iranian occupation of Egypt ushered Egyptians into an era of peace and this was a very positive development, particularly if we take into consideration the terrible divisions that the country had known for centuries even before the three Assyrian invasions, 150 years earlier.

Iranians could invade Egypt by circumnavigating the Arabian Peninsula but they knew that this would certainly have an ominous end; imperial expansion is far more important an attempt than mere transportation. Uniting lands under a universal scepter is a divine blessing; sending messages and transporting merchandises sold or purchased elsewhere are ordinary human activities. You can never compare the former to the latter. This worldview or world conceptualization was common among all the important nations of the Antiquity. The valorization of the Earth derived from critical passages of their holy books; it was a matter of Cosmogony and Cosmology.

On the other hand, the inferiority, transience and profanity of the Sea (: Salt Waters), the marginal role that it had to play in human affairs, and the preservation of life far from it were also key topics of the most civilized ancient nations' holy books. In striking contrast with Ether, Soft Waters, Earth and Air, the Sea represented only an unholy element of chaos, disorder, uselessness and unholiness. For the Ancient Sumerians, Akkadians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Cushites, Hittites and Iranians, the seas were the threatening barbarian periphery; no divine attribute was given to this element. It is irrevocably imperative that, when it comes to human affairs, namely prophecy, eschatology, and soteriology, there is no Salvation in the Sea. The impure element will be canceled and, by definition, it has no place either in the Original Paradise or in the Kingdom of the Heaven.

If we leave Spiritual Ontology and History of Religions aside, we can conclude that the ensuing historical fact proved to be that islands never generated civilizations; on the contrary, they merely reflected the civilizations developed in the lands in the vicinity of which these islands happened to be. It is noteworthy that, only in later periods (1st millennium BCE) and among less advanced civilizations (namely the Phoenicians, the Carthaginians, the Greeks, the Romans, etc.), we attest divinities of the sea. Indicatively I add that the Ancient Yemenites (Sheba, Awsan, Qataban, Himyar and Hadhramaut), who developed a great continental civilization while also engaging in extensive maritime activities, colonizing Somalia, Socotra, and the Eastern African coast land, and sailing to India and beyond, did not worship any major divinity of the sea. This assessment only reconfirms my earlier statement that, contrarily to the holy element of Soft Waters (later mythologized among Greeks and Romans as the 'Ocean', i.e. the Soft Waters stream that surrounds the Earth), the Sea (Salt Waters) is an impure and profane element.

Consequently, we can realize why sea powers do not and cannot become proper empires. This is so, because they lack land continuity; accordingly, people living in islands cannot fathom the concept of universal empire, which exemplified all major historical empires. Yet, universalism (or ecumenism) is *conditio sine qua non* for the foundation of a real empire, and this fact became well known as early as the World History's first empire, namely that of Sargon of Akkad, before 4500 years. It goes without saying that all empires started first as small kingdoms, and all theoretical considerations appeared after a significant land expansion. This means that land invasions are in reality enthralling methods of spiritual initiation for every good king and for his gallant soldiers and armies. Violence is holy, whereas absence thereof is profane and destructive.

Among all the major historical empires, the Roman Empire constitutes an oddity. Although it undeniably expanded across vast lands in Europe, Africa and Asia, in spite of the fact that it willingly attempted to be positioned in the series of historical empires that originate from Mesopotamia (translation *imperii*), and notwithstanding its apparent, continental character, it ended up with the formation of a truly bizarre imperial structure around a sea: the Mediterranean.

As such, the Roman Empire was the materialization of a rather counterfeit universalism, because the earlier empires and their theoretical backgrounds made full abstraction of the sea. Imperial considerations matter greatly for Russia today, because the Eastern Roman Empire functioned as a pertinent continental empire, fully detaching itself from the already briefly described Roman particularity, and in the process, epitomizing (as New Rome) what Third Rome (Muscovy-Russia) would, could and should be. About:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Translatio_imperii

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyrus_Cylinder#Conquest_and_local_support

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_of_Kings

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_king

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_of_the_Universe

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_of_Sumer_and_Akkad

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_of_the_Four_Corners

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_domination

V. Civilized Continental Empires vs. Barbarian Sea Powers

To make a clear distinction between civilization and barbarism, we can compare the Achaemenid Iranian conquest of Egypt (525 BCE) with the Spanish invasion of Mexico; there is an enormous difference between the two events that are separated from one another by more than 2000 years. The first event did not cause even one thousandth (1/1000) of the bloodshed caused in Mexico by the Spanish colonial monsters that were fully conscious of the fact that they fought with detrimentally superior weapons (firearms).

