





Since the latest official document of the military doctrine of the United States, just published, directly relates in the same package what is happening between Ukraine and Russia with the pulse with China, and considers that this is the main dimension of all this, it is necessary to ask about the genesis of the current situation: how did we come to this? What happened?

To answer, one must look at the general framework of several decades of "Chinese success".

### *Success*

China's integration into globalization, understood in this case as the pseudonym of US world domination, implicitly contained the scenario of turning China into a vassal of the West.

The purpose was to pressure China to implement the structural reforms defined by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, to fully open its markets to Western companies, and to ensure that the integration of Chinese elites into its globalization would eventually result in a subordinate form of government more acceptable to the West than that of the Chinese Communist Party.

To buy a single Boeing aircraft from the United States, China had to produce one hundred million pairs of pants.

It was not foreseen that playing on the terrain designed by others, China would twist that purpose. The "Chinese miracle" was to use a Western recipe designed for their submission to strengthen autonomously and independently. It did so by placing conditions and restrictions on the entry of foreign capital into China and, above all, by maintaining a firm grip on the reins of the process. It succeeded because, thanks to the low price and high

efficiency of labor in China, foreign capitalists and businessmen made huge profits in the "factory of the world" and this appeased and moderated their governments.

China took advantage of this integration into globalization to develop, learn and acquire technology.

The results are in sight and are extraordinary in all respects; in terms of increase in average life expectancy, elimination of poverty, GDP (remember that in 1980 China's weight in global GDP was 2.3% and today it is 18.5%), education, science and technology, military, large companies, without forgetting, of course, the great progress in harmful environmental emissions. All of that will enter the history and economics textbooks of the future.

Faced with this result, a well-known American commentator (CNN's Fareed Zakaria) expressed his bewilderment thus:

*"The strategy produced complications and complexities that led to a more powerful China that did not respond to Western expectations," that is, the expectation that in the process China would become subaltern.*

All this happened in the last 30 years, but the chronicle of recent years added even more anxiety to the situation. The 2008 global financial crisis, a genuine detritus to the U.S.-centric casino economy, offered the first major evidence of Western weakness and the dangers of non-regularization of the financial sector, as well as the general fact that capital rules over governments rather than the other way around. China governed the crisis much better, as it had happened eight years earlier with the bursting of the dot-com bubble.

Before, the disastrous consequences of the wars that have been chained since the attacks of September 11, 2001, with more than three million dead, some forty million displaced and several societies and states destroyed, made clear a gigantic irresponsibility on the part of the first world power. The withdrawal of the United States from the climate change agreement and the mismanagement of the pandemic crisis in the West (compared not only to China, but to the whole of East Asia) increased that evidence of disorder. So, against this backdrop, the U.S. response has been military pressure and sanctions.

*The answer*

Desde la normalización de relaciones chino-soviéticas de mayo de 1989, China había gozado de treinta años de tranquilidad exterior que le permitieron concentrarse en su desarrollo.

Autoeliminada la URSS como gran adversario, en los noventa la mirada de los estrategas de Washington se empezó a dirigir a China, pero el 11-S neoyorkino colocó en el centro al

terrorismo yihadista (otro resultado de la mala política anterior que se volvía contra sus autores) y ofreció a China una prórroga de diez años: diez años más de relativa tranquilidad.

In 2012, Obama announced the Pivot to Asia, moving the bulk of the *U.S.* military-naval force to the Pacific, to tighten the military encirclement around China.

The Chinese reacted by putting on their seat belts: strengthening the party's authority at all levels and personal leadership at its collective leadership.

But above all, in 2013 China announced *the "New Silk Road"* (Belt & Road Initiative), an ambitious global strategy to break the fence, and export overcapacity. That is, a strategy at once geopolitical and economic.

The New Silk Road is a decades-long effort with astronomical funding (\$4 to \$8 trillion) aimed at establishing an international geo-economic support network that economically and commercially integrates 70% of humanity across Eurasia. Without needing to recall the theses of Halford Mackinder that are now being dusted, that necessarily erodes the world power of the United States in the hemisphere. It also greatly complicates any purpose of encircling a power that without being a "friend", nor "ally", nor "bloc leader", is a positive partner of almost all nations.



Shanghai Cooperation Organization, members, observers and associates

The implicit goal of the New Silk Road, in the words of Henry Kissinger, is nothing less than "to shift the world's center of gravity from the Atlantic to the Pacific." Next to it the historic Marshall Plan remains as something small...

