



A Frenzy World Order: Between Diplomatic Cooperation and Deceiving Entanglement

Khalida Madoui

Ecole Normale Supérieure Assia Djebar (Algeria)

madouikhalida4@gmail.com

Abstract

This article tackles how The United States rose out of its isolationism and was to head the world on behalf of democracy, and the free enterprise. In its race with the Soviet Union, the United States rose glorious and thought after the Cold War unilateralism would prevail. The work aims to demonstrate that, by the turning of the twentieth century, Asia rose as a geopolitical mighty continent and endangered the US hegemony. Not only Russia rose and its revived policy traced new geopolitical pillars to the country but also is today making with the great China and Iran a Eurasian coalition that is really endangering an earlier western order. The article sheds light mainly on the Chess game in the Middle East and shows the new balances of power at the international arena and how they are playing geopolitically. The basic methods carried throughout the work are: the Qualitative Data Analysis, the Interpretative Policy Analysis and the Discursive Narrative Analysis. Indeed, it presents the events from a historical perspective when their interpretation is made via a critical argumentative one.

Article info

Received

February 13 ;2024

Accepted

September 03;2024

Keyword:

- ✓ American Hegemony
- ✓ Rise of Russia
- ✓ The Trade War and China
- ✓ Iran resistance
- ✓ Euroasianism.



1. Introduction

The American leviathan rose up in arm unipolar after the Cold War, all set and certain it is but to orchestrate irretrievably the world in its own geopolitical paths. The Chinese dragon, however, and the Russian bear just a phoenix that never dies, would upturn veracities and would not bow to the US game and rules; a new dawn for a Eurasian century is to hold back the American hegemonic and might to have its unipolar say. Multipolarism grew and face up the US's world order. Key regions are boiling in the world and an escalating friction between the great payers, the US, the SU and China together with strategic pivot nations say Iran, Syria and Turkey, all made of the Middle East and the Far East the regions the most troublesome. The US applauding to the echoes its hegemony and uneager to give up the role of the sheriff of the world continued to contend any raising power and rebuke the idea it is declining as a unipolar and superpower as the new world realities are imposing multipolarity if not giving ascendance to a new hegemon, China. Together with Moscow, Peking with hands given to key regions in the Middle East are making an Eurasian territorial might that is challenging a long standing American naval power. Is it a New Cold War where powers negate each other's clout and impose the new rules on the Chess board? It is surely a hot cold war by the time Ukrainian battlefields succumbed to fighting.

2. Methodology

2.1. Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

Amidst twentieth century politico-economic realities, the United States; the hegemon since WWII, and the leader par excellence of a *Pax Americana* seems facing challenges for its premium role. Becoming a debtor, facing deficits and inflation, losing headship in trade as

facing new foreign investments of other growing nation, chasing extremists everywhere, seeking others' oil, all were but novelties of the international arena the US is to face up. Key research questions would then rise out of new imposed rules of the geopolitical game worldwide: In what way the US is losing its hegemony? How the "revanchist" Russian policy and the Chinese open economic policy is endangering the earlier world order America created? Is *Pax Americana* dying as facing terrorist attacks by the time the US is considering a Middle Easter hegemon, say Iran, part of the ISIS? What new strategies may save the role of the American Sheriff? Is that game really over?

2.2. Aims of Research

This research aims at shedding light on the new realities of world order after growing nations had made it difficult for the American hegemony to keep first amidst the international scene. It shows how a powerful Russia, eager to manage alongside Eurasianism, had made the other eastern part of the world challenge the modern liberal mode and end the universality myth. Russia besides an economic growing China but surely backing Iran and the Middle East endangered regions had created a new chess game where no hegemon yet is to arise but surely a multipolar world is to emerge. The article shows how the American hegemony is facing up emerging nations and realities on geopolitics and economy.

2.3. Methodology and Analysis

Through "Qualitative Data Analysis" (Glynos et al., 2009, p.13), the article analyzes corpora as: books of history or academicians' researches considering events and politics of the world. Researches

not only present historical accounts on the rise or the fading American hegemony and the circumstances leading to new realities through a historical descriptive approach, they also provide criticism through argumentative analysis of narratives and counter narratives on key events and policies. What is to appear are the circumstances that helped other nations to grow in the international arena in a way it transcended the US might and hegemony and opened a large gate for a new world order, a post-unilateral system that is to create rather multipolarity.

The Discursive Narrative Analysis and the Interpretive Policy Analysis go beyond the historicity of the events in this research. Indeed, a narrative describes a 'sequence of events' (Sutherland, 2013, p. 1) and should not be presented as a chronological or linear; but rather in reflective ideas. In that way a movement in time, that is an analysis of past events that created America the hegemon with considerations of present realities and the American fading hegemony in view of a futuristic multipolar world is apparent of the work. The Interpretive Policy Analysis sheds light on policy process making worldwide. Interpretations and arguments on key events that are making realities between war and peace and between rising and declining nations helps understand the emerging new world order. A narrative analysis constructs an 'interpretive context' to cognize and analyze the socio-political universal arena. 'contextualization' aids understand and locate past events to understand present ones and speculate what horizons might hide (Glynos et al., pp.20-24).

3. Background to the American Imperialism

Straightforwardly after the American Spanish war in 1898, the United States (US) embarked at the turning of the nineteenth

century with new strategists and doctrines that brought it -as manifest destiny would have it- overseas. The American navy stretching over oceans, notably after the Panama Canal was built, challenged actually the British maritime supremacy. National power eased growth of the U.S. and its fast industrialization surpassed the global GDP and unseated the British from the economic primacy as well. With the war outbreak, the American military force was to emerge worldwide along its idealism that President Woodrow Wilson incorporated in the European geopolitics. Europe, reliant on the US in that war to recover from the ashes, lost an earlier might and prestige in the international scene. Keeping isolated was basically coming out of a sense of securing the US shores, afar from mayhem and a frenzy world headed heretofore by Europeans. In the wars' aftermath the geopolitical game ascertained new rules however when The US and ex-SU took over; the quest for global supremacy architected a fifty-years-Cold War. The geopolitical new scene faced the two oceans' maritime might of North America to the Eurasian territorial strength. The nuclear weapons that had shown might from both parts were by the same token endangering and any escalation was to be hindered with much self-discipline and wisdom (Brezizinski, 1997, pp. 4-6).