Plainly acting as a continental empire, Achaemenid Iran fully respected the Ancient Egyptian population, civilization and local administration. The Achaemenid shahs were depicted as typical Egyptian pharaohs with complete Egyptian hieroglyphic names and in Ancient Egyptian art form; the Iranian satraps' close cooperation with the major sacerdotal colleges (notably the Iwnw-Heliopolitan priesthood) ensured continuity for the local civilization, peace and freedom for the Egyptian people, prosperity for the imperial administration, and seamless integration of Egypt in the empire. Later, the Iranian pattern of local rule, provincial administration, and peaceful annexation was maintained by the Ptolemies and the Romans. It was an undeniable success of religious tolerance, socio-behavioral distinction, and cultural persistence.

The Iranians did not force the Egyptians to become Zoroastrians, contrarily to the monstrous and evil attitude of the Spanish conquistadores who executed scores of innocent, imperially proud, and spiritually superior Mexicans, who did not accept to change their religion and become 'Christian'. The Iranians did not demand of the Egyptians to learn Old Achaemenid Iranian, write in cuneiform writing, accept the Iranian culture, and adopt the Iranian customs and way of life. Furthermore, the Iranians did not impose a loathsome tyranny on the Egyptians.

Quite contrarily, the cruel Spanish rule over Mexico caused an unprecedented genocide (in the name of Jesus), whereas those who survived had to learn and write Spanish, accept the obnoxious Castilian culture, and imitate the cruel behavior of their conquerors; however, even in that case, they were viewed as an inferior race and treated with incommensurable contempt. This concerned even the mestizos, every offspring of mixed race (Mexican/indigenous and Iberian).

Fully functioning as a sea power, pseudo-Christian Spain (considered as heretic by the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople at the time) disrespected the populations that the conquistadores enslaved overseas, spreading for the first time in World History racism outside the limits of Western Europe. Intentionally, viciously and bestially, the 16th c. Spanish Jihadists {this is the correct term!} destroyed a civilization incomparably higher than theirs in every sense. The criminal gangsters dismantled every sense of local administration and imposed Spanish criteria, measures and concepts, therefore decimating the local populations and extending their bias, bigotry, hatred of the other, cruelty and inhumanity across other continents. About:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Achaemenid_conquest_of_Egypt

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambyses_Romance

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Twenty-seventh_Dynasty_of_Egypt

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thirty-first_Dynasty_of_Egypt

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spanish_conquest_of_the_Aztec_Empire

The Spaniards set the pattern for the other Western Europeans who imitated their barbarism; I am herewith referring to the Portuguese, the French, the Dutch and the English. We can certainly discern variances of colonial practice, but this fact does not change in anything the appalling nature of the Western European racism, odium and inhumanity. The French were worse than the Spaniards, and the English proved to be worse than the French, because they wanted to "make the world England" - which is the most racist tenet ever uttered in World History.

Closing this brief description, I have however to add that the Ancient World's major sea powers, namely the Phoenicians and the Carthaginians, were not known for similar cruelty; we don't have any textual source or archaeological evidence to support such claim.

All the same, there was certainly an abominable model that the spiritual masters of the conquistadores, i.e. the apostate popes of Rome and the Renaissance intellectuals, certainly had in mind before sending the conquistadores to butcher the civilized indigenous populations of the lands that they colonized.

It consists in one of the World History's bleakest pages of utmost barbarism, inhuman monstrosity, and repugnant cruelty. The abhorrent deed that served as model for the conquistadores was perpetrated by a tiny, racist and uncivilized state that the Western colonial countries have always exalted. Quite interestingly, during the Christian Eastern Roman imperial times, the past of this abominable and outrageous statelet was deplored and detested, as it was considered an outcast of the civilized world.