*Cold war*

Under Donald Trump, the climate change was abrupt, especially when in his July 2020 speech Secretary of State Michael Pompeo openly appealed for regime change in China,

directly pointing to the Chinese Communist Party as the "main enemy of the United States."

Despite the unusual division of the *American establishment*, the policy of trade sanctions and military pressure against China has a broad consensus in both factions of the US regime.

This is already an open cold war, with strong propaganda campaigns and demonization of the adversary. With Biden, we are witnessing an escalation of tension with Taiwan, the world's leading producer of semiconductors, taking center stage.

Since 1978, the recognition of the "one China" principle, i.e. Taiwan is part of it, as well as the *Taiwan Relations Act* (TRA) of 1979, were the foundation of the bilateral relationship in this area.

The content of the TRA was ambiguous: although the island belonged to China, it contemplated the supply of "defensive weapons" to Taiwan and said that any attempt to get Beijing to resolve secession by force would be cause for "grave concern". That is to say: it was not said "we will help Taiwan militarily if there is conflict".

Now it is said. Biden has said it four or five times. In addition, all U.S. action is not taken by the U.S. UU draws a provocative rethinking that John Ross exposes as follows in *Tricontinental* (published in Spanish by El Salto):

For the first time since the beginning of diplomatic relations between China and the United States, Biden invited a representative of Taipei to the inauguration of the US president.

Speaker Nancy Pelosi—the third-highest ranking U.S. official in the order of presidential succession—visited Taipei on August 2, 2022.

The United States has called for Taipei's participation in the United Nations.

The United States has intensified the sale of arms and military equipment to the island.

(e) The number of U.S. delegations visiting Taipei has increased.

U.S. Special Forces have trained Taiwanese ground and navy troops.

The United States has increased its military deployment in the South China Sea and has regularly sent warships through the Taiwan Strait.

As in Ukraine with its de facto integration into NATO and its conversion into a military battering ram against Russia since 2014, this end to ambiguity with Taiwan means that Washington crosses a historic red line of China. And as in Ukraine, in the most immediate geographical environment of the adversary. In addition, the United States is pressuring other countries in the Chinese environment Australia, India, Japan, South Korea, (also

England and the EU itself) to join sanctions and military coalitions, in the same way it has done in Europe with Ukraine.

As in Ukraine, in the Taiwan crisis there is no interest in negotiations to resolve tensions with a step back, or to prevent accidental military clashes, or to reduce risks in general.

The American security strategy asserts that the war in Ukraine, and the weakness of Russia that it appreciates in it, confirm that China represents "*the main threat, as the only competitor endowed with sufficient economic, military and political power necessary to rethink the international order*". To this end, he calls for revitalizing the network of alliances that reduce China's ability to maneuver. That is what is being done.

The war in Ukraine, which China certainly did not want, is aimed at militarily preventing the Eurasian integration that is a fundamental axis of China's *grand strategy of the New Silk Road*. The attack on the Baltic gas pipelines is the best illustration of this action to break vital links and must be read in that context. From that point of view, Ukraine is part and prolegomena of the current cold war against China in East Asia.

For the time being, and although this vector may present problems in the future, it has been possible to turn the European Union into a vassal and integrate it into that cold war against its main Chinese trading partner, which seriously damages its own economy.

The awareness of all this explains China's position in this war, its position that "European security must be decided by Europeans" (Xi Jinping to Olaf Scholz in May), and its opposition to sanctions against Russia, crystal exposed in April by Chinese television commentator Liu Xin: "*We are told, Help me fight your Russian partner so that I can better concentrate against you later.*"

"The post-Cold War era is definitely over, and a competition is underway among the major powers to shape what comes next," President Biden writes in the introduction to the just-released 2022 "National Security Strategy" document. "China is the only competitor intent on redefining the international order that has the capabilities to do so," he says.

The eloquent Ursula von der Leyen, the "*American president of Europe*", according to the magazine "Politico" of the United States, recognizes the unity of the whole package and the European belligerence in it, when she affirms that "the war in Ukraine is not just a European war, it is a war for the future of the world so the scope of Europe can only be the whole world". That's where we're at.

*Rafael Poch de Feliu*

*Edited by [María Piedad Ossaba](#)*

*Source: [Rafael Poch de Feliu](#) – Blog, November 8, 2022*

**La Pluma. net 08.11.2022**