

Dr. Johnson has Found His Mini-Me:
Ladislav Zemanek's on Russia and China Ending Western Global Hegemony

Presented by Matthew Raphael Johnson and Sven Longshanks
Radio Albion
May 28, 2026

Zemanek is a 33 year old [scholar](#) at the Valdai Discussion Club, Russia's answer to Davos. He was a communist activist in Czechia in 2010-2011, but converted to Orthodoxy once he saw the bankruptcy of Marx. He was even an election observer in the Donbass republics, saying they were all free and fair. Talking about the Jews got him [arrested](#), but since it was scholarly, he was set free. He's both a conservative and a nationalist.

The recent [summit](#) between Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping sent another wave of panic through Western political and media circles. On both sides of the Atlantic, the growing partnership between Russia and China is habitually described as an authoritarian alliance plotting against the Regime. Headlines drip with warnings about a new anti-western axis. Think tanks speak in apocalyptic tones. Liberal commentators invoke a new Cold War, but beneath the hysteria lies a simpler reality: The old world order is losing its grip *[is this news to him? I've been writing about the Sino-Russian alliance for 25 years]*.

The Russia-China partnership is not a crusade against the west *[yes it is]*. It is a revolt against unipolarity – against the idea that one civilization, one ideology, and one political model should dominate the entire planet indefinitely. Moscow and Beijing are not trying to destroy the international system. They are building alternatives to an order monopolized for decades by Western liberal power *[how is that different? They are trying to replace the postwar Regime]*.

This distinction matters enormously. What Putin and Xi are advancing is the idea of a multipolar world: A world where civilizations, nations, and cultures can pursue their own paths without ideological supervision from Washington, Brussels or transnational liberal institutions *[again, has he just learned this?]*. Far from threatening Europe and America, this transformation could ultimately save them from their own political and civilizational exhaustion.

When Russia and China first issued a joint [declaration](#) on multipolarity in 1997, few in the West took it seriously *[I remember it distinctly when it was released on May 15, 1997 and I took it seriously]*. At the time, the Soviet Union was gone, American power appeared unstoppable and liberal globalization seemed destined to swallow the planet whole. Borders were supposed to fade. National sovereignty was increasingly portrayed as obsolete. Globalization accelerated while NATO marched steadily eastward. *[The Declaration stated:*

Every country has the right independently to choose its path of development in the light of its own specific conditions and without interference from other States. Differences in their social systems, ideologies and value systems must not become an obstacle to the development of normal relations between States. All countries, large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, are equal members of the international community. No country should seek hegemony, engage in power politics or monopolize international affairs].

Yet Russia and China already sensed the weakness hidden beneath the triumphalism. Even at the height of American dominance, both powers understood that a world organized around a single ideological center would eventually generate instability, arrogance, overreach and backlash, which is exactly what happened. Endless wars, regime-change interventions, financial crises, deindustrialization, mass migration, censorship, social fragmentation and cultural nihilism slowly eroded confidence in the liberal model itself [*that is the liberal model*]. Nearly 30 years later, Putin and Xi have returned to the same historical idea – only now from a position of far greater strength.

At their latest summit, the two leaders adopted a new joint declaration on the multipolar world order and the reform of global governance – a manifesto on sovereignty, shared security, openness, inter-civilizational dialogue and democratization of international relations. More profoundly, it rejects the belief that liberal modernity represents the only legitimate destiny for mankind. This is what truly terrifies liberal elites. The emerging Eurasian vision challenges western geopolitical dominance as well as the very ideological foundations of the post-Cold War order itself. It insists that humanity is composed of many civilizations, not one universal civilization governed by a single moral and political doctrine.

In many ways, the Putin-Xi vision resembles a genuinely Schmittean *Pluriversum*: a world of sovereign civilizational states rather than a homogenized global marketplace administered by technocrats, NGOs and supranational bureaucracies. In this world, nations are not expected to abandon their traditions, religions or historical identities in the name of abstract universalism. Diversity among civilizations is treated not as a problem to be erased but as a reality to be respected.

Particularly striking was the declaration's recognition of the constitutive and positive role of religion in civilizational development and renewal. At a time when many western institutions treat Christianity and religious tradition as embarrassing remnants of the past, Russia and China acknowledged spiritual inheritance and cultural continuity as pillars of social cohesion and meaningful intercivilizational dialogue.

That message will resonate far beyond the two countries. Across Europe and the US, millions increasingly feel alienated by borderless economics, bureaucratic managerialism, cultural deracination, collapsing communities, demographic anxiety and the aggressive moralism of liberal ideology. They are told that national identity is dangerous, tradition oppressive, religion backward and sovereignty obsolete. Yet the more the liberal order promises liberation, the more fragmented and rootless western societies become [*the more corrupt they become*]. Putin and Xi are speaking into that vacuum.