This statelet is Athens, i.e. the Mediterranean basin's most disgusting ignominy. Only in modern times, the sea powers' criminal and racist academics and statesmen turned Ancient Athens' pedophilia, sexual anomaly, perversion and disgusting darkness into absurdly applauded felony. During the Peloponnesian War, which was a tribal butchery that lasted almost three decades (431-404 BCE) and constituted Ancient Greece's greatest 'contribution' to World History, Athens (a sea power and corrupt republic) opposed the Kingdom of Sparta (a minor continental power).

As Melos Island (a tiny independent statelet) sided with Sparta (due to their common Dorian origin), the Athenian fleet sieged the misfortunate island (416 BCE) and in the process, due to the heroic stance of the local population, the cruel and inhuman Athenian soldiers executed the entire male population to the last, also selling the women and the children as slaves. Of course, as it always happens with sea powers, Athens was unconditionally vanquished and the cursed city was set ablaze by the victorious Spartans, but the cruel Melian genocide remained in World History as the best example of Greek barbarism and sea power inhumanity.

The fact that this horrible deed did not prevent Western European intellectuals and academics from lauding and extolling Ancient Athens clearly demonstrates their biased nature and evil character. As Renaissance intellectuals and Catholic monks were well versed in Thucydides, who authored his biased narrative about the war, must have noticed the merciless attitude of the Athenian rascals. They subsequently

presented it as an example to the uncouth and ruthless conquistadores whose deeds fully demonstrated that sea powers can never be civilized. About:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Melos

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Melos#The_Melian_Dialogue

As regards the so-called Ancient Greece, i.e. the meridional periphery of the Balkan Peninsula south of Ancient Macedonia and Ancient Illyria, one has to admit that the great exposure to the sea, the lack of a major river, and the absence of vast plains or a plateau prevented the region from becoming the cradle of a major civilization. That's why it was always a marginal region for all the empires in which it belonged: the Roman Empire, the Eastern Roman Empire, and the Ottoman Caliphate.

VI. Continental Empires, Sea Powers, and Divisive Traps

Whereas continental empires expand on land, sea powers disembark in faraway lands only to spread chaos and diseases, perpetrate massacres, and destroy cultures and civilizations. After the first stage of Modern European colonialism, which helped demonstrate the Western European gangsters' cruelty at the material level, three sea powers (France, Holland and England) created enormous colonial 'empires' in Asia and Africa, carrying out massive spiritual genocides. If the sudden collapse of the great continental empires of Mexico and Peru was due to the unmatched superiority of the Spaniards in terms of weapons (firearms), the disintegration of the Asiatic continental empires was in fact never completed (thank God!).

As there was no more armament superiority, the sea powers employed ruse and deception against the Ottomans, the Safavid-Afshar-Qajar Iranians, the Great Mughal Empire, and Qing China. Only China managed to resist, in spite of the Opium Wars, and of the partly occupation (or colonization) of Chinese coast lands. When the sea powers attempted to oppose Imperial Russia from further expanding in Central Asia, started the Great Game, which continues down to our days.

The most commonly known trap that sea powers invented and implemented against the continental empires is the divisive practice, which is rather known thanks to the Latin maxim 'divide et impera' ('divide and rule'). This practice was early attested in the Antiquity among continental kingdoms fighting for prevalence in a wider region of secondary importance where many smaller states and nomads lived; the ancient kings and emperors used their armies for lands of crucial importance (against main opponents) and their diplomacies for region of lesser significance.

Since the 16th c., sea powers' deceitful practices against the great Asiatic continental empires involved the formation of trade companies on the territory of the targeted states, the dictation of trade terms, the instigation of numerous local rebellions, the invention and establishment of fake states, notably Afghanistan, the utilization of religious leaders against kings and emperors, the support of locally dissident voices, the preaching of divisive beliefs, the diffusion of controversial ideas, the propagation of the Western European modernism and behavioral system, and the activation of endless wars among the major continental empires (Ottoman Empire vs. Russia, Ottoman Empire vs. Iran, Russia vs. Iran, Iran vs. Mughal Empire, Russia vs. China).

In the 19th c., when the Great Game started, the sea powers managed to infiltrate among many small nations that belonged in different continental empires, utilize numerous individuals, educate numerous rebels (by means of 'studies' in Western universities), promise national independence to the supposedly 'oppressed' nations of the continental empires, etc. Aptly utilizing religious or linguistic affinities, the colonial agents managed to create alliances between an imperial administration and representatives of several indigenous nations in another continental empire, notably Czarist Russia and the Armenians, Aramaean Nestorians (falsely called 'Assyrians'), Eastern Romans (Rumlar/Romioi), and Pontus 'Greeks' (: Eastern Romans) of the Ottoman Empire.

