

Why I Choose Russia Over The West

First Principles



Val Guillou

Content

Introduction (*FREE*)

THE WEST

1 The Thucydides Trap: When Fear and Hubris Drive Destructions

- US Supremacy by Whatever Means
- The Forces Behind the US Seeking Supremacy
- Cognitive Dissonance in the West
- Why the Elites in the West are So Incompetent (*FREE*)

2 The Trojan Horse: How Noble Ideas Unravel Societies

- Enforced Gynocentrism
- Worship of Nature
- Repression of Truth
- Sliding into Dystopic Postmodernism

RUSSIA

3 The Right Side of History: In Search of Continuity

- A Terrible Geography: a History of Defense
- A Great Historical Tragedy: the Fall and Fragmentation of the Soviet Union
- How Far Russia Has Come
- Russia - China: the Great Partnership

Conclusion

This is a sample. The number of pages displayed is limited.

INTRODUCTION

In earlier centuries, most people lived in a kind of intellectual twilight. Widespread illiteracy, the high cost of books, and the scarcity of media meant that only a narrow elite could access the knowledge needed to interpret events and form coherent judgments about the world. The danger then was ignorance born of scarcity.

Today, we face the opposite danger: ignorance born of excess. Instead of silence, we endure a permanent roar. Twenty-four-hour news cycles, social-media echo chambers, and algorithmic feeds deliver a ceaseless stream of disconnected facts, half-truths, and emotional triggers. We are immersed in commentary yet starved of comprehension, flooded with opinions yet unable to distinguish substance from theater. The result is not enlightenment, but exhaustion and confusion.

In such an environment, the only reliable path is to return to First Principles. By First Principles I mean the effort to strip away the slogans, propaganda, and inherited prejudices, and to ask the most basic questions about power, security, culture, and the forces shaping our world. Instead of beginning with what we are told to believe—or with what we would like to be true—we begin with what can be observed, tested, and reasoned from the ground up. Only then can we move beyond frustration and start to grasp the deeper forces that are driving civilization toward conflict and decay.

First-Principles thinking is not an academic luxury; it is mental discipline. It is the method of the scientist who, before mastering chemistry, studies the

properties of atoms and molecules. It is the habit of the craftsman who, before building a chair, examines the grain of the wood and the strength of the joints. And it is the duty of the citizen who, before deciding who the heroes and villains are in international affairs, asks: What are the irreducible interests at stake? What lies beneath the slogans and moral posturing? In which societies can a human being still protect himself, build a life, and live with dignity?

This approach demands not only rigor but humility. To reason from First Principles is to admit how limited one's knowledge is and how easy it is to mistake familiarity for understanding. It requires discipline to avoid the comforting illusion that repeating fashionable opinions is the same as thinking. Without that humility, we fall into cognitive traps: we overestimate our grasp of complex topics, we underestimate our biases, and we slide into self-reinforcing assumptions that make genuine learning impossible.

In this book, structured in three chapters, I strive to apply this method consistently.

The first two chapters focus on the contemporary West and argue that two different but related dynamics—one imposed from above by its ruling class, and one emerging from within Western societies themselves—are pulling the West toward decline.

In Chapter 1, *The Thucydides Trap: When Fear and Hubris Drive Destruction*, I argue that the West led by the United States, has chosen a path of perpetual supremacy at any cost, and that Washington's aggressiveness, combined with Europe's dependence and irrational russophobia, has become a central driver of global instability.

In Chapter 2, *The Trojan Horse: How Noble Ideas Unravel Societies*, I turn to the internal front, examining how seemingly high-minded ideals, when distorted and unscrutinized, have turned into destructive ideologies that corrode social trust, erode competence, and hollow out the cultural foundations of Western nations.

Finally, in Chapter 3, *The Right Side of History: In Search of Continuity*, I shift the focus to Russia. Drawing on the arguments developed in the previous chapters, I make the case that, for a Westerner who seeks continuity, sovereignty, and the possibility of a dignified life, Russia—despite all its undeniable flaws and contradictions—offers a more coherent and viable alternative than the direction in which the West is now heading. This book is an attempt to explain why, when judged from First Principles rather than from propaganda, I choose Russia over the West.