During the Cold War and even after, the US held an international preeminence and might as- though dissimilarly- did prior empires. Like imperialists that were infected by an imperialist syndrome besides the adventure and glory, 'the white man's burden' and 'la mission civilisatrice'. The US still though launched a cooperative policy with nations since its entanglement in world affairs. Participation in regional economic cooperation as Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC) and North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), together with communal security systems as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC) are

but illustrations of the American military and economic participation and infiltration abroad. Likewise, international financial institutions say specialized global cooperative institutions as the World Bank, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are part of the American global system, all architected by the Americans in Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. Brzezinski thinks countries deliberately have a rather irrevocable penchant for being shielded by the US (ibid, pp. 12-16).

4. The Birth of a Russian Mighty Geopolitical Rival

Since the world order turned into unipolarity, the policy of the Kremlin has been oscillating between continuity and change but ineluctably challenging to the White House. Indeed, Russia was looking for the glorious Soviet era by maximizing its power and ensuring security in a disruptive and jeopardous globe. The Middle Eastern-Russian ties had confronted Moscow and Washington all over again as the situation was strategically and diplomatically escalating there. Russian foreign policy had always been favoring non-entanglement in internal affairs of foreign countries. Exceptions befell by the turning of the third millennium with the annexation of the Georgian Crimea which constituted a real face up to Western advancement and marked actually a Russian regional might and international back. This in fact was ensured by the political centralization in leadership inherited since the Tsar days and that undeniably endured with the Russian Constitution. The pre-2000 Russian foreign policy was characterized by an opening to an Eastern-Western diplomacy and a joining to the NATO but soon a tougher Russian policy was to assert a new tendency towards global issues and a balancing multipolar order to stand up the American hegemony. That was a new realism between the traditional and realist national interest view point that is

targetting “ legitimacy in regional and global politics” and “revitalizing the great power” of Russia. (Garcia, pp. 104 -106).

Since he took office, President Vladimir Putin sought attain a national idea that safeguards his achieved goals and the community seems cherishing the ‘cast of the West’ as a revisionist policy. Revival and revanchism had gone hand in hand indeed. A tough foreign policy might be perceived as a regain of lost pride or a reaction of a feeling of low self-esteem or may be simply a habit of being but imperial, a status to be recovered. ‘The Russian bear arose from the dead’ seemingly, and like a phoenix Russia reasserted itself in international arena as a player that never dies (McNabb, 2016 pp. 8-10). The foreign policy of President Putin had ever been controversial to the West and the NATO’s diplomacies. The NATO sweeping strategy along former Russian influence zones together with the ‘out of area’ operations was annoying for Russia. Moreover, the US cancelation of the Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABMT) had shown how isolationist Russia was treated; a policy it wouldn’t have shut an eye on. The war on terror and the joint scheduled fighting by the US’s side opened nevertheless new horizons for a rising Russia. Some would have seen this as a ‘bandwagoning’ from the part of President Putin with all new summits and prerogative granted to the US and EU. However, Economics had upturned the game as The Europeans were the main gas importer from Russia. Moreover, the 9/11 upheaval was the window of opportunity that enabled Russian entanglement in Central Asia and the Caucasus, the region the most disruptive at its periphery (Nygren , 2008, pp.7-19).

Since the collapse of the USSR, Russia implemented a security policy that is not conventional. Russia had even sensed jeopardy by external foes and accordingly any surroundings are to be watched out. This meant for Russia a security measurement that depends on expansionism and a rely on ‘buffer zones’ as it did with Warsaw Pact

earlier and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), and Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) today. The “third Rome” theory¹ made of Russia’s imperial self-esteem surfaced behind the shield of President Putin. Add to these, the Kremlin centralized but also ‘vertikal’ policy made of Russia’ security that fussy as unopened to any democratization notably with the rise of the fundamentalist threat. Such a belief and doctrinal thinking made of Russian strategies expansionist over territories of Caucasia and Central Asia and Ukraine but almost all lost by its crumple (De Haas, 2010. p.3). Indeed, the case of Ukraine is worth mentioning for the ties between both Moscow and Kyiv were at frictions since Ukraine’s independence. Though the signature of both Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Budapest Memorandum ensured the security and sovereignty of Ukraine from any territorial assault, the Crimea-offered by President Nikita Khrushchev to Kyiv in 1984- led to a real political malaise between the two neighbors over the Black Sea Fleet at Sevastopol that ended by the Crimean annexation to Russia by 1914 resurrecting a Cold War aura with the US and EU members (Kimball, 2014).

During the 1990’s ‘retrenchment’, Russia knew real fallout in economic and militant capabilities that knew a rise under President Putin. The Russian recovery depended mainly on oil and gas’ sectors. After it shrunk, the defense budget of Russia rose to mark 20,4% of the GDP when a year ago it was only 15% as an instance (US defense was estimated at 39% in 2013). The might however will be only regional as Russia is trapped East by China and West by EU and a ‘Balkanized’ Ukraine. Still though, the Eurasian architectural building comes to be among the priorities of Russia’s revanchist and ‘grand strategy’. In spite of a

challenging realities and a geopolitical uncertain Asian fusion that may ease corporation and guarantee a Russian ‘sub regional’ primacy, many corporations advanced exchange in economic and security within a Eurasian frame as Putin’s Eurasian union, The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)², and Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO). Russian’s regional hegemony is far reaching in a USSR formula but it promotes corporation with allies and neighbor; that was the new mulipolar reality, an Eurasian challenge rather (Sussex, 2015, pp. 24-29).