Then, by seemingly making the Russians imagine that their infiltration inside the Ottoman Empire increased (whereas the Western colonials definitely controlled these minorities by means of bribery and corruption), they turned them against another major continental empire, i.e. the Ottoman Caliphate. But this development was beneficial to the sea powers' agenda and catastrophic for both Eurasiatic empires.

About:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divide_and_rule

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Game

VII. The 'Greek Orthodox' Delusion of Russians

Long before Nicholas II, many other czars committed disastrous mistakes for the continental empire that they had to solidly maintain and properly expand. It was absurd for Russians to support anti-Ottoman activities and rebellions of the Eastern Roman Orthodox subjects of the Caliphate. Russia's monumental failure was plainly demonstrated in 1917, but we have first to analyze the reasons and to offer several examples, before examining the disastrous results that the Romanovs brought upon their heads with their 'Greek Orthodox' delusion.

The term 'Greek Orthodox' is an ahistorical, deceitful, modern construction; there was never such nation or people or church for the very simple reason that for all Christians, before and after all the theological disputes and the schisms, 'Greek' was a shameful and profane name and entity as an idolatrous, polytheistic and utterly blasphemous nation. Actually, there was never an ancient Greek nation, and -more importantly- there was never an ancient Greek state, be it a kingdom, a tyranny, a tribal union or an ignominious 'republic'. 'Greece' was merely a geographical notion to describe the South Balkan confines south of Mount Olympus; 'Greeks' ('Hellenes') was a noxious recapitulative term applied to a group of tribes (Achaean, Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians) that lived among other populations (Pelasgians, Illyrians, etc.), which were not considered 'Greeks'. Furthermore, numerous foreign slaves, notably Scythians, lived in some cities-states.

Homer was therefore not a 'Greek', but an Ionian of Anatolia, culturally unrelated to South Balkans; yet, when he used a recapitulative name for the participants of the naval military expedition against Troy (Taruisha), he basically called them 'Danaans'. In the external, Oriental historiographical sources (Hittite, Assyrian-Babylonian cuneiform, Egyptian hieroglyphic, Old Achaemenid Iranian, Ancient Hebrew, etc.), we never attest a recapitulative term about all these marginal tribes. This is normal, because the plethora of the historically unimportant and meaningless Ancient Greek

'statelets' never united in one kingdom. 'Greeks' (Graeci) is merely a posterior, Latin name by which the Romans designated this collection of tribes and clans. Useless to add that to the Romans Graecia (Greece) was geographically, ethnically, culturally, linguistically, spiritually and socio-behaviorally very different and absolutely distinct from Macedonia, Illyria, and Thrace in the Balkans, and from Lycia, Caria, Lydia, and Phrygia in Anatolia.

The so-called Ancient Greeks were so disparate tribal elements that, despite Alexander the Great forced most of them to unify under Macedonian scepter, after his death, they continued living in the disorderly and haphazardous manner of theirs, being impossible to incorporate in any of the kingdoms of Macedonia, Attalid Anatolia (Pergamon), Seleucid Syria or Ptolemaic Egypt (although Antiochus III the Great attempted to achieve it in 192-188 BCE, only to be stopped by the expanding Romans). Simply, Ancient Greeks were unfit to civilize. That is why the Romans, extending their control throughout South Balkans in the middle of the 2nd c. BCE, were forced to decimate them, notably during the conquest of Corinth (146 BCE).

Annexed to Rome, Greece became a rather unimportant province strongly characterized by population movements (local populace relocating elsewhere and foreign populations settling in the lands south of Macedonia), aggressive invasions, and spiritual-religious-cultural Orientalization. The name 'Greece' was forgotten and that is why the lands south of Macedonia became part of the Roman province of Macedonia (147 BCE). The lands of 'Greece' were later detached from the senatorial propraetorial province of Macedonia by Emperor Octavian Augustus, during a major administrative re-arrangement (27 BCE); they formed a separate Roman province, but they were named Achaia. This shows that, even as a geographical term, 'Greece' was an obsolete name.