CHAPTER 1

The Thucydides Trap: When Fear and Hubris Drive Destructions

The West

The sections 'US Supremacy by Whatever Means', 'The Forces Behind the US Seeking Supremacy', 'Cognitive Dissonance in the West' are not included in this sample.

Section 1.4

Why the Elites in the West Are So Incompetent

I have chosen to make this section freely available because the phenomenon of incompetence within the Western elite is often overlooked or underestimated as a key factor in explaining the West's sharp decline. It is crucial to recognize that there has been a dramatic deterioration in the quality and competence of leadership across the Western world—not only in Europe, but also in North America and the Collective West more broadly.

It is therefore worth pausing to examine why so many Western leaders today appear simultaneously inept and strikingly arrogant. This is, in my view, a distinctly Western pathology. Nothing comparable can be observed in Russia or China, where elites are formed and tested under very different conditions. The steady degradation of Western elites, combined with an irrational and visceral Russophobia, has had catastrophic consequences for Europe's geopolitical stability, industrial strength, and long-term economic health.

Contemporary Western elites are systematically selected, educated, and incentivized in ways that almost guarantee their unsuitability for serious statecraft. They may possess high intelligence, impressive credentials, and considerable energy, yet they are strikingly incompetent when it comes to real-world leadership, strategic thinking, and the protection of their own societies' core interests.

Education As Accreditation, Not Learning

Across the West, education has quietly shifted from shortening the learning curve for real skills to selling accreditation as a license to participate in the labor market, especially at the university level. The model has moved away from helping people master a craft and toward providing a stamp of approval that grants access to certain professions and social circles.

Elite education no longer focuses on teaching students how to think, how to reason independently, or how to educate themselves over a lifetime. Instead, it increasingly trains them in ideology, narrative, and conformity, what to say, what to signal, and which dogmas must never be questioned. The major training grounds for Western elites illustrate this clearly: in the United States, Harvard and Yale; in Britain, University of Oxford and the University of Cambridge (collectively known as Oxbridge); in France, institutions like ENA and Sciences Po. These schools are less about cultivating judgment than about inducting students into a specific worldview and network.

Using a First-Principled approach, we have to understand what education was originally about. The justification for education was simple and practical: it shortened the learning curve. Take a welding school as an example. In theory, you could teach yourself welding through years of trial and error, slowly discovering what works and what fails. Formal training, however, compresses that painful process into a focused period of instruction, where you practice proven techniques under guidance. In this model, education makes sense because it saves time, reduces costly mistakes, and equips you faster to do real work—whether in welding, carpentry, or any other concrete craft.

By contrast, the prevailing purpose of much modern higher education has become accreditation. Most universities no longer function like a welding school. They do not reliably teach a specific craft that you will actually use, nor do they necessarily care about or even understand what you will be doing after graduation. Their primary product is the credential itself: a degree that signals you have passed through a recognized institution and are therefore allowed to compete for certain professional or elite positions, regardless of whether you acquired much of practical value along the way.

This dynamic is crucial because the main elite career tracks—government, NGOs, international organizations, corporate management, and the broader “leadership” class—are heavily gated by such credentials. Ambitious young people quickly realize that they must attend these universities “for the ticket,” and the institutions respond accordingly. They optimize around brand,

selectivity, and throughput, not around serious skill-building, intellectual rigor, or moral courage.

Over time, this system produces a particular kind of leader: highly adept at collecting credentials, fluent in the approved ideological language, and skilled at navigating bureaucratic procedures, but often lacking concrete experience, technical competence, or practical judgment. This is one of the core mechanisms through which Western elites become incompetent in real-world governance.

At the same time, many of the most capable but non-conformist young people are filtered out by a narrow, unforgiving path that punishes visible mistakes and rewards cautious obedience. Those who question dogma, take risks, or fail publicly early on are often excluded, while compliant rule-followers with spotless formal records advance. As a result, the system elevates individuals who have rarely confronted real failure, who have not had to repair the consequences of their own errors, and who therefore lack the hard-earned judgment that genuine leadership requires.

Ideology, Narrative, And Loss of Critical Thinking

Western elite education now forms people around a rigid ideology and a prefabricated story, rather than training them to examine arguments and evidence for themselves. Instead of presenting multiple frameworks and teaching students to test them against reality, many universities socialize their students into a single moral-political lens and treat alternative perspectives as illegitimate, dangerous, or simply beneath consideration.