Five key geostrategic players and five geopolitical pivots can be defined in Eurasia: France, Germany, Russia, China, and India are major and active players while Ukraine, Azerbaijan, South Korea, Turkey, and Iran play the role of critically important geopolitical pivots. France and Germany are seeking the US political linkage and a dream to make a new shaped Europe when Great Britain is getting afar the European ‘game’ and then is no more as traditionally and historically said a geostrategic player. Brezezinski gave a historical account to light up this idea as follows:

Sir Roy Denman, a former British senior official in the European Commission, recalls in his memoirs that as early as the 1955 conference in Messina, which previewed the formation of a European Union, the official spokesman for Britain flatly asserted to the assembled would-be architects of Europe. The future treaty which you are discussing has no chance of being agreed; if it was agreed, it would have no chance of being applied. And if it was applied, it would be totally unacceptable to Britain ...au revoir et bonne chance. (as cited in Brezezinski, p. 23)

¹ After Rome and Constantinople

² The SCO comprises eight states China, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Pakistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan

Britain's unwillingness to participate in the Economic and Monetary Union, targeted for January 1999 had shown its rejection to a political unification; it prefers an economic corporation based on free trade but a political security agenda far afield the European community. Britain is still an American ally but 'is a retired geostrategic player'. (ibid, p. 23)

5. *Eurasianism: A Political Philosophy and Episteme in Point*

The spin mattered actually. Whatever the spin, Eurasianism being a 'political philosophy and episteme' is open to conservatism ideologies be they traditional, revolutionary or social but never liberal as it denies Western 'universalism'. Alexander Dugin the God father of the Eurasian project favors plurality on the basis of a civilizational epistemic diversity. Eurasianists simply think about a new concoct - afar modernism and westernization- that provide with new forms fitting other communities more open to geopolitics and anthropology, neo Eurasianism surfaces to face up modernity in a post-modern aura and then is detaching from western culture and its superiority. Eurasianism-structuralism neoeurasianism insight brought ideational structural basis upon which politicians may formulate their Eurasia's project doable (Dugin, 2012, pp. 136-139). This is a project of an 'integration of large space' say a 'Great Space'; a civilizational entity. (ibid, p. 155). Dugin wrote:

Before our eyes this new reality is emerging – the reality of one world organised entirely on the American paradigm...This Empire is uni-polar and concentric by its very nature...

In order to promote our project of a Greater Europe and the multi-polarity concept, we appeal to the different forces in European countries, and to the Russians, the Americans, the Asians, to reach beyond their political options, cultural differences and religious choices

to support actively our initiative, to create in any place or region Committees for a Greater Europe or other kinds of organizations sharing the multi-polar approach, rejecting uni-polarity, the growing danger of American imperialism and elaborating a similar concept for other civilizations. If we work together, strongly affirming our different identities, we will be able to found a balanced, just and better world, a Greater World where any worthy culture, society, faith, tradition and human creativity will find its proper and granted place. In the centre there is the 'rich North', Atlantic community. All the rest of the world, –the zone of underdeveloped or developing countries, considered peripheral, – is presumed to be following the same direction and the same course that the core countries of the West did long before it (ibid, pp. 242-245).

The Eurasian political board comprises three key players: Russia, China, and the European Union. Each of these might not exist geopolitically isolated from the other in spite of the intricacy of making the fusing project come true. Trapped in the centre, Russia that like the 'double headed eagle' of its emblem is oscillating between two directions: the European, and the Asian, the movement of the chess pieces is hence forwards and backward that axis. China, the second Eastern player might be hegemonic over Eurasia as economics are serving each of them, but this depends on civilizational aspects that will locate Russia either in Europe's or in Asia's cultural milieu. Many problems stretching today from North Africa to Afghanistan seem urging both continents create a new context that is to face off emerging security threats in regions where resources are rich but in a troublesome Muslim-majority area. Today Russia is eager to create a 'Greater Eurasia' when China thinks Asia is its 'natural 'sphere of influence'. The aim of President Putin in launching this strategy that unites Europe, Asia and Russia in between is thought to be

a strategy to avoid being what Zbigniew Brzezinski called a 'black hole' between China and Europe, and the two poles might be closed up (Mações, 2018, 54-56).

Russia, though enfeebled compared to its earlier high days, is still a great geostrategic player and had much influence on earlier Soviet satellites. Once strong its toll on surrounding states was noteworthy though the question that revolves today in the minds is whether Russia is to become a European democracy or an Eurasian empire in spite of earlier lost pieces. Likewise, China is a major player; it is actually affecting the distribution of power in Asia, as its economic thrust is making its might in the region. Moreover, the Taiwan issue will certainly give rise and affect the American perch in the Far East. Like South Korea that is allying with the US, Japan is a growing economy in the East and still keeping under the American protectorate. This leaves the door open for American security role in the Far East as keeping an eye on any Chinese steps forwards Chinese-Japanese diplomacy. India considers itself, notwithstanding, as a Chinese rival; it is a regional 'hegemon' but not that bothering the US interests in the South Asian. Ukraine is a geopolitical pivot; had it lost its independence the European steady eastern borders would have been endangered- Poland falls too I that case considering the dominoes effect. Still though if Russia controls Ukraine, had an outsized sight on the black sea, its imperial Eurasian might turns quite ubiquitous, something China will surely abhors. Similar to Ukraine, Azerbaijan, a source of oil and pipelines to Europe, is a significant independent steady domino; its statue will be decisive towards the Russian imperial project. Turkey and Iran, potent geopolitical players but fighting each other's reach are far from being hegemon in the region; they are still geopolitical pivots (Brzezinski, pp. 21-26).