Of course, one has to add also that the descendants of the Ionians and the Aeolians in Western Anatolia inhabited several other Roman provinces, notably Asia (129 BCE; established after the dissolution of Attalid Pergamon), Bithynia and Pontus (63 BCE), Galatia (25 BCE), Cappadocia (17 CE), Lycia and Pamphylia (43 and 74 CE), Pontus (62 CE), and Commagene (72 CE), being however ethnically, linguistically and culturally amalgamated with numerous other Anatolian nations, the Iranian settlers of the Achaemenid times, the Roman ruling class, and the remnants of various invaders, notably the Galatians. This means that, in the 1st and 2nd c. CE, those Anatolians were entirely disconnected in every sense from the historical process that took place in South Balkans ('Achaia', not Greece).

With the Edict of Caracalla (212 CE; 'Constitutio Antoniniana') all the free citizens throughout the empire ('Provincia Achaia' included) were declared 'Roman citizens'. This overwhelming imperial change irrevocably put the tombstone on the remainder of the 'Greek' tribes either in Anatolia or South Balkans; this is so because it proved that they were imperially or politically extinct. Then, the groundbreaking edict was enthusiastically accepted across the empire; this fact demonstrated that, except the Romans (who were amalgamated with most of the nations of the empire), no other nation existed west of Euphrates and east of the Iberian and Mauretanian coasts of the Atlantic Ocean.

In other words, no other tribe, people, ethnic group, religious community or nomad clan had retained their moral integrity, their cultural identity, their socio-behavioral

values, and their imperial or political world view intact up to the point of forming an independent kingdom or empire. They had all gradually been entirely Romanized. By 212 CE, if Greeks had ever existed, they would have vanished.

Later on, the Greek speaking populations in the South Balkans were repeatedly decimated during the numerous catastrophic invasions (first wave: 300-500 CE; second wave: 500-700 CE). During the same period, due to their obdurate rejection of Christianity as the sole official Roman religion and to their obstinate attachment to their absurd polytheism, they caused an unprecedented massacre of the pagans among them. 'Hellen' or 'Graecus' (Greek) ended up meaning 'profane', 'villainous', 'promiscuous' and 'blasphemous' during the period of the Eastern Roman Empire (down to 1453). The inhabitants of the surviving part of the Roman Empire called themselves 'Romans' {Ρωμαῖοι - Ρῶμιοι; أروام (Arabic); رومیان (Farsi); Rûmîler & Rumlar (Turkish)}, denying with abject indignation that they had any relation with the 'Hellenes' or 'Graeci'. About:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persecution_of_pagans_in_the_late_Roman_Empire

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massacre_of_Thessalonica

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_massacres_in_Greece#Ancient_Greece

In the terrible imperial and religious confrontation that pitched Rome against New Rome (Constantinople) already before the fall of the Western Roman Empire (476 CE) but more openly after Rome discarded (752) the institution of Constantinople-selected/approved popes of Rome (which was imposed by Justinian I in 537), the pejorative term 'Hellene'/'Graecus' became a crucial tool in the hands of the impious and blasphemous, anti-Christian popes of Rome, who attempted to utilize various barbarians (notably the Frankish Merovingians and Charlemagne) in order to oppose the Eastern Roman Empire, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the prevailing Caesaropapism.

Following the two schisms (Photian schism: 863-867; East-West schism: 1054), the launch of the Crusades (1095), and the Latin conquest and sack of Constantinople (1204), in order to fully discredit the Eastern Roman Empire and to posture as the sole religious authority among Christians, the Latin (: Western European) pseudo-Christian 'Catholic' occupiers and looters of the Eastern Roman Empire extended the use of the term 'Greeks' for their Eastern Roman Christian Orthodox subjects. The abominable, Satanic rule of the Latin conquerors was fully overthrown (1261), but the scheming Catholic heretics had managed to establish a strong foothold in parts of Romania (Ρωμανία; as the official name of the Eastern Roman Empire was in Eastern Roman language) and to form small groups of theological lackeys and local stooges, who became known as 'Enotikoi' (Ενωτικοί; pro-Union). It goes without saying that the papal puppets tried to diffuse the pejorative name, but they failed to achieve any substantive results until the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Sultanate (1453) and the end of the Ottoman rule in South Balkans (early 19th c.).