Future elites are thus trained to see politics and policy primarily as a struggle between narratives. The task is not to understand the world as it is, but to promote a story that feels morally satisfying to their own camp. Success is measured by how persuasive the narrative sounds within their circle, not by how well it corresponds to messy, inconvenient facts on the ground.

Over time, this environment erodes the habit of genuine critical thinking. Graduates lose the practice of weighing evidence, of arguing in good faith

opposing views, or of changing their minds in light of better arguments. Instead, they become fluent in a limited set of rhetorical tools: attacking motives, applying stigmatizing labels, and dismissing disagreement as morally suspect. Disagreement is not something to be understood or answered; it is something to be discredited.

When these graduates move into government, media, NGOs, and international organizations, they carry the same habits with them. They handle policy challenges and public scrutiny in much the same way they handled uncomfortable questions in seminars: by branding critics as bigots, extremists, or foreign propagandists rather than engaging with substantive objections. The goal is to police the boundaries of the “acceptable” narrative, not to resolve contradictions between that narrative and reality.

The result is a class of decision-makers who are outwardly confident but intellectually questionable. They can repeat talking points with great assurance and elegance, yet they struggle to adapt when events flatly contradict their preferred story. In my view, this is one of the core reasons today’s Western elites prove so incompetent, especially under pressure and in crises.

A revealing example is the exchange between Ned Price, then U.S. State Department spokesperson under the Biden administration, and Associated Press journalist Matt Lee in February 2022, right before Russia conducted the Special Military Operation in Ukraine. Price asserted that Russia was planning to stage and film a fake Ukrainian attack as a pretext for invasion. When Lee pressed him to provide evidence for this serious claim, Price did not respond by offering proof, by outlining what could be revealed, or by candidly acknowledging the limits of what could be disclosed. Instead, he suggested that if Lee doubted the assertion, he was taking “comfort from Russian propaganda.”

This doesn’t answer the question; it morally discredits the questioner by associating him with an enemy narrative, which is exactly the kind of label and dismiss tactic elite western universities teach.

A competent, critically trained official would either provide some evidence, explain clearly why it cannot be shown, or admit uncertainty; instead, Price swaps argument for accusation.

This pattern—protecting claims from scrutiny by framing critics as aligned with the “wrong” camp (in this case, “Russian propaganda”)—is not an isolated incident. It illustrates how Western elites have been taught to defend an ideology and a narrative rather than to reason with citizens who ask for justification.

You can check for yourself here:

<https://edition.cnn.com/videos/us/2022/02/04/state-dept-spokesperson-ap-reporter-heated-exchange-russia-newday-keilar-vpx.cnn>

Now let’s look at another example with Europe’s top diplomat, Kaya Kallas, Head of the European Union for Foreign Affairs. Kaya Kallas is completely inept and out of touch with reality. When Russia started using Oreshnik missile strike, she demanded more weapons and rejected diplomacy. It is exactly what you would expect from an official blinded by their own prejudices. She is incapable of accepting the idea that there needs to be negotiations with the Russians. She's incapable of accepting the realities on the ground, and she just will not face those realities.

Also, a particularly embarrassing episode happened at the Munich Security Conference this year in 2026. During a panel discussion with US National Security Advisor Mike Waltz, Kallas said:

“When Russia goes to war, they go alone. When you [the US] go to war, we're there with you. We're even dying for you. We're fighting for you. We're dying for you. So just please admit that you're a superpower, but we're also with you.”

Kallas is essentially begging for American approval and recognition — admitting Europe's role as subordinate — while simultaneously contradicting her own previous claims that "China completely props up Russia." This shows a lack of coherence and self-awareness, her statement being internally contradictory. Basically, Kallas publicly positions herself as

a vassal pleading with the master, which is embarrassing and unprofessional for someone in her senior diplomatic role.

You can check for yourself here at minute 13. But beware, it is pretty cringy to listen to: <https://youtu.be/s6kHg0b5ozI?si=IsoFcDWwVYkTBznf>

Yes, those are the type of people ruling us. No wonder the West is collapsing.