In short, this what Brzezinski said about Iran and Turkey:

"Turkey stabilizes the Black Sea region, controls access from it to the Mediterranean Sea, balances Russia in the Caucasus, still offers an antidote to Muslim fundamentalism, and serves as the southern anchor for NATO..... Iran dominates the eastern shoreline of the Persian Gulf, while its independence, irrespective of current Iranian hostility toward the United States, acts as a barrier to any long-term Russian threat to American interests in the Persian Gulf region." (ibid , p26)

Russian Euroasianism emerged as an expansionist strategy with geographical relations it developed and deepened with Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon and Pakistan, protecting, hence, its borders between the Caucasus and the Middle East. The use of force was an instrument that would highly serve Russia regain its might while facing up Washington. Intervention in Syria for instance, making it a geopolitical ally was an unpredictable military move in the new century, a step that seized to be since the early years of Cold War. The Middle East diplomatic significance is threefold for Russia: it is economic to protect oil and gas agreements, it is political to promote ties between Russia and Middle Easterners, and it is securing as Russia is fighting terrorism say fundamental Islamic groups spreading violence and Mass Destruction Weapons' production (MDW). Not only the Turkish-Russian ties were aiming at realizing an economic progress³ but also at withstanding Western entanglement in neighboring countries⁴, and maintaining a powerful status in the international Arena. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism and its support by the Turks is controversial for the Russians,

³ Turkey signed an agreement in 1984 on natural gas, Russia's top priority is gas and oil pipelines towards Turkey and Europe.

⁴ The Asetana agreement was meant to placate the Syrian-Turkish issue on the de escalation zones

however, who perceived that path as regional threat indeed (Garcia, p. 109).

6. Russia Amidst International Crisis

Likewise, the Syrian case presents another challenging issue to settle in between Moscow and Ankara.⁵ Turkey claims it is eager to keep a well secured Syria but also and controversially sustains a free Kurdistan state, to ensure safety towards the Mediterranean and European markets. The Kurdish project implementation stunk in the nostrils of Russia as it is by its borders and threatens the Russian Oil State Company, ROSNEFT. It would encumber any attempt of its secession from Syria. In spite of their diplomatic malaise, Iran, Turkey, Russia adopted the Astana format to put an end to the Syrian conflict (Garcia, 112-113). In Sochi first, President Ardugan and Putin met for an earlier agreement and then in Astana for an intent of 'de-escalation' of Syrian most troublesome regions. Together with President Ruhani, they played the 'guarantors' of peace on May 4th 2017; they were eager to end the assaults and the unsteady confronting situation in Syria to improve the humanitarian situation and open peaceful talks. The agreement tackles too the issue of refugees' return, a cease fire in the de-escalating area and the establishment of zones of security to prevent military confrontations. The basic aim of Russia was to impose its political and strategic might while heading such a political step, not only to ensure alliance vis-à-vis the Syrian regime but also to guarantee Iran will be fighting by its side the opposition, the ISIL and any terrorist groups. Most importantly was to impede Washington seemingly paving a way to intervene military to behave unilaterally in an already devastated Syria (Assessment Report, 2017, pp.1-4).

Giles narrates how ten years after the break of the Syrian war in 2011 the

marvelous decorated mosques became just piles of grey wreckage. Between dead and refugees, one cannot imagine how destructive has been such a war for Syrians. The long-lasting Syrian warfare is today's highly destructive proxy war because of foreign military mingling; they would not tolerate President Assad's ties with Hezbollah and the Iranian Shiite regime. Syria becomes a 'pariah state' since 9/11 because of its ties with Iran. The controversial policy of Syria with respect of Israel and the US led to such an animosity that led to nowadays' disastrous war. Syria with chemical weapons ownership and usage accusation made it part of the Axis power along with North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya and Cuba. The US sanctions on Syria for financing weapon projects' charge worsened its ties with the West. Syria's early assistance to the Maronites in the Lebanese civil war followed by President Rafik Al Harrinri assassination kept Syria's political proclivities skeptical and ousts it from the international community maintained Giles. Syria was ousted from the Arab League and this had enfeebled it as no aid could be granted. Only Russia and Iran stood by the Syrian regimes' side. Since they rebuffed together Iraq, Syrian and Iranian ties were becoming strong. With the Russians, they were stronger since 1971 when the USSR built its port at Tartus. In 2005, Russians reinforced their ties when they canceled 75% of Syrian debts, something that urged Syria to aid too in Russia's confrontation to Georgia. The longer was the war; the more proxy nations were to face confrontations. Today it is the US –Russian escalating frictions regarding Syria and the American troops deployment there that is endangering (Giles, 2019). A new Cold War aura seems emerging, indeed.

In his article, Rais gave another interpretation and a different dimension to the conflict. The Syrian crisis is worsening,

⁵ Iran from its part would support Assad's regime to maintain the stability of the region and its good ties with

Hizbullah, by the time Moscow was too concerned by its pipelines.

according to him, since earlier days of the revolution but it seems rather an inter-regional conflict than an uprising against the regime of Al Assad. Accordingly, Syria becomes part of a struggle of regional supremacy between Iran and the Gulf kingdoms. Iran's steady stature in the region is contingent upon the stability of the recent Syrian regime while the opponents would rather emerge as hegemonic if El Assad is toppled. The two belligerent camps are the pro-Syrian regime and Hizbullah backed by Iran facing the Syrian opposition and the Free Syrian Army supported by the Turkish, the Gulf and the West. This is a proxy war between two regional powers each perusing regional hegemony. The rivalry is basically because of the Shiite-Sunnit divergent doctrines that made them religiously and economically at odds. The Saudis and Qatari financial and weaponry help to the opposition is then to curve the Shiite sect and prevent any Iranian dominion. Iran finances the Arab Syrian Army, sent arms and even fighters. The proxy war is also between great powers that are supporting each camp thus Russians and Westerners by each side. The fall of Syria would have terrific leverage not only on Iran but also Syria. Though a proxy war, the conflict may lead the Syrians into more dissension. The whole region may fall in chaos with a perpetual fighting, the region is already troublesome and the Qaeda is playing off the conditions of each country against the other (Rais, 2013).