With the removal of the Christian Orthodox Eastern Roman obstacle, the apostate, Anti-Christian, Catholic Church launched the projects that it had already prepared for about 250-300 years: Renaissance and Colonialism (the totally mischievous term 'Discovery of America' must be considered as an obsolete falsehood). Part of the Renaissance intellectual-scientific-artistic fallacy concerned Ancient Greece; it was indeed the fabrication of an entirely ahistorical, misleading and delusional narrative which did not represent but distort the historical truth, which was contained in

historiographical sources and documented in the archaeological material record. The intentionally distorted representation of Ancient Greece was coined 'Hellenism' in disparaging contradiction to the use of the term that Ancient Ionians, Aeolians and others made of it.

During the Late Antiquity, Ionians described as 'Hellenism' the tendency of some people in Anatolia and Syria (Cappadocians, Phoenicians, Aramaeans, Jews) to appear dressed after the 'Greek' fashion and to adopt the cosmopolitan lifestyle of Ionians, Athenians and Macedonians living in cities founded by Alexander the Great and his successors. But during the Renaissance, 'Hellenism' defined the falsehood that anti-Christian Western European intellectuals, fraudsters, academics and crooks invented, fabricated and believed about Ancient Greece.

The villainous forgery of Hellenism was quite useful to the Satanic gangsters who killed millions of Mexicans and Peruvians; it helped diffuse scores of profane topics, concepts, illusions, sick passions, evil desires, immoral behaviors, anti-Christian attitudes, and an absolutely putrefied world conceptualization at the very antipodes of Christianity. By merely marketing these mental and intellectual contaminations as 'civilization', the so-called Renaissance 'humanists' started distancing themselves from the faith that they deceitfully presented as still theirs. They thus produced a polarization that gave birth to other movements like Classicism, Enlightenment, etc., which further contributed to the corruption of the Western world and, through colonialism, to the degeneracy of the rest of mankind. In this manner, the formation of the modern faithless, worthless and useless societies was completed, only to fully corroborate the various calls that we now hear for eugenics, population control, and reduction of the world population to 500 million or 50 million people.

All this was totally unknown to the Muscovites, the Tatars, and the populations of Novgorod, Astrakhan and Sibir (Siberia) back at the time of Ivan IV the Terrible. To them, Constantinople was merely Tsargrad (Царьград), the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire (Восточная Римская империя), even more so because Gennadius Scholarius (Геннадий Схоларий) ensured the *translatio imperii*, making of Mehmet II the successor of Constantine XI Palaeologus, who was the last of the Palaeologi dynasty (Палеологи). Tsargrad means literally 'the city (gorod/город) of Caesar' (i.e. the Roman Emperor), thus fully demonstrating that to the Russians the realm that the Ottomans conquered in 1453 was purely, entirely and indisputably Roman.

The dispute around the term lasted no less than 450 years, ever since Sophia Palaiologina (born Zoe; 1449-1503/ Софья Палеолог), niece of the last Eastern Roman Emperor, married Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow (1440-1505 / Иван III Васильевич) in proxy marriage (1 June 1472; in the Old St. Peter's Basilica, Rome) in presence of Gian Battista della Volpe, diplomat and adventurer in the Muscovite service in the 15th c., who became rather known as Ivan Fryazin (Иван Фрязин). Sophia, accompanied by a pontifical custody led by Ivan Fryazin, reached Moscow (Muscovy) on 12th November 1472 and later gave birth to many children, notably Vasili III of Moscow (Василий III Иванович/1479-1533), who was the father of Ivan IV the Terrible. The dispute ended with the abdication of Nicholas II (15th March 1917) and the abolition of the Ottoman sultanate (1st November 1922), because -for ca. 470 years- one of the titles of the Ottoman sultans was Qaysar-i Rum (قبصر روم).

We therefore conclude that Ivan the Terrible knew only Romans and Eastern Romans, and wanted to position Muscovy as continuity to Tsargrad; of 'Greeks' he probably never heard. The same is true for most of his successors and for the first of the Romanovs. Only after the rapprochement with European dynasties that Peter I attempted, numerous academics, artists, and architects started moving from France, Germany, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Denmark and England to Russia. They diffused what was then called 'European civilization', involving the tenets of Renaissance, Classicism and Enlightenment, including Hellenism.