The Ukraine conflict accelerated historical processes already underway. Western governments unleashed unprecedented sanctions against Russia, expecting economic collapse and political destabilization. Instead, Russia adapted. Its economy diversified, redirected eastward, and survived the largest sanctions regime in modern history [*It's now the world's fourth largest economy using PPP measures. According to the PMI (Purchasing Manager's Index), [Russia](#) sits at 52, while the US has been under 50 for some time and Germany is at 48.5. Worse, France is at a shocking 43.8 meaning that it is collapsing. This means Russia is growing. The western world has no accurate data about Russia since sanctions were imposed. I'll explain this if you want*].

China played a decisive role in that outcome, providing for trade expansion, deeper financial cooperation, increased technology exchanges, and new logistical and commercial corridors. Predictably, western commentators portrayed this as Beijing “enabling Russian

aggression,” but China's calculations are far more strategic.

Chinese leaders understand that sanctions have evolved from exceptional measure into instruments of systemic coercion. Asset seizures, financial exclusion, and economic warfare create precedents that can eventually be used against any state unwilling to submit to western political demands. Thus, Beijing’s support for alternative financial systems doesn't only help Russia – it is a defense of sovereign autonomy in an increasingly weaponized global economy.

This explains the growing importance of BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, trade in national currencies and independent payment infrastructures. These initiatives are designed to create resilience and strategic flexibility. Even the west could benefit from this type of system. A world in which economic interdependence cannot be weaponized so easily may ultimately prove more stable than one governed by coercive monopolies.

Ironically, it's liberal globalization itself that created this fragmentation. The same elites who once preached open markets and global integration now advocate censorship, sanctions, decoupling, industrial protectionism, and ideological conformity. The supposedly universal liberal order has revealed itself to be highly selective, punitive, and openly political. Russia and China simply adjusted to reality faster than the West did.

The geopolitical importance of Sino-Russian relations cannot be overstated. Together, Russia and China dominate the strategic core of Eurasia – the largest landmass on Earth. Their shared border stretches farther than any other in the world. Both are nuclear powers, permanent members of the UN Security Council, and civilizations with deep historical memory.

What many western analysts still fail to grasp is that this partnership is not historically abnormal [*it's centuries old, other than the Sino-Soviet split, they have traditionally been allies*]. If anything, it corrects decades of imbalance. After the Cold War, Russia looked overwhelmingly toward Europe and the US. China became economically intertwined with America. Even today, despite rising tensions, China's economic relationship with the US remains far larger than its trade with Russia [*but less strategic*].

The real geopolitical paradox here is that western elites simultaneously pursued confrontation with both powers while expecting them not to align strategically. By opening a two-front struggle against Russia and China at the same time, the liberal establishment accelerated precisely the Eurasian partnership it feared most.

Europe has suffered the greatest consequences. As European governments severed ties with Moscow, China gained privileged access to Russian energy, raw materials, agricultural exports, military technology, chemicals and Arctic trade routes [*Russia also has tons of uranium*]. Europe voluntarily surrendered strategic advantages while Beijing [*and India*] stepped into the vacuum. In many respects, Europe is financing its own geopolitical marginalization. Future European leaders may eventually realize that permanent confrontation with Russia serves neither Europe's prosperity nor its security. A stable Eurasian balance built on cooperation rather than ideological crusades would benefit the entire continent.

The greatest misunderstanding surrounding multipolarity is the belief that it means the destruction of the west [*the west is doing that by itself*]. In reality, it may represent the only path toward western renewal. For decades, liberal globalism hollowed out the very foundations of western civilization. National sovereignty gave way to supranational and corporate bureaucracy. Manufacturing disappeared. Borders weakened. Communities fragmented. Endless foreign interventions drained public trust and money. Cultural atomization replaced social solidarity [*he sounds like me 20 years ago*].

Under liberal universalism, nations themselves were expected to dissolve into a

borderless order *[more like a blob]*. Ordinary Europeans and Americans increasingly reject that vision. They want continuity, identity, security, tradition, and meaningful sovereignty – the same principles Moscow and Beijing now defend openly on the world stage. This does not mean the west must imitate Russia or China. That kind of uniformity would go against the very idea of multipolarity. Civilizations should be free to develop according to their own histories, traditions, and moral frameworks without external ideological enforcement *[Hegemony will always exist, but it will be regional, not global]*.

Russia, China, Europe and even the US are not natural civilizational enemies. In many respects, they share a common adversary: Liberal globalism and the transnational class that weakened sovereignty, eroded traditions, shattered social cohesion, and subordinated nations to abstract universalist dogmas *[my God, I feel like I'm 35 again, I've got to contact this guy and get him on a show at Albion]*. The Putin-Xi summit, therefore, symbolized the accelerating transition from a world organized around ideological uniformity to one grounded in civilizational plurality.

Western elites may resist this transformation for years to come, but history rarely reverses course *[the west is out of time]*. The unipolar era is ending, and it wasn't Russia or China that destroyed it. Liberal globalism exhausted itself from within. A balanced world of sovereign civilizations, distinct cultures, and multiple centers of power does not threaten Europe or America. It may offer the only viable path toward restoring their own civilizational confidence.