

Postscriptum to Paolo Urio

America and the China Threat

From the End of History to the End of Empire,

Atlanta, USA, Clarity Press, 2022

**The making of the new multi-polar world,
and the end of the uni-polar world America made**

- 1. American ideology: the main obstacle to peaceful international relations, or the negative consequences of the uni-polar world**
 - 1.1 US foreign policy and the Ukrainian war**
 - 1.2 The similarity of US foreign policies towards Russia (Ukraine) and China (Taiwan)**
- 2. The beginning of the end of the uni-polar world America made**
 - 2.1 The silent transformations and China's strategy**
 - 2.2 How the silent transformations paved the way to the multi-polar world**
- 3. The acceleration of the making of the new multi-polar world: China's strategy at its best**
 - 3.1 The Ukrainian war accelerator**
 - 3.2 From bilateral trade swap agreements to strategic partnerships and the attack on the US dollar**
 - 3.2.1 The inevitable de facto alliance between China and Russia**
 - 3.2.2 From financial swap agreements to strategic partnerships**
 - 3.2.3 The importance of the Belt and Road Initiative – BRI**
 - 3.2.4 Towards a synergy between BRICS, SCO and BRI?**
 - 3.2.5 The decline of the US empire and the attack on the USD**
 - 3.3 How China and Russia hammer the final nail in the coffin of the unipolar world**
 - 3.3.1 China on the US hegemony and its perils**
 - 3.3.2 China's global Security Initiative**
 - 3.3.3 China's position on the settlement of the Ukrainian crisis**
 - 3.3.4 Putin's address to the Federal Assembly**
 - 3.3.5 The letters of Presidents Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin, 19-20 March 2023**
 - 3.3.6 The 23 March Joint Statement of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation on deepening the comprehensive strategic partnership of coordination in the new era**
- 4. How to explain why the Global South is escaping the US domination and joins the multi-polar world set up by China and Russia**
- 5. But what about Europe today ?**

The making of the new multi-polar world, and the end of the uni-polar world America made

Since I completed the writing of this book on August 27, 2021, many important events have occurred that makes it necessary to update the findings I developed therein. It is important to remind the reader that in this book I demonstrated that the characteristics of the US ideology and its projection into its foreign policy established during the first decades of the US Republic have not changed fundamentally since then.

This means that without taking into consideration this ideology, it is impossible to understand today's US foreign policy, and to give sense to its strategy towards China and its long march towards prosperity and global power, nor towards Russia's intervention in Ukraine, nor towards the *de facto* alliance that has developed during the last decades between China and Russia, and which is consolidating today, as well as the attraction that this alliance exercises upon the rest of the Global South in all continents.

1. American ideology: the main obstacle to peaceful international relations, or the negative consequences of the uni-polar world

Let me therefore summarize the main features of the US ideology and its projection on foreign policy:¹

1. Exceptionalism, i.e. the US Republic is exceptional, meaning: it is different and superior to any other forms of government; it is not only a 'technical' but also a moral superiority;
2. The US, the depository of Universal Values, has the right and even the duty to diffuse them all over the world;

¹ This will need several repetitions that may irritate those who have read attentively this book. Repetitions are nevertheless necessary in order to give to this Postscriptum the coherence it needs for showing the causal link between the foreign policy the US has developed before the outburst of the Ukrainian war (i.e. what this book has dealt with) and what happened afterwards. The consequence is that this Postscriptum has a logic of its own, and can be read independently from the book.

3. The US is also the Indispensable Nation that is entrusted with the Manifest Destiny to lead the rest of the world towards the End of History, i.e., to the triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism; therefore, one of the major objectives of US foreign policy is to establish and maintain leadership all over the world ;
4. On top of all that there is the belief that America and its people have been chosen by God and this gives to the US ideology a touch of sanctity that makes it unshakeable and even indestructible.

This ideology has been summarized by one of the most respected American Presidents, Thomas Jefferson, in an official letter addressed to the then-Governor of Virginia, James Monroe. Contrary to the words used above for defining the dimensions of the US ideology (exceptionalism, universal values, Indispensable Nation, Manifest Destiny), Jefferson writes in 1801, in a style deprived of pathos, i.e. he defines the US foreign policy as a simple ‘matter of fact’:

‘However our present interests may restrain us within our limits, it is impossible not to look forward to distant times when our multiplication will expand it beyond those limits, and cover the whole northern, if not the southern continent, with people speaking the same language, governed in similar forms, and by similar laws’.²

In plain English: our interests are determined by our development (the multiplication); in spite of the fact that presently our interests may be restrained within our borders, it is impossible not to look forward to a distant future when the interests derived from our development will not be satisfied if the US remains within its today’s borders; therefore, we will have to expand beyond our present limits. Where? Quite logically Jefferson mentions North America. This will be done towards the West through the Indian Wars thanks to which the US slaughtered the Native Indians and dispossessed them of their territories, and towards the South, where the US launched a war of conquest thanks to which it stole more than half of the Mexican state. But Jefferson does not stop there, he goes on to consider that, why not,