I could provide a bunch of other examples with figures such as Ursula von der Leyen, Christine Lagarde, Mark Rutte, and many others, where moral labeling, narrative pushing, incoherence, and even emotional outbursts routinely stand in for serious debate and evidence-based argument. Actually, an entire book and even an entire library could be dedicated to that topic: the incompetence of Western elites.

Accreditation Loop and Bad Incentives

The incompetence of Western elites does not appear by accident; it is produced and reinforced by a powerful accreditation loop and a set of deeply distorted incentives. These dynamics have severe real-world consequences and play a major role in the West's ongoing decay.

In practice, career advancement in government, major corporations, and NGOs is driven far more by prestigious brands—names like the Ivy League, Georgetown, Goldman Sachs, McKinsey, the World Bank—than by demonstrated good judgment or real-world achievements. Elite careers are built as a chain of brands, not as a record of wise decisions or tangible real-world results.

An Chilean friend from a prominent family and who went to the US to received such education and pursue career, once described to me in details the dynamic of career advancement among the elites.

The loop typically begins when a talented young person secures admission to a prestigious university—an Ivy League school, Oxbridge, or a similar institution. That first stamp becomes the foundational accreditation on their CV. From there, they are recruited by what might be called “finishing schools”

for the ruling class: firms like McKinsey, Goldman Sachs, Booz Allen, or equivalent consultancies and banks. These organizations absorb large numbers of elite graduates, train them in their house style and jargon, and then expect most of them to move on after a few years, carrying the brand with them.

Networking then acts as a form of implicit, ongoing accreditation. These firms maintain strong ties with their alumni even as they move into other companies, international institutions, or government. This fosters a durable sense that “we’re all in it together” across otherwise separate organizations. Time spent at such firms—or at bodies like the World Bank, the IMF, or major NGOs—becomes another credential, signaling to future employers that the individual is part of the trusted network and has passed through multiple elite filters.

Careers are thus built as a sequence of stamps rather than as an accumulation of responsibility and proved competence. A typical path might look like this: an Ivy League economics degree, two years at Goldman Sachs, three years in risk management at the finance arm of a large tech company, a short stint at the World Bank, and then an application to become CFO of a mid-sized firm or to take a senior policy role in government. To a recruiter or selection committee, the sequence itself is often enough. The path shows that the person is a “semi-heavyweight” who has cleared all the right gates, regardless of whether their concrete decisions at each stage were wise, disastrous, or simply irrelevant.

These incentives are profoundly unhealthy. Success depends on staying within the accreditation pipeline and never seriously rocking the boat. People are rewarded for conformity, networking, and narrative fluency rather than for accurate judgment, moral courage, or the ability to learn from failure. Because careers hinge on credentials and consensus, elites have every incentive to follow crowd opinion and almost none to make contrarian but correct choices. When they do fail—through bad policies, mismanagement, or catastrophic strategic errors—the consequences are usually cushioned. The same individuals are often recycled into other prestigious roles, think-tanks, or academia, because their brand chain remains intact.

In this way, systemic incompetence at the top not only persists but becomes self-protecting. The system filters for people who know how to navigate institutions, signal loyalty, and repeat the prevailing story, not for those who can confront reality when it is inconvenient or dangerous.

The end result is a Western elite class that is:

- Extremely compliant
- Lacking in critical thinking
- Arrogant
- Risk-averse
- And, in many crucial areas, ignorant

Why Incompetence Looks Like Conspiracy

So now Western institutions routinely produce leaders like Ned Price, Kaja Kallas, Ursula von der Leyen, Mark Rutte, Keir Starmer, Friedrich Merz, and many others: impeccably credentialed, highly confident, and rhetorically aggressive, yet often strikingly ignorant about geography, history, and the practical consequences of their decisions. They have spent decades collecting degrees and titles, not learning how to think clearly under pressure or how to protect the basic interests of their societies.

This mismatch between status and competence leads to catastrophic failures: unnecessary wars, chronic financial instability, coercive and poorly designed pandemic measures, the suppression of dissent and protest, sweeping censorship regimes, the “woke” capture of key institutions, and strategic blunders such as cutting off access to cheap Russian gas without a realistic replacement plan. When similar mistakes occur across many Western countries at roughly the same time, and are justified with almost identical language, it is understandable that observers begin to suspect a single hidden agenda.