The rise of the proponents of Westernization at the time of Catherine II became a real threat to the Russian Orthodox identity; this generated several reactions, notably the Pochvennichestvo (Почвенничество) movement, the supporters of the so-called Slavophilia (Славянофильство/however, the term is not accurate), the fervent defenders of traditional Russian values, such as Sobornost (соборность), Obshchina (община), etc., and -last but not least- a monarchical conceptualization of Russia as Orthodoxy, Autocracy & Nationality (Православие, Самодержавие, Народность). About:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pochvennichestvo>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavophilia>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sobornost>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Obshchina>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orthodoxy,_Autocracy,_and_Nationality

<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/church-history-and-the-predicament-of-the-orthodox-hierarchy-in-the-russian-empire-of-the-early-1800s>

<https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-hccc-worldhistory2/chapter/the-westerners-and-the-slavophiles/>

However, this reaction was not enough to eliminate the diffusion of the historical forgery that the biased Western scholars undertook in 18th and 19th c. Russia. Then, in the case of the so-called Greek Revolution of 1821 and the subsequent formation of the tiny pseudo-state 'Greece' (by the English and the French colonials) Russia made exactly the same mistakes as in the case of Serbia. The Russian diplomats, statesmen and czars were fooled enough to possibly believe that the descendants of the Eastern Romans could make 'Greeks' resurrected after almost 1500 years!! Even worse, the imperial elites failed to fathom that, if the English and the French wanted to perform the rebirth of the Ancient Greeks, as a blasphemous act of Black Magic, this simply meant that they intended to utterly destroy Orthodoxy and Christianity in general.

Failing to realize that the only descendants of the Ancient Ionians and Aeolians, surely amalgamated with numerous other nations, were located in Ottoman Anatolia and that the inhabitants of the South Balkan Ottoman provinces were ethnic Slavs amalgamated with Vlachs, Albanians, Italians, Turks, Egyptians and Berbers, the czars contributed greatly, at their own detriment, to the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. The imperial Russian elites could not realize that to defend their interests, as a continental empire, they had to side with the Ottoman Empire and Qajar Iran. The only beneficiaries of the numerous Russian-Iranian and the Russian-Ottoman wars were England and France. When it comes to the tiny state of Greece, this became the embodiment of colonially educated and prepared elite that govern their country according (not to the local, national interests but) to the needs of their colonial masters.

It is ironical but, by helping the tiny Greek state first exist and second expand, the Russians damaged their own chances to ever reach their secret and mystical targets: Tsargrad (Constantinople) and Jerusalem. The Russian Church of Mary Magdalene (Церковь Святой Марии Магдалины) on the Mount of Olives symbolized that vision; constructed in 1888 by Alexander III, the splendid edifice with the typically Russian gilded onion domes epitomized all the Russian Orthodox eschatological claims.

As a matter of fact, the Russians were far closer to both locations than their rivals (the English) were; they could reach there first. But to do so, they should ally themselves with the Ottomans and strengthen the Ottoman Empire against the evil erosion carried out by the French and the English. And this is the merciless strike that Fate delivered to the naïve Czar Nicholas II who thought it possible to ally Holy Russia to the filthiest and most execrable realm on Earth, namely England; although he wanted to reach Jerusalem first, he was arrested and imprisoned in his own country, when the profane general Edmund Allenby entered the old city of Jerusalem on 11th December 1917. Russia was plunged in the Marxist-Leninist abyss, when England achieved its largest territorial extent.

This disaster will come again, if Russia's present ruling elite and administration make the same mistake and fail to realize that the worst enemies of Holy Russia are (not the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Germans, the French, the Israelis or the Americans but) the English. It is only England (along with London's various paraphernalia, i.e. the pseudo-states of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) that turns the US, NATO, and also EU against Russia. The reason is very simple; in full agreement with their Satanic eschatological agenda, the English want to prevent Holy Russia-Third Rome from becoming "a blessing on the Earth" (Isaiah, 19:24). To cancel the English agenda, Russians must remove Shakespeare from their education.