²Thomas Jefferson, (1801). ‘From Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe,’ 24 November, National Archive, Founders Online, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-35-02-0550> where you will find the complete text of the letter with several footnotes that briefly explain the circumstances.

the expansion may be further developed within the whole Southern continent. And here the US will build a world where people would speak the same language (and Jefferson does not even bother to specify: it will be English) governed under similar forms of government and by similar laws. And here again, Jefferson does not need to specify that these will be liberal democratic forms of government and the laws governing those people will be adopted through those forms. Remark that the letter is addressed to James Monroe who was to become the President of the US who, in 1823, proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine that made South America the exclusive 'garden' of the US. Note that the most significant word used by Jefferson is 'expansion', that was to become the major dimension of US foreign policy. Even today, the Ukrainian crisis can be interpreted as one of the consequences (for me the major consequence) of the expansion of US power in Eastern Europe, thanks to the expansion of NATO towards Russia's borders.³

Should we add another sentence by Thomas Jefferson, we will have the whole picture of the major dimensions of the US foreign policy. In 1816 Jefferson writes:

'We are destined to be a barrier against the return of ignorance and barbarism. Old Europe will have to lean on our shoulders, and to hobble along by our side'.⁴

Put this in relation with the hysterical propaganda the US mainstream media and establishment have developed towards today's barbarians, i.e. Russia and China, and the concomitant bullying of the US European allies (in fact treated as vassals) so that they comply to the US interests, and you will understand that what is happening today can be retraced to the origins of the US ideology and its translation into foreign policy. The Biden

³ Whereas the dominant Western opinion is that NATO expansion is not the cause of the Ukrainian crisis, a few American scholars share my opinion. See for example two articles written already at the beginning of the Ukrainian crisis by Professors Jeffrey Sachs (Columbia University) and John Mearsheimer (University of Chicago): Jeffrey Sachs, 'A New Post-Soviet Playbook. Why the West Should Tread Carefully in Ukraine', *Foreign Affairs*, March 4, 2014, and 'Ukraine Is the Latest Neocons Disaster', *Consortium News*, 1 July, 2023, <https://consortiumnews.com/2022/07/01/ukraine-is-the-latest-neocon-disaster/>; John Mearsheimer, 'Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault. The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin', *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2015, pp. 1-12. Sachs and Mearsheimer have written extensively since then and have been interviewed by the English site of the Chinese Television (CGTN).

⁴ Thomas Jefferson, (1816). 'To John Adams from Thomas Jefferson,' 1 August 1816, National Archive, Founders Online, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/99-02-02-6618>.

administration has embarked upon a crusade between democracy (led by the exemplary, exceptional, indispensable American democracy) against the totalitarian rest of the world.

Furthermore, the construction of this ideology (especially points 2 and 3 above) automatically translates into the US foreign policy and justifies all sorts of interventions all over the world. Moreover, since the beginning, it has led to the partition of the world into two camps: on the one side WE, with our superior Republic, and on the other side the OTHER, i.e. the rest of the world, the inferior races and the barbarians whose behaviour (actual and/or potential) is interpreted as a potential existential threat to democratic America, be it by the Native Indians, the Mexicans, the Communists of all kinds (especially the Soviet Russians), the North Koreans, the Vietnamese, the Russians, the Chinese, etc. Even secondary powers such as Cuba or Venezuela, may be seen as a threat. These countries, their leaders and people, must be converted, one way or the other, to liberal democracy and capitalism and should behave within an international system in a subordinate position, under the domination of the US. Inevitably, this way of conceiving the relations between the US and the rest of the world, has led to the implementation of a foreign policy oriented by a zero-sum mentality that necessitates all sorts of interventions abroad so that the other countries abide to the dictates of the US: covert and overt military interventions, subversive activities within countries leading to regime change, sanctions, and proxy wars. These actions, that clearly contradict the principle of sovereignty, have dramatically increased during the last decades, when the US has experienced a significant loss of power.

These actions are today frequently interpreted by the rest of the world as an unacceptable bullying by a declining hegemon that is not accepting its loss of power. The consequence is that the US is not ready to negotiate with the emerging powers a new architecture of the international system that would take into consideration the legitimate interests of those countries. Inevitably, the US would consider that this new international order is not compatible with US national interests as defined by the US itself. Now, history shows that the US has always considered that its national interests are, without contest, compatible with the interests of all other nations. Moreover, by leading the rest of the world, the US establishment considers that the US is the sole country able to provide to the international community the public goods of peace, stability and prosperity it needs.