From the outside, the pattern can look too synchronized to be accidental. The same talking points appear in Washington, Brussels, London, Paris, and beyond; the same moral slogans are used to defend policies that repeatedly hurt ordinary people. Faced with this eerie alignment, many people conclude that there must be a secret, Illuminati-style conspiracy coordinating everything behind the scenes, rather than many different elites independently making the same kinds of bad decisions for the same structural reasons.

But the reality is both more banal and more disturbing. These Western elites do not possess a secret, coherent grand strategy; they are not master planners playing four-dimensional chess. Most of the time, they improvise, protect their own careers, and default to whatever their peers regard as acceptable. Because their advancement depends on staying inside the accreditation network and maintaining the right image, they copy one another's policies, language, and risk assessments. This herd behavior creates synchronized errors that feel centrally directed, even when no single group is actually in charge.

Many of the policies that damage ordinary citizens—extreme restrictions and coercions during the pandemic, the dismissal of protests, the promotion of obviously shaky narratives, or the determination to prolong confrontation with Russia—are best understood as the natural output of this class. These are officials who are confident because they are insulated, who cannot think outside their ideological box, and who have never been forced to pay the price for their own mistakes. They are not super-villains flawlessly executing a centuries-long blueprint; they are members of a ruling class selected for the wrong qualities and rewarded for repeating the same errors.

It is therefore crucial to see the Western elite for what it really is: a class formed by a broken system of accreditation and incentives, trapped in its own echo chamber, and therefore condemned to make similar, predictable mistakes again and again. From the outside, this can look like coordinated malice. In truth, it is something less dramatic but more toxic: structural incompetence, arrogance without wisdom, and conformity without understanding.

What If the Western Elites Were Competent

If Western elites were genuinely competent—reality-oriented, principled, high-minded, and intellectually independent—the West would feel to many people like a kind of rough paradise: not perfect, but far saner, fairer, and more livable than it is today.

A culture of reality, not narrative

In a West led by competent elites, public life would be organized around reality rather than PR.

- Governments, media, and major institutions would treat facts as hard constraints, not as obstacles to be spun away. Models, predictions, and policies would be routinely tested against outcomes and openly revised when they failed.
- A president or senior official caught saying something false would be expected to correct themselves in public, not to double down and smear critics as “misinformed” or guilty of “disinformation.” Spin would still exist, but brazen gaslighting would be career-ending, not career-enhancing.

You would feel this shift in everyday life. When a crisis hit—a war, a pandemic, unrest in a foreign country—you would hear explanations that acknowledge uncertainty, lay out trade-offs, and clarify which assumptions might be wrong. Citizens would grow accustomed to leaders occasionally saying: “We misread this. Here is what we are changing, and why.”

Institutions that actually work

Competent elites would treat institutions as tools for solving problems, not as ticket dispensers for careers.

- The state would focus on core functions: security, justice, infrastructure, basic public health, and a stable economic and legal

framework. Agencies would be judged on clear output metrics: crime trends, infrastructure quality, accurate excess mortality reporting after vaccination campaigns, educational outcomes, and similar indicators.

- Regulators would enforce simple, predictable rules instead of labyrinthine procedures that only large, well-lawyered players can navigate.

In such a world, the average person would experience government as competent but mostly unobtrusive. You could start a small business without drowning in forms. Court cases would move quickly enough that justice still felt like justice. Public transport in major cities would be clean, safe, and reliable by default, not an unexpected luxury.

Meritocracy that rewards judgment

The selection system for elites would reward the ability to make good decisions under uncertainty, not the mere accumulation of credentials.

- Education would shift back toward sharpening the mind. Elite schools would build their reputations by producing graduates who can reason, argue both sides of a case, admit error, and learn new domains quickly. Ideological litmus tests would be recognized as a sign of intellectual fragility, not virtue.
- Hiring and promotion at the top—whether in the civil service, corporations, or major NGOs—would focus on track record: what hard calls did this person make, and how did those decisions turn out over time? Degrees and brand-name employers would matter less than demonstrated competence in real situations.