The malign intervention of the US was clearly to breed bad blood as it assisted the Kurdish Syrians in 2014 and aided its militia the People's Protection Units (YPG) to invade Kobani own earlier under the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). Its aid was also to topple the caliphate regime there and unable the Kurds install their might for a future independent state. Unexpectedly, President Trump years later abrogated the assistance when his troops were retrieved from North Asia and left the Kurds amidst a fighting against the Turkish

and their 'proxy Arab militias'. The Democratic Autonomous Administrations (DAA) and Democratic Union Party (PYD) aspired project seems affecting the Syrian crisis in a different way. (Tejel, 2020, p 1, para, 1&2). The region indeed, between the American intervention in the North and the Russo-Irano-Turkish protectorate by the Syrian-Turkish borders had revived the era of 'influence zones' of great powers. To Russia and the US, the Turkish become a real great player as its troops and airplanes are repulsive to retrieve the path that made the solution of the Syrian squabble over the frontal areas and zones impossible with a Turkish agreement (ibid, p. 4, Para 4&5).

7. The Chinese American Trade War

Meanwhile the United States that is facing energizing strategic states in Asia where the oil stakes by the Caspian, the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf are internecine by Russia, an earlier rival, it seems also in troubles in the very Far East where the arena knew a Chinese-US frictions imposed by a global new economic order and ended by an endangering trade war; a ticking time bomb. When the Americans imposed safeguard tariffs on Chinese goods, tensions were elevated; something that would threatens their GDP falling, not excluding the effect of the dispute on the European Union. Some would refer to a Sino-American new Cold War. Chinese net export means are energizing though its economy and its exporting market led to a decrease of the US trade contribution worldwide. The fallout of the trade war should not be neglected though the worst scenario could lead to some job position losses and foreign reserves assets decrease, one could hardly imagine it might be devastating and it is not in fact. It is still worth mentioning that diplomatic and economic measures were initiated to put an end to mistrust and supposedly violating policies. After US investments on some productions said to be in contrast to the

World Trade Organization (WTO) and which developed a “full-fledged trade war”, China agreed to review its subsidy policy on wind energy, solar energy, high-performance batteries, and alternative fuel vehicles. It should be then laid out that a return in negotiations table is the last solution after a “tough talk” rhetoric to avoid any real economic or even political traumatic evolution and, henceforth, maintain the status quo (Chong & Li, p. 1-6).

It should be noted that the times where China was a coy growing nation seem to be passing as it is today by the twenty first century eager to quit the discreet profile and demand leadership. This will urge an open economic policy and foreign investment in the Central and Eastern European countries’ area (EEC) that cope with new global markets and its varied production as a strategy. An earlier collaboration, say 16+1 launched by Peoples’ Republic of China with European Union and Balkan is one example. These same collaborators would be part of a strategic region where the new Chinese ‘One Belt One Road Initiative’; say the ‘New Silk Road’ project will be underway in the field of high technology infrastructure and green technologies for instance. EEC engaged in the liberal market are still facing a dishonest field but also insufficient opportunities to build and face their economic deficiencies. The law is not sustainable. Smart diplomacy to face economic problems is very important basically on the basis of political stability.

The European of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) reported the Chinese banks are providing loans for states with low rates. Top down diplomacy, however, needs an understanding in generating soft power on collaborators. China today established ties with Greece, Macedonia, Serbia, and Bosnia for shipments and goods distribution and is expecting the domino effect on the rest. Adam Smith explained in his *Wealth of Nations* “it was not by gold or by silver, but by labor that all the wealth of the world was originally purchased.” (Gorgjievskia, 2019, para 1, 2, 3)

Imposing tariffs on each other’s imported goods marked the escalating trade war between China and the US. Beijing levy 5% on American goods and 15% on the US crude and, hence, approaches the fuel field. While Trump levy 15% on Chinese imported smart speakers, Bluetooth and headphones. The official Xinhua news agency said: “the United States should learn how to behave like a responsible global power and stop acting as a ‘school bully’”. On the people’s daily, it was stated that these tariffs will not blockade the progress of China; all foreign investment cannot be ignored. Indeed, the US policy towards China aimed at compelling changes vis-à-vis ‘intellectual property protection’, ‘technology transfer’ and ‘market accesses. China had ever rejected Washington’s accusations that it is trading illegally. The Trade War is not first of its conflicting genre; already friction over US navigation freedom near the South China Sea and the Taiwan’s sovereignty ⁶