The consequence is that the US ideology has become what I have labelled ‘a weapon of mass destruction’, meaning that it has destroyed the capacity of the US establishment to conceive of a world different from ‘The World America Made’, and in this different world a different role the US may play. This incapacity has 3 very practical consequences that have been developing for a long time and that we see today popping up in the open in the news concerning the Ukrainian crisis, as well as the US policy towards Taiwan:

:

1. The incapacity to read the real intentions of the other side: clearly Putin has no intentions to re-create the Tzarist nor the Soviet Empires; and China has no intention to invade the rest of the world with its armies and military bases thereby imitating the American model.
2. The incapacity to take stock of the changes in the distribution of power resources that have been developing silently (in Chinese: ‘qián yí mó huà’) for a long time and that we see today popping up in the open in the news concerning the Ukrainian crisis, as well as in relation to Taiwan (economy, science and technology, military, and diplomacy), especially in favour of China (just one example: in 1990 China GDP in PPP was less than 4% of the world total, the US had 21%; 30 years later China overtakes the US at 17%, the US is down to 16%; the same is true for the share for exports + imports and other indicators of power);
3. Even more important, is the US establishment’s ‘incapacity to put itself in the shoes of the other side’, i.e. to see the world from the point of view of the OTHER. This is due to the way the US, and more generally the West, react to the emergence of new powers such as China and Russia: it projects on them its own way of thinking and of implementing foreign policy: those new powers would inevitably act as the US did when it had the power to do so. The US establishment is incapable of imagining that those powers may be wanting to establish cooperative common endeavours beneficial to all parties concerned, and who, based upon the principles of independence and sovereignty, would not want to be told how to behave at home.

As explained in my books, the decline of the US has been evident for several years, and already under the presidency of Barak Obama, testified by the incapacity of realizing regime changes in Cuba, Syria, Venezuela, Iran ... and China where the US has supported, and is still supporting today, subversive and independentist movements in Tibet, Xinxiang, Hong Kong and Taiwan. The last regime change was the one orchestrated in Ukraine in 2014.

Obama successor, President Trump, had to manage that decline. Interestingly, Trump did so by first putting a halt to the neoliberal globalization, that he considered to be responsible for the outsourcing abroad of large segments of the US industrial basis and thus for the deindustrialization of the country. So, he withdrew the US from the Trans-Pacific-Partnership and postponed *sine die* the negotiations for the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, that would have placed the US (in addition to NATO) in a dominant position in Europe, a clear move to contain Russia, and a clear move to contain China in the Pacific, in addition to the alliances with Japan and South Korea, and the partnerships with several Asian countries.

Moreover, during the presidential campaign Trump put forward several foreign policy options clearly incompatible with the interests of the US establishment.⁵ These were: the US should negotiate with Russia and North Korea; NATO is obsolete, clearly suggesting that it should at least be reformed with a reduction of U.S. spending, and increasing contributions from European members; diminish U.S. debt, by reducing spending in the military, diminishing military interventions abroad, withdrawing from Afghanistan and Syria. This would have meant a reduction of military spending in favour of one of the major (maybe the more powerful) components of the US establishment: the military-industrial complex. The only proposal favourable to the establishment was to point to China as the main U.S. competitor. But, contrary to the traditional foreign policy towards China, Trump's policy was based more upon economic sanctions and the use of subversive activities hopefully leading to

⁵ Paolo Urio, *China Reclaims World Power Stats. Putting an End to the World America Made*, London & New York, Routledge, 2019, pp. 129–143. Chinese translations: Paolo Urio, 无声的变化:中国重新成为世界大国的战略选择, China Intercontinental Press, 2022, pp. 146-227.

regime changes (already initiated by his predecessor) than on military overt and covert interventions.

It is well-known that ‘the Deep State’ is that part of the US establishment dominated by neo-conservatives, i.e. ultra-nationalists favourable to the US hegemonic foreign policy. The Deep State operates in the shadow, outside the scrutiny of Parliament, independent mass media and public opinion. Clearly, it could not accept the majority of Trump’s foreign policy proposals. So, the Deep State did everything in its power to prevent Trump from realizing them. It also fabricated an impeachment procedure based upon faked revelations about the collusion between Russia and the Trump team, that went on during practically all the 4 years of his presidency. Finally, they failed, Trump was not impeached and could finish his presidency. But the deep State did not give up. There is sufficient information that strongly suggests that the Deep State manipulated public opinion during the 2020 presidential election that ended with the victory of Joe Biden. The so-called ‘Twitter files’, the scandal that became public in December 2022 and is still developing in the US and beyond, at the moment of writing this Postscriptum and will certainly show the under-cover use of social media by the Deep State (in particular, by using the Federal Bureau of Investigations - FBI) to influence public opinion during the 2020 presidential campaign. A scandal not very favourable to the image of American democracy.

Overall, we can say that after the end of the Trump administration the US Biden Presidency went back to its traditional foreign policy by bringing its features to quasi perfection: (1) addiction to military means, i.e. the extraordinary increase of the military budget to finance covert and overt military actions; (2) proxy wars, especially against Russia and China by the sending of billions of armaments to Ukraine and to Taiwan; (3) regime change (subversion); (4) sanctions, especially by the weaponizing of the US dollar, thanks to its position as the main reserve currency and as the main means to settle international payments, this being made possible thanks to the illegal extraterritorial use of US laws; (5) the threat of using sanctions for bullying the countries that try resisting the US dictates to condemn Russia’s intervention in Ukraine. The latter concerns practically all the countries of the Global South (including China and India).