Earlier Publications: Titles, Dates, Links & Contents

From the Pandemic to the Special Operations in Russian Ukraine (3 April 2022)

<https://www.slideshare.net/MuhammadShamsaddinMe/from-the-pandemic-to-the-special-operations-in-russian-ukraine>

- 1- A Critical Confrontation between Jesuits and Freemasons
- 2- The Pandemic and the Jesuit Eschatological Agenda (and how it has advanced throughout the last millennium)
- 3- The Multiple Dimensions of the Conflict between Russia and Ukraine
- 4- The Historical Facts

My position about Ukraine, Russia, and the Russian Special Operations in Russian Ukraine - in brief (15 April 2022)

<https://megalommatis.livejournal.com/25045.html>

<https://megalommatis.blogspot.com/2022/04/my-position-about-ukraine-russia-and.html>

<https://ok.ru/megalommatis/statuses/154562853352280>

https://vk.com/megalommatis?w=wall429864789_6737%2Fall

<https://www.slideshare.net/MuhammadShamsaddinMe/my-position-about-ukraine-russia-and-the-russian-special-operations-in-russian-ukraine-in-brief>

1. Many people did not expect it, but I did
2. The plan to split Russia to 5-10 pieces
3. There is no Ukrainian language or nation
4. The negative impact of History
5. If Ukrainians are a nation, then Egypt's Sa'idis are a nation too!

Russia, Ukraine and the World-I: 'Moscou, les Plaines d'Ukraine, et les Champs-Élysées' (14 March 2023)

<https://megalommatiscomments.wordpress.com/2023/03/14/russia-ukraine-and-the-world-i-moscou-les-plaines-dukraïne-et-les-champs-elysees/>

https://www.academia.edu/98495216/Russia_Ukraine_and_the_World_I_Moscou_les_Plaines_dUkraine_et_les_Champs_%C3%89lys%C3%A9es

I- The Historical Background

II- Western Colonialism against Russia: Projection of Fake Concepts and Historical Falsehood onto Russian Elites

III- Western Bias: Russia's Europeanization as De-Russification

IV- Where does the Fallacy of European Russia End?

V- False Identity for Russians means Defeat in the Great Game

VI- The Fall of the Romanov: due to the False Concept of 'Russia as a European Empire'

Russia, Ukraine and the World-II: 5000 Years of Russian Asiatic Identity vs. 500 Years of Anglo-French Racism & Colonialism (21 March 2023)

<https://megalommatiscomments.wordpress.com/2023/03/21/russia-ukraine-and-the-world-ii-5000-years-of-russian-asiatic-identity-vs-500-years-of-anglo-french-racism-colonialism/>

https://www.academia.edu/98873247/Russia_Ukraine_and_the_World_II_5000_Years_of_Russian_Asiatic_Identity_vs_500_Years_of_Anglo_French_Racism_and_Colonialism

I. The Western Anti-Russian Bias

II. Skillful Western European Falsification of Russian History

A. Erroneous contextualization of Archaeology of Northern Asia

B. Deliberate use of overlapping terms: Northern Asia, Siberia, and Scythia

C. Prehistory and Ancient History of Northern Asia are subject to modern borders and to the meaningless attempts for 'national archaeology'

D. Failure to discern Northern Asia in its entirety and true dimensions

E. Deliberate, multifaceted distortion of the Asiatic Turanian Migrations

F. Minimization of the cataclysmic presence and prevalence of the Turanian nations throughout Eastern Europe

G. European academia-backed biases: malignant disregard of the spiritual value of Kievan Rus, and absurd focus on ethnic, racial and linguistic considerations

H. Erroneous focus on Kievan Rus and disastrous neglect for Volga Bulgaria

I. Concealment of the historical reality of the Turanian ('Tatar-Mongol') period

Russia, Ukraine and the World-III: the need for a New UN or how UK, US, France and NATO must be defenestrated from the world (28 March 2023)

<https://megalommatiscomments.wordpress.com/2023/03/28/russia-ukraine-and-the-world-iii-the-need-for-a-new-un-or-how-uk-us-france-and-nato-must-be-defenestrated-from-the-world/>

https://www.academia.edu/99242411/Russia_Ukraine_and_the_World_III_the_need_for_a_New_UN_or_how_UK_US_France_and_NATO_must_be_defenestrated_from_the_world

https://vk.com/megalommatis?w=wall429864789_8657%2Fall

I. Ukraine or Ireland and Switzerland?

II. England, France, and the fake state 'US'

III. Ukraine or Mexico?

IV. UK, France, US and NATO: the Enemies of the Mankind

V. The Fallacy of all Geopolitical Analyses