⁶ US-Chinese ties had ever been fractious. The first Taiwan Strait Crisis come out when President Eisenhower elevated the US blockade on Taiwan in 1953, a step followed by the Chinese President Chiang Kai-Shek sending of his troops in Quemoy and Matsu islands in the Taiwan Strait something that created friction between the two countries till August 1954 when they signed a mutual treaty of defense in 1954. In 1955, the US threatened to use the nuclear weapon against China if no withdrawal is accomplished by the nationalists. China developed her Atomic Bomb in 1964 by the time the Vietnamese crisis was escalating. Reagan reduces restrictions on Taiwan with the ‘Six Assurances’ and signed with China a communiqué to normalize ties; a step that comes as a

reaction to the Russian expansionism. In 2000, Clinton signed a US-Chinese trade pact and China joined the World Trade Organization a year later. In 2007, defense spending in China increases with 18% to protect its national security and territory. Vice president Dick Cheney thought of this progress as a ‘peaceful rise’. The crises of 2008 made China the largest holder of the US debts and led to a real interdependence in the Sino-American economies. Two years passed and China becomes the second largest economy; it is in its way to overtake the primacy in economy. Trans Pacific Partnership was signed with countries in the pacific region during Obama’s office with Clinton encouragement to counter the Chinese threatening rise. The American

underpinned by US against the Chinese claims of the island were at its peak (Blanchard et al., 2019, part. 1). To placate that lasting dispute, the US under President Trump office had serious talks with the Chinese President on January 2020 and they concluded a trade deal, say phase one under attempt. The pact signed by both antagonists had kept the commerce between them open, even if ties in other sectors are not that promising. The pact basically eliminates forced technology transfer and protects intellectual property. A check up of the continuity and the well advancing is made every six month but that will be hampered after the US was blaming China for the Covid 19 pandemic. President Trump seemed eager to sanction China for that and this raised doubt on his commitment to homage his deal. The deal was signed earlier and both Presidents were fervent at 'strengthening the coordination of the macroeconomic policies'. China opened its markets to American banks and is buying American goods- though not with an amount agreed on (46%). Some would say with the pandemic this is unrealizable (Sawson & Bradsher, 2020).

China, however, is in panic regarding any blockade threat from the part of the US. Indeed, China's worry urges towards a naval policy to protect its routes not only in the Indian Ocean but even in the Middle East and Africa and the Western Pacific and the Baltic Sea. Indeed, earlier the US threatened many Chinese fleets. In 1993, for instance, the US navy stopped a Chinese container on international maritimes water sand, inspected the ship for doubting it was transporting MDW to Iran. The vessel was not released before three weeks-docking in Saudi Arabian port, as the Americans arrogantly consider this as a national

security threatening act. This was alarming and frustrating for Chinese authorities who would not permit such a surpassing step again; they need a strong navy indeed to protect their ships⁷. In the Gulf of Aden, they deployed ships for an anti-piracy mission in 2008 (Lague & Lim, 2019). The defense system of China that is taking size is much more jeopardizing according to Navarro as the Chinese are developing craftily their arsenal:

China's newly modernized Navy and Air Force feature everything from virtually undetectable nuclear submarines and the latest Russian-designed fighter jets to ballistic missiles that can precisely target America's aircraft carriers on the high seas. China's own "Pentagon" is confidently developing advanced weapons systems-many of which have been stolen from us by Chinese hackers and spies!- to shoot down our satellite and GPS systems and send nuclear warheads deep into the American Heartland (Navarro, p. 5).

Rotary motion on tariffs rises from both sides, an imperative situation that urged both the US and China to solve the dispute and orchestrate bilateral and multilateral corporations that cope with unilateral activities. China then will comply with the WOT commitments and make some reforms including state owned enterprise, some subsidies and digital trade. The US too is to respect values and avoid short term gains and 'fig leaf' deals. This will create a free market and fortify global trading system. These measures are to clear the US investments in China. It should be notified that an export to China ensures millions of jobs in sectors as agriculture and services. Yet, Chinese low waging manufacturing

shortage was to be blamed in China increase and President Obama accused the Chinese for abuse and surpassing the trade international law that led to such a polemic economic situation. However, President Obama met the Chinese opponent President Xi Jinping in 2013 for the Shirt Sleeves Summit to tackle better ties and efficient corporation. In 2014, they met on the Asia-Pacific

Corporation and agreed on the Joint Climate announcement, indeed. Escalation grew again when China started building islands on lands in the Chinese South Sea, something that elevated Trump tone over the Chinese. They are however to maintain well balanced ties far from any frictions. ('US Relations with China 1949-2020')

⁷ China's total amount of trade was 4,6 Trillion in 2018.

were quite destructive for the US. In seeking mutual beneficial economic exchanges, the US-China bilateral outcomes should be market oriented and speedier corollary could be achieved thanks to Article 25 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding DSU. They are not to go beyond the WTO's bound levels for a 'pragmatic compromise' (Meltzer & Shena, pp.1-3).

The installation of a naval base in Pakistan had raised the fears of India from a containment of its tracts and maritime beds following the Chinese 'string of Pearls' doctrine. This is a theory that aims at creating a network of military and commercial facilities in the Indian region. There was launched first China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) and then the One Belt one Road (OBOR) project to ease the Chinese traffic ways. The same encircling was made around Japan and other American allies in the region. Some of these pearls are the Strait of Malacca that comprises 80% of the Chinese oil transfer. Good diplomacies are maintained with Malaysia and Singapore that are at neighboring regions. In view of any conflict with Indian⁸, China built a naval base in Cocos Keeling Island. The Myanmar Kyaukpyu port is another illustration of Chinese gas pipeline invested there. Coco Islands are also part of the string of pearl for war precautions. Likewise Bangladashi port of Chittagong is too very significant as Sri Lankan Hambantota. The Gwadar port in Pakistan is part of the CPEC but also a shield in case of any Sino-Indian struggle. This is giving China omnipresence in the Indian Ocean Region. To counter the American presence in Africa and Middle East, China had a foot in Sudan, Kenya and Djibouti (Dabas, 2017).