Even allies, especially European states, have been subjected to bullying. Moreover, should they hesitate to comply, as has been the case of Germany, the US brutally destroyed the important economic link between Germany and Russia represented by the Nord Streams 1 and 2, that were meant to provide cheap Russian gas to the core of the European industrial basis.⁶ Without that source of energy, many observers forecast the de-industrialisation of Europe and the transfer of European industries to the US, unless China steps in by offering to European industries a better economic, social and energy environment within its fast-developing economy. On 4th of November 2022 Chancellor Scholz of Germany, accompanied by a group of influential German businessmen, met President Xi Jinping in Beijing. A move that clearly pointed in this direction, especially as nothing was revealed about the content nor about the outcome of the discussions. Quite interestingly, the US establishment very strongly criticised Scholz's move.⁷ Clearly, the hegemon does not allow its vassals to defend their national interests when they are incompatible with its own interests. The US is using the Ukrainian war not only to attack Russia, but also to forbid its European allies (in fact its vassals) to develop an independent foreign policy. It is likely that this situation will persist for decades, as the US is doing everything it can to keep its European allies within its economic, political and military sphere of influence. Especially in a time when the US is certainly aware that the rest of the world (the Global South) is escaping, slowly but surely, from the domination it has been able to establish thanks to the Washington Consensus and the fall of the Soviet Union. Clearly today the US is terrified by the idea of the development of a Germany-Russia-China axis that may have the consequence of excluding the US from Eurasia. There is sufficient evidence that the US organized the sabotage of the Nord Stream 1 and 2. Germany would thus be separated from Russia for a long time.

Nevertheless, as I sustained in this book, my forecast is that common economic interests between Russia and China on the one side and Germany (and the rest of Europe) on the other will not fade away for ever. It is necessary to point out that the century long economic

⁶ This is clearly an act of war not only against Russia, but also against one of the main US allies: Germany: Seymour Hersh, 'How America Took Out the Nord Stream Pipeline', 8 February 2023. (<https://seymourhersh.substack.com/p/how-america-took-out-the-nord-stream>).

⁷ See the comment published by one of the most influential American think tanks, the CSIS (Centre for Strategic and International Studies): Lily McElwee, 'How Scholz's Unpopular Trip to Beijing Actually Served U.S. Interest', CSIS, November 7, 2022.

cooperation between Germany and Russia will one day come back with a revenge. That this day will not be necessarily in a distant future, has been attested at the beginning of September 2022 when German chemicals group BASF announced that it had started production at a giant complex in southern China's Zhanjiang. The first plant at the site will produce 60,000 tons of engineering plastic compounds a year for the automotive and electronics industries and will be supplied entirely by renewable electricity. The company expects to invest up to 10 billion euros (\$9.95 billion) in the site, which will be its third largest globally when complete in 2030. The same can be said of other German industries such as the automobile. Finally, the unbelievable pressures exerted by the US upon all its European allies during the Ukrainian crisis, may show, in a not-too-distant future, that the US uses them not so much as allies but as vassals to realize its own national interest, even if this would mean for Europe economic crisis, inflation, and deindustrialization. Will then Europe be able and willing to re-define its foreign policy on the basis of its own interests?

In summary, all the actions which the US establishment has undertaken for a long time and is still implementing today to maintain its hegemony, are justified by the US by the necessity to perpetuate its leading position over the rule-based liberal international order. And this translates very clearly in today's US foreign policy towards Russia and China.

1.1 US foreign policy and the Ukrainian war

Two remarks are necessary as an introduction to this topic. First, the US narrative on the Ukrainian war is based upon a blatant lie upon which all the rest of the narrative is based: that Ukraine is a sovereign, independent and democratic country, therefore, that we, the Western democratic countries, must do whatever is in our power to help Ukraine to defend itself against the non-provoked Russian aggression. Ukraine is certainly a sovereign state, as are all the countries members of the United Nations.⁸ But this does not say anything significant about the nature of the Ukrainian regime. This is done by taking the second characteristic, i.e. independence. Clearly, since it proclaimed its independence after the fall of the Soviet Union,

⁸ This is why Taiwan, that is not a member of the United Nations, is not a sovereign state.

Ukraine has never been fully independent, as the US had been present in Eastern Europe since at least the fall of the Soviet Union. Since then, the US developed its presence by providing advisers, by investing huge amounts of money into the Ukrainian economy, and by installing numerous bio-labs on its territory since the mid-2000s, and by financing, training and arming the Ukrainian military especially after 2014. In fact, Ukraine definitely lost its independence after the Maidan coup d'état, when the US, following a script it uses quite often, took advantage of the troubles between those who in Ukraine favoured cooperation with the West and those who were more favourable towards Russia, sustained and in fact orchestrated a coup d'état that illegally brought to power a pro-western government supported by ultra-nationalists and even neo-Nazi politicians and activists. Several neo-Nazi battalions were formed, generally financed by local oligarchs. These battalions committed well-documented crimes against the Russophile Ukrainian population and attacked the Eastern provinces of the Donbass that did not recognize the illegal coup d'état. These battalions implemented a regime of terror against the population of these provinces. More than 14.000 people were killed between 2014 and 2022, of which more than 5000 were civilians of Russian origin, as attested by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).