Over the years, this would slowly dismantle the accreditation loop. A forty-year-old who built a successful mid-sized business or turned around a failing hospital could rival an Ivy-League–McKinsey–World-Bank résumé for top roles. Ordinary people would see more leaders who had actually run something in the real world before being put in charge of entire sectors.

Rich, free, and stable

With this kind of leadership, Western societies would become wealthier, freer, and more stable at the same time.

- Economically, competent elites would pursue policies that maximize long-term productive capacity: encouraging innovation, removing barriers to building and entrepreneurship, and avoiding unsustainable debt or bubbles. Crises would still occur, but they would be shorter, less severe, and less obviously self-inflicted.
- Politically, free speech would be treated as both a safety valve and an information-gathering tool, not primarily as a threat to be managed. Censorship would be rare and tightly constrained, because elites confident in their reasoning would prefer to argue and persuade rather than to silence.

Most citizens would see steady, modest improvements in their living standards: better and more affordable housing in growing cities, high-quality medical care that does not bankrupt them, and an education system that genuinely prepares children for adult life. People would feel that if they worked reasonably hard and behaved decently, the system was broadly on their side.

Trust instead of cynicism

Above all, a competent elite would rebuild something that now appears almost utopian: trust.

- Because major decisions would be explained clearly and checked against observable results, ordinary people could follow the feedback loop between policy and outcome. When leaders asked for sacrifice—higher taxes, temporary restrictions, vaccination campaigns, military commitments—citizens could see both the rationale and the limits.

- Scandals and mistakes would still occur, but the default response would be investigation, accountability, and learning, not stonewalling and quiet promotion to another post. Over time, corruption and cover-ups would come to feel like deviations from the norm rather than the permanent background noise of political life.

Such a West would not be paradise in the sense of perfection or the absence of suffering. It would be paradise in the older, humbler sense: a place where life is recognizably hard but ordered and hopeful; where institutions are fallible yet fixable; and where those who govern are capable enough that most people can simply get on with living, working, raising families, and building their own small corners of the world.

A System Too Entrenched to Reform

I want to close this section with a sober assessment: it is very unlikely that Western elites—or the system that produces them—will undergo meaningful reform anytime soon. The structures described throughout this chapter are not accidental flaws; they are deeply embedded features of a self-reinforcing system. Education, accreditation, and career incentives all align to reproduce the same type of leadership, generation after generation. Systems like this do not correct themselves easily, especially when those who benefit from them are also those responsible for reform.

In the meantime, the trajectory appears set. The quality of leadership will continue to deteriorate, and with it, the resilience of Western societies. This decline is not occurring in isolation. It is compounded by deeper internal weaknesses—cultural, ideological, and institutional—that are eroding these societies from within. These dynamics will be explored in detail in the next chapter, *The Trojan Horse: How Noble Ideas Unravel Societies*.

Viewed through a broader historical lens, the current moment bears uncomfortable similarities to the late stages of the Roman Empire: a loss of institutional competence, an erosion of shared purpose, and elites increasingly detached from the realities faced by ordinary citizens. History

does not repeat itself exactly, but it often rhymes—and the echoes here are difficult to ignore.

Faced with this outlook, one must think not in terms of reforming the system, but of navigating it wisely. For individuals and families, the priority becomes preservation: of stability, of opportunity, and of a coherent future. That may, in some cases, require difficult decisions, including the possibility of leaving environments that are visibly entering a phase of long-term decline.

As will be discussed in the third chapter, *The Right Side of History: In Search of Continuity*, certain countries appear better positioned to offer that stability and continuity. Among them, Russia stands out as a state that, despite its challenges, maintains a clearer sense of direction, sovereignty, and long-term strategic coherence.

The question, ultimately, is not whether the West will change course—but whether you can leave before it's too late.

CHAPTER 2

The Trojan Horse: How Noble Ideas Unravel Societies

The West

The sections 'Enforced Gynocentrism', 'The Worship of Nature', 'Repression of Truth', and 'Sliding into Dystopic Postmodernism' are not included in this sample.

CHAPTER 3

The Right Side of History: In Search of Continuity

Russia

The sections ‘A Terrible Geography: a History of Defense’, ‘A Great Historical Tragedy: the Fall and Fragmentation of the Soviet Union’, ‘How Far Russia Has Come’, and ‘Russia – China: the Great Partnership’ are not included in this sample.