8. An Iranian Jeopardous Middle Eastern Hegemony

If the US had tried to bow to the market law and put an end to the trade war in the Far East of Asia, it is with Iran that the escalating confrontation is becoming jeopardous. It is true that in the post- Cold War that Iran altered its political way and opened its diplomacy to a dialogue among civilizations. Yet, September the 11th attacks made of Iran one among the three countries of the Axis of Evil besides Iraq and North Korea. The US maximizes its hegemony in the Middle East region by raising the Nuclear power issue and sanctions imposed on Iran to "curb" its ideological political activities. This had given the geopolitical world order a new model in managing regional affairs around Iran and its neighbors so as the US imposes its will and foreign policy 'geopolitical code'. Such a code will enable it to attain its objectives and impose a post Cold War world order that guarantees its irrevocable supremacy and unipolarism. Its foreign policy became regionalist, indeed (Naji, pp. 95-94).

After the success of the Islamic Revolution that coincided with the end of the Cold War, Ayatollah El Khomeini and President Rafsanjani opted for the policy of neighborhood rather than exporting the Revolution. Iran learnt to play a salient role regionally and globally mainly because of the Caspian oil and geographical Iranian emplacement that ensures transportation of resources through the Persian and Indian Ocean and pipelines through its territories via Russia (ibid, p. 96). When the US engaged in a war against Iraq then passed the Non Proliferation Act that isolated politically and economically both Iran and Iraq, For El Khatami, America was a prisoner of the Cold War mentality as it was

⁸ India built good ties with Japan, Taiwan, South Korea and Philippine to counter the Chinese projects. It made economic and military exchanges with Bangladesh. With Iran it developed Chabahar port in the mouth of Hormuz

Strait, the most important strait in the Middle East for traffic transportation. Good ties too were carried with Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Mongolia.

considering Islam as its new enemy. For neo-conservatism, the American agenda, however, should be military to protect oil resources and business there. The US would not likewise tolerate the construction of a nuclear weapon, a rather Americo-Israeli policy that the Iranians are to resist in spite of the majority UN members. Russia favored, however, economic, military and nuclear corporation to counter balance any Western and NATO expansions Eastwards. (*ibid*, 98-99). Indeed, Iran is a prominent ally from the Middle East for Russia as it secures the Kremlin interests and security.⁹ In view of its geostrategic position, it would play a crucial role in many Caucasus, central Asia and Middle Eastern issues. It would make of the region powerful and Moscow is in a need of such strength to balance the Westerners'. The ties deepened during the Ukrainian crisis when the relations with European Union and the US were at its worst state. (Garcia, pp. 114-116)

Eurasian amalgamation formulas had given raise to face up American hegemony as the three great Asian powers were eager to unite economically, politically and strategically. Rashid Alimov in the *Chronicles of the UN* explains that Shanghai Cooperation SCO was a 'multinational association' for security, stability of the Eurasian area to 'counteract threats and promote trade, cultural as well as humanitarian corporation (Alimov, n.d, Introduction section, para. 1). A meeting between Brazil, Russia, India, and China (BRIC) met during the G 8 in Japan Summit and according to the Organization for Economic Corporations and Development (OECD), the BRIC with respect of the 8% of the global sources and the 25 % global GDP share had made together a third of the largest energy companies besides the two third of both Europe and the US equally.(It becomes BRICS as later joined by South

Africa and made of the group more significant) (BRECS Information Center, 2014, para. 1). In 2015, Moscow Conference for International Security debunk on the NATO jeopardy on Russia and how the US provided it with arms they may use in neighboring countries, this made President Putin more alert and eager to give the go-ahead forwards Eurasian military alliance (Gorenburg, 2015, para. 3).

The TAAS news upholds that Iran's basic foreign policy was to keep balance ties with all its Eurasian neighbors notably Russia and China. The potential long term corporation agreements is according to Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif so significant by the renewal of the 2001 Treaty of The Basic Principles of Corporation between the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran And a twenty five years acquiescence with China. The Iranian-Indian ties are since 2003 bettering after Chabadar port construction (TAAS, 2020). In his article, Sheng Zhang explains that the Iranian-Chinese agreement seems that peculiar as it is declared to maintain the good friendship between the two nations. However, it opened a large gate for theorizing the step by being either a 'shameful treaty' where Chinese are to exploit Iran's resources or an 'aggressive Chinese expansion' seemed an intention for troops' deployment in the Middle East. Apart from a clear stand in the UN for the regime of Al Assad and the Belt and Road Initiative BRI , both challenging the US interests, the Chinese are rather not intervening as an Asian great power. In the Arab League Headquarters' speech then Chinese President Xi Jinping, in 2016, announced the three 'no's principles' that enunciate the Chinese policy: 'not to look for any proxies, not to seek any spheres of interests and not to attempt to fill any power vacuum in the Middle East.' (Zhang, 2020).

⁹ The Caspian Sea bordering, Azerbaijan, Iran, Russia, and Kazakhstan is very important maritime issue that urges for deep ties.

9. Conclusion

It should be noted that the 'Us vs. Them' foreign policy during the Cold War had made of the containment a traditional policy inherited by all President of the US by time epoch. After the Cold War, a new attempt to take new interventionist paths under the umbrella of the UN as a coalition of states as in the case of the first Gulf War but soon such a world order ceased to survive. The 'Us vs. Them' comes back again after the 9/11 attacks in New York when prediction of Samuel Huntington seems coming true, the Islamist were attacking the West. The new threat is endangering not only the US but also the whole world. Soon these fundamentalists were to become state sponsored terrorists, infiltrating hands the foreigners could use to achieve objectives abroad. Soon, all preaching that the Americans would install democratic regimes where terrorism would be overcome is no more credible narrative. The American foreign policy is tainted today with hypocrisy, no democracy was installed and no territory was left after the war on terror never ended (Ostergard, 2006, pp.43-46).