Finally, for sustaining that Ukraine is certainly not a democratic country it suffices to mention some of the well-attested features of its political system: domination by independent and corrupted oligarchs, infiltration by neo-Nazi ideology and organizations in all sectors of Ukrainian society. This does not mean that Ukrainian people and society are overwhelmingly permeated by Nazism. It simply means that Nazi organizations and people, even if a minority, succeeded in permeating all the important sectors of Ukraine, polity, economy, army, and secret police, and in setting-up of the so-called 'Kill list', that gives identity information about people (Ukrainians and foreigners) who are considered as enemy of Ukraine. When these people disappear, their photo is barred with a red trait with the information: 'Eliminated'.⁹ The Ukrainian secret police is well-known for committing all sorts of crimes.

⁹ It is interesting to note that the list comprises American politicians such as Rand Paul, Tulsi Gabbard, investigative journalist Glenn Greenwald, journalist Caleb Maupin, former Colonels Douglas Macgregor and Richard Blake (who has also been member of the US Parliament), former Marine Corps intelligence officer Scott Ritter, former Marine veteran Brian Berletic, former CIA analysts Ray McGovern and , Professors Jeffrey Sachs (Columbia Journalist) and John Mearsheimer (University of Chicago), plus several European nationals, such as Clare Daly Member of the European Parliament), Jacques Baud (former Swiss intelligence colonel), Roger Waters (founder of iconic Pink Floyd).

Moreover, practically all parties and media that dare criticise the regime have been outlawed and TV stations have been regrouped under the control of the government. The result is first of all a public discourse that manifests an unbelievable level of racism towards everything that is Russian. Racism is certainly one of the main, probably the main manifestation of nazi ideology. Moreover, this has been translated since 2014 into aggressive military and paramilitary operations against the Russian minority in the Eastern regions (Donbass) as well as elsewhere, starting with the Odessa and Mariupol massacres of May 2014. Similar aggressive military operations against the Eastern regions are still going on at the moment of writing.

Second, as for the non-provoked Russian aggression, it is interesting to mention one of the last statements by former Soviet Union's President, Michael Gorbachev who in 2021 criticized the NATO expansion after the fall of the USSR: 'They [the Americans] grew arrogant and self-confident. They declared victory in the Cold War.' In fact, he said, it is 'together' that Moscow and Washington had pulled the world out of confrontation and the nuclear race. Instead of keeping the promise not to expand an inch Eastwards toward Russia, 'the winner' [of the Cold War] decided to build a new empire. Hence the idea of NATO expansion'.¹⁰ It would be too easy to point out Gorbachev's naïve attitude. Had Gorbachev analysed in depth the American ideology and its translation into foreign policy, maybe he would have asked for an international treaty explicitly containing the West's promises. Nevertheless, one could refer to several cases showing that even when promises are put in writing, the US is very skilful in avoiding complying with promises, should the US think that American interests, values and national security would be at stake. For Gorbachev, I think that it is fairer to point out his sincere goal to free the world from the dangers of the Cold War and Russia from a failed regime. Anyway, the fact remains: the West, and especially the US betrayed Gorbachev.

In spite of this betrayal, Russia (from Yeltsin to Putin) persisted for years in trying to obtain from the US and Europe to be associated to the management of security in Europe. The last time was in December 2021 when Russia submitted to the US and NATO two international treaties that would have made it possible to avoid military conflict. Considering, not without

¹⁰ Rozina Sabur, 'Mikhail Gorbachev: US grew arrogant after the fall of the USSR', *The Telegraph*, 24 December 2021.

reason, that the presence of NATO near its borders represented an existential threat to its security, Russia wanted to introduce a legally binding promise that Ukraine would not join NATO, as well as a reduction in NATO troops and military weaponry stationed in Eastern Europe, especially nuclear weapons. This proposal looked quite reasonable, especially if compared to the so-called ‘missile crisis’ that occurred in the Caribbean in 1962 when the Soviet Union tried to install missiles in Cuba near the southern coasts of the US. The US strongly reacted to this move and obtained the withdrawal of the missiles, thus avoiding a nuclear war. The similarity of the two situations has been pointed out by many observers. But it was dismissed by the US. Another manifestation of how the US compares similar situations: they are not similar when the exceptional US Republic is part of the equation. In particular, the US arrogantly declared that the admission of other countries to NATO was at the discretion of those ‘sovereign and independent’ countries, in particular Ukraine and Georgia, that the US had officially envisaged to become members of NATO already in 2008. So, for the US its security could be assured at the expense of the security of Russia, contrary to the principle of **indivisible security** supported by Russia, China and the Global South. Moreover, the US warned Russia of "swift and severe" economic sanctions should it invade Ukraine.¹¹

Considering that not only the shelling of civilian settlements in the Donbass provinces by the Ukraine army was still going on, but was being further developed in frequency and intensity in February 2022 (as attested by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe OSCE) Russia launched a ‘special military operation’ through which it invaded Ukraine (24 February 2022) with the declared goals to (1) free the Donbass provinces inhabited by a large majority of ethnic Russians whom had been shelled by the Ukraine army and its ultranationalist in fact neo-Nazi battalions since 2014, when the US helped to orchestrate a coup d’état against the democratically elected Ukrainian president, (2) the demilitarization and (3) the de-Nazification of Ukraine.

Moreover, we must also take into consideration the fraudulent use of international agreements approved by the Security Council of the United Nations (the 2014-2015 Minks agreements) to gain time to allow the militarization of Ukraine by the US and NATO,

¹¹ Sometimes also referred to as the ‘principle of equal and indivisible security’, means that the security of one single country cannot be assured at the expenses of other countries, which is exactly what the US-led NATO military alliance has tried to impose to Russia since the fall of the Soviet Union.

whereas its stated goal was that the Ukrainian government would negotiate a new autonomy status with the Donbass provinces within the Ukraine state. Clearly, Russia was ready to accept that the Donbass would remain within Ukraine, provided that it would be given a new status with a sufficient level of autonomy, in addition to the non-admission of Ukraine to NATO. Recent public declarations by former Ukrainian president Petro Poroshenko, former Chancellor Angela Merkel and former President François Holland confirmed the fraudulent use of this agreement by Ukraine, supported by the US government. As said above, Russia decided to safeguard its interests and security in the regions by invading Ukraine. The conflict is still going on at the moment of writing this Postscriptum.

That the US was not ready to operate in favour of peace, became apparent when in March-April 2022 the US and the UK sabotaged an agreement reached between Ukraine and Russia (with the support of Turkey) that could have paved the way to a cease-fire and eventually to peace. Immediately the Ukrainian regime delayed *sine die* the ongoing negotiations with Russia. It became then clear that the US objective was, as publicly declared by President Biden, to destroy the Russian economy, a prelude to the regime-change in Moscow.¹² Putin must go; a strategy frequently used by the US since the 1953 Iranian coup d'état, and there have been many that followed during and after the Cold War. The way would then be wide open to dismantling Russia into several smaller states, under the domination of the US. History shows that this is not the first time the US has envisaged and in some cases implemented this move. Towards the end of WW2 the US had plans to destroy the German industrial basis and to dismantle Germany into several smaller states, later abandoned for introducing Germany into the NATO alliance to help the US to contain Soviet Russia. In 1991-1999 the US succeeded in dismantling Yugoslavia (the last communist country in Europe) by conducting two wars (one of them illegal), whose negative consequences are still today causing instability in Europe. The same may be said about China.

This systematic ambiguous and, in some cases, fraudulent behaviour of the US and the Ukrainian governments inevitably led Russia to the conclusion that the West, and its self-

¹² By doing this, the Biden administration was following the 2019 report by the RAND Corporation: 'Overextending and Unbalancing Russia'. RAND is the think tanks financed by the US government that provides analyses and advice to the US Defence Department. For a brief analysis of this report see Manlio Dinucci, 'How to Destroy Russia. 2019 Rand Corporation Report: Overextending and Unbalancing Russia', SANA - Syrian-Arab News Agency, 30 June 2022, <https://www.sana.sy/en/?p=276698>.

proclaimed leader, the US, was ‘not agreement capable’ and therefore could not be trusted.¹³ It took several decades for the Russian leadership after the fall of the Soviet Union to come to this conclusion. This is certainly because Russia shares with Europe several important dimensions of its culture: history, language, religion, music, figurative arts, architecture, etc. Both Yeltsin and Putin tried on several occasions to convince the West (especially the US) to associate Russia with the management of security in Europe. They were dismissed with arrogance. Clearly for the West, the loser of the Cold War had no right to share responsibilities with the West, led by the ‘democratic, exceptional and indispensable US nation’. Today Russia has understood that it has better prospects for forging cooperation with Asian countries, and more generally with countries of the Global South in all continents.

China does not have this problem. Its civilization developed outside our languages, outside our history, independently from us, indifferently from us, as per the statement of the French sinologist François Jullien. China had the ‘chance’ of suffering semi-colonial dictatorship during what it labels ‘the century of humiliations’ inflicted to it by the Western powers and Japan, plus several decades of bullying by the US. Thanks to these tragic events, the Chinese have learned to distrust the West. After their re-rise to world power, China and Russia, confronted with the American crusade against the rest of the world, have decided to join their power resources into a de facto alliance. As we shall see below, this alliance is attracting an increasing number of countries of the Global South.