Every decade there was an enemy, a state where principles of democracy were neglected to its people, where America is to rush towards saving the oppressors, where only Westerners are heroes. This is the scenario history is writing and repeatedly mentioning in its books but the accounts turn to be all moonshine. No state believes any more in Uncle Sam's stories and this had spelled the end of America. No community believes in the heroic American mind because after all Americans are not leaders, they are people of the US that should orchestrate their affairs first? But who governs, that is the question. Actors of American foreign policy are shaping the word, curving it up into pieces to divide and rule. Today a common sense arose that Americans do not engage in war unless the

flow of oil and gas is guaranteed there. No democracy might be working in a disturbed country; damaged after years of wars and coexisting with a trauma of a stolen heritage. If the Americans are to bring civilization and democracy as pretended, should it be a due to rob museums and make of them ruins that only remind people about their history and civilization. Isn't it a conspiracy against the culture of the 'Other'? Why is it that all the time that intervention is where Israel feels threatened? Is the scheme about OIL, is it about WEAPONS or is it only a crusade to usurp the land, the identity, the religion to destroy the Arab- Muslim civilization as it never ceases to launch clouds of spittle and venom on Islam and Muslims.

Cited Works

Alimov, R.(n.d). The Role of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization in countering threats to peace and security. *The Chronicles of the UN*.

<http://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/role-shanghai-cooperation-organization-counteracting-threats-peace-and-security>

Assessment Report. The Astana Agreement: Russia Pre-empts No-Fly Zones. (2017). *Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies*

Blanchard, B. & Singh, S. (2019, December). US and China hit each other with fresh sanctions as Trump's Trade war Continuous to escalate. *The Independent*. www.independent.co.uk, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/us-china-trade-war-trump-new-tariffs-xi-jinping-expensive-a9087391.html+&cd=1&hl=fr&ct=clnk&gl=dz>

Brezzezinski, Z. (1997). *The Game Board*, Basic Books.

Chong, T. T. L., & Li, X. (2019). Understanding China US trade War: Causes, Economic Impact, and the Worst-Case Scenario, the Lau Cho Talk. *Working Paper: Lau Chor Tak Institute of Global Economics and Finance*, 71.

Dabas, M. (2017, June 23). Here all you should know About 'String of Pearls', China's policy to encircle India. *Indiatimes*.

De Haas, M. (2010). *Russia's Foreign Security Policy in the 21st Century Putin, Medvedev and beyond*. Routledge Francis and Taylor Group

Dugin, A. (2012). *The Fourth Political Theory the Fourth position*. (Kurpianova, N., Tokmakova, M. Schief, O., Maas, Y., Cherednikov, V., Ananyan, Z., Smirnov, F., Lazareff, C., & Fedorov, I., trans). Arktos

Garcia, H. M. A. (2018). Evolution of Russian foreign policy and the Middle East. *JANUS. Net*, 9(1), 103-121.

Giles, O. (2019, September 13). How did the Syrian civil war become a proxy war? *The National Interest*.

Glynos, J., Howarth, D., Norval, A., Speed, E. (2009). *Discourse Analysis: Varieties and Methods*. National Centre for Research Methods.

Gorenburg, D. (2015, May 20). Moscow Conference on International Security: Part 4 Russian views of NATO. PONARS Eurasia. <https://www.ponarseurasia.org/article/moscow-conference-international-security-2015-part-4-russian-views-nato>

Gorgjievskaja, E. T. (2019, April 8). The Chinese 'Silk Road' of threats and opportunities in the void between the EU strategy, CEE interests and Citizens. *Institute of Sociology*. <https://www.soc.cas.cz/en/news/chinese-silk-road-threats-and-opportunities-void-between-eu-strategy-cee-interests-and-citizens>

Kimball, S. (2014, March 11). Bound by Treaty: Russia, Ukraine and Crimea. Deutsche Welle. <https://www.dw.com/en/bound-by-treaty-russia-ukraine-and-crimea/a-17487632>

Lague, D. & Kang lim, B. (2019, April 30). China's fear of an American blockade. *Reuters*

Maçães, B. (2018). *The Dawn of Eurasia on the Trail of the New World Order*. Yale University Press.

McNabb, D. E. (2016). *Vladimir Putin and Russia's Imperial Revival*. CRC Press, Taylor and Francis group.

Meltzer, J. P. & Shenai, N. (2019, February 28). *The US China Economic Relations, A Comprehensive Approach*. Brookings.

Naji, S. (2011) *Us-Iran relations in the Post-Cold war Geopolitical Order*, *Asian Social Sciences*, 7(9), 94-108. doi:10.5539/ass.v7n9p94

Navarro, P. & Autry, G. (2011). *Death by China: Confronting the Dragon-A Global Call to Action*. Pearson Education.

Nygren, B. (2008). *The Rebuilding of Greater Russia Putin's Foreign Policy towards the CIS Countries*. Routledge Francis and Taylor Group

Ostergard, Jr. (2006). The Failure of America's post Cold War foreign policy: From the Persian Gulf to the Gulf of Guinea, *the Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, 43-55.

Rais, M. (2013). The Syrian Crisis : a Prox War, *lejournalinternational*.

Sussex, M. (2015). *From Retrenchment to Revanchist ... and Back Again? Russian Grand Strategy in the Eurasian 'Heartland'*. In Sussex, M & Kanet, R. E (Eds). *Russia, Eurasia and the New Geopolitics of Energy Confrontation and Consolidation*. Palgrave Mcmillan.

Sutherland, O. (2013). Discursive normative analysis: A study of online autobiographical account of self-injury. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(48), 1-19. <http://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2013.1434>

Swanson, A. and Bradsher, K. (2020). American and Chinese officials Take Pulse on Trade Deal, Six Months In. *New York Times*.

Tejel, J. (2020, Feb 8), Review - The Kurds of Northern Syria. *E International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/81108>

US Relations with China 1949-2020. (n.d). <https://www.cfr.org/timeline/us-relations-china>

Zhang, S. (2020). The 25 years agreement between China and Iran: A continuation of previous policy. Washington Institute