1.2 The similarity of US foreign policies towards Russia (Ukraine) and China (Taiwan)

By March-April 2022 it became evident that the regional Ukrainian war was in fact part of a much larger confrontation between Russia and the US-led NATO alliance, and even between the West and the Global South, or, as per the Biden definition, a conflict between democracy and dictatorship. As if the American behaviour towards Russia and its intervention in Ukraine would not suffice to discredit the US foreign policy, the US has at the same time increased its

¹³ ‘Not Agreement Capable’ (недоговороспособны) is a term Russian diplomats came up with to describe their American counterparts, after each deal in Syria seemingly fell apart during the Obama Administration.

provocations against China, that reached a new apex with the Speaker of the US House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi's visit to Taiwan. It is today clear that the Chinese government has come to the same conclusion as the Russians (i.e. that the US is 'not agreement capable') after witnessing the ambiguous foreign policy the US has conducted for decades regarding the status of the Taiwan island: officially proclaiming (as stated on the website of the US Department of State) that it does abide with the 'One China Policy' principle, while in practice, supporting the independentist factions in Taiwan. In this regard, it is interesting to note that Western mainstream media has given a vast coverage to Mrs Pelosi's visit to Taiwan, pointing out the humiliation it has inflicted on China. It is even more interesting to note that these same media did not even mention the great triumph gained by the Kuomintang (KMT) during the local election of November 2022 when the Taiwan president, Tsai Ing-wen, resigned as head of the ruling Democratic Progressive party (DPP) after it suffered severe local election losses.

But the origin of the US foreign policy towards Russia and China goes well back before the Russian invasion of Ukraine. In this book, by quoting US official documents, and statements by influential mainstream think tanks, politicians, journalists, and scholars, I have shown that the US establishment has considered for a long time China and Russia to be the most dangerous 'revisionist' countries that threaten the existence of the US-led-rule-based-liberal international order and thus the US national interests ... or more exactly the interests of the US establishment.

The consequence is that Russia and China must be fought and defeated by all means. Make no mistake, China is well aware of the fact that the attack on Russia (and hopefully, for the US, its defeat) may be the first step towards a subsequent attack on China. The State-run Chinese TV has posted the following joke commenting on the US asking China for help in the Ukrainian crisis: 'Can you help me fight your friend so that I can concentrate on fighting you later?'

The present situation, which is mainly the consequence of mistakes the US has made since at least the end of the Cold War, is that Russia and China have forged a *de facto* alliance, that is attracting into its orbit an increasing number of countries that are also willing to escape the

dictatorship of the US Empire. The West says that Russia and China are isolated. This is a mistake or propaganda. Let me just quote an indicator: the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) has attracted more than 150 countries representing at least 60% of the world population and 40% of the world GDP. And, as economist Michael Hudson has sustained, the power of the dollar (one of the pillars of the US power) is today fading away at an accelerating speed.¹⁴ All this explains why the US does not accept negotiating with Russia and is in fact encouraging Zelensky to do the same. See the January 2023 Zelensky visit to the US Congress and the US decision to send more weapons to Ukraine. So, it is clear that the US hopes that the longer the Ukrainian war lasts, the more devastating will be the damage to Russia economy, military power and political stability. The consequence is that we are at the brink of a world war that may turn nuclear. The winners are clearly the US establishment and within it the giants of the gas industry and those of the military-industrial complex that sells arms all over the world ('free' and not free: see Yemen; but who cares about the Yemen people?). The losers are clearly the lower middle classes and the poor people in Europe and in the US, and even more so the Ukrainian people (in both the western and the eastern parts) and the small countries of the Global South.

The West is arming Ukraine to fight, on its behalf, a proxy war, it clearly cannot win. How courageous we are!! Adam Schiff, the US House Intelligence Committee Chairman, said recently: 'the US aids Ukraine and other people so we can fight Russia over there and we do not have to fight Russia here'. At the moment of writing, reliable sources forecast an imminent vast offensive by the Russian army, that will end with the defeat of Ukraine.¹⁵ It is difficult to forecast what will be the reaction of the US. It seems that some voices within the US establishment are considering abandoning Zelensky and finding a solution with Russia. It is not clear if this option will prevail within the Biden administration, as it is still dominated by the neo-conservative warmongers, i.e. the neo-conservative war-addict-regime-change

¹⁴ See the new edition of Hudson's book on capitalism: Michael Hudson, *Super Imperialism. The Economic Strategy of American Empire*, London, Pluto Press, 2021 (Third Edition) and among the many articles he has published recently on this topic: Michael Hudson, 'NY Times is wrong on de-dollarization: Economist Michael Hudson debunks Paul Krugman's dollar defence', 7 May 2023, <https://geopoliticeconomy.com/2023/05/10/ny-times-dedollarization-michael-hudson-paul-krugman-dollar/>

¹⁵ See, for example, the analyses of former US high-ranked members of the US army and the CIA, such as Col. (retired) Douglas MacGregor, Col. (retired) Richard Black, former Marine Corps intelligence officer Scott Ritter, former Marine veteran Brian Berletic, former CIA analysts Ray McGovern and Larry Johnson, former CIA Case Officer Phil Giraldi, available on the internet and/or on YouTube.

Quartet ‘Biden-Blinken-Sullivan-Nuland’, that has been in charge of the US foreign policy in Eastern Europe already during the Obama administration (2009-2017) when it orchestrated the regime change in Ukraine in 2014 and reorganized, armed and trained the Ukrainian army.¹⁶ What is nevertheless clear is that the Ukrainian war has accelerated the development of a multi-polar world, as we shall see below.

2. The beginning of the end of the uni-polar world America made

The Ukrainian war and the aggressiveness US policy supporting Taiwan against China, have not been at the origin of the multi-polar world, but have considerably accelerated the end of the world America made. It has been a several decades-long process that I am going to analyse hereafter by explaining how the Chinese strategy worked, namely its ability to take advantage of changes in the international order, some occurring independently of its foreign policy, some others on the contrary, deriving from its own decisions to act when it had a reasonable prospect to succeed.

2.1 The silent transformations and China’s strategy

In this book I pointed out the silent transformations (in Chinese: ‘qián yí mó huà’ - 潜移默化) that have been developed in the long time without being fully acknowledged by both Western mainstream media and the US establishment: changes in the distribution of power that testify the decline of the US on practically all the power resources, and the decline of the attractiveness of the American political system that is still today advertised by the US to the world as the best political system, whereas it has developed into an authoritarian oligarchy dominated by big business and financial organizations, as well as by the military-industrial

¹⁶ In fact, these high officials have been active well before the Ukrainian crisis and have been part of all the US interventions abroad aimed at establishing, developing and maintaining the US Empire, so that I am tempted to qualify them collectively as the ‘Infernal Quartet’. Their full names with their official position: Joe Biden (President of the US), Anthony Blinken (State Secretary, i.e., Minister of Foreign affairs), Jake Sullivan (US national security advisor to the President) and Victoria Nuland (Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs); their careers is available on the official US site.

complex. This type of power led to the transfer of money from the American people to the upper 1% and to a dramatic increase of poverty.

One may consider that the silent transformations may have a dynamic of their own, and there is certainly some truth in this. But China's history shows that the silent transformations need to be sustained and oriented by a long-term strategy, so they produce the desired outcomes. This is what China has done from 1949 on by improving the health and the literacy of the Chinese people and by implementing the four modernizations (agriculture, industry, science and technology and defence) that paved the way to the long march toward prosperity¹⁷ and to world power.¹⁸

In order to help the reader to understand the link between the silent transformations and China's strategy regarding the transition to the new multi-polar world, let me remind him of how I explained the rationale of China's strategy in Chapter 3. For the Chinese strategist it is very important to be able to manage time, understood not in the Western sense of chance, or destiny, but as 'time-opportunity'. It is by leaving the course of 'things,' the occurrence of events, to develop without interfering that one can be most efficient; more precisely, by combining 'the acting' upon the elements of the situation that one can change to one's advantage, with 'the non-acting' when one does not have a reasonable possibility to change some elements to one's advantage. In order to act efficiently, one must wait for the favourable occasion, the favourable moment; and it is here that it is possible and necessary to act with no hesitation, otherwise 'the magic moment' may fade away. But this does not mean that the strategist must wait passively for the opportunity to occur. On the contrary, by manipulating reality 'upstream of the silent transformations,' the Chinese strategist induces the opportunity, by a variety of covert actions. And this is the most efficient strategy. This is clearly linked to the concept of manipulation, in the sense of transforming the environment with the purpose of facilitating the advent of the favourable and intended outcome. The

¹⁷ Paolo Urio, *Reconciling State, Market, and Society in China. The long march toward prosperity*, London & New York, Routledge, 2010, Chinese translation: Paolo Urio, 走向繁荣的新长征:协调国家、社会和市场的关系, 北京, 中信出版集团, 2016.

¹⁸ Paolo Urio, *China Reclaims World Power Stats. Putting an End to the World America Made*, London & New York, Routledge, 2018, pp. 129–143. Chinese translations: Paolo Urio, 无声的变化:中国重新成为世界大国的战略选择, China Intercontinental Press, 2022, pp. 146-227.

Chinese strategist does not wait for the ‘chance’ (in the Western sense) to appear; he induces it rather than forces it, by working as far as possible ‘upstream.’¹⁹

By doing so, China has been successful in changing the ‘situation potential’ to its advantage, trapping the U.S. into a fixed position from which it seems unable to escape, i.e. continuing to implement a foreign policy based upon the threat, and eventually the actual use of economic and military means. In this book I showed that the U.S. foreign policy has been deeply stuck in the 19th century original ideology analysed at the beginning of chapter 3. Even the ‘unusual’ President Trump has not succeeded in escaping from the dictatorship of the dominant ideology. By comparison, I showed that during the same period of time, China’s ideology and its translation into foreign policy has undergone several fundamental changes since at least the end of the XIX Century. Moreover, Chinese strategy has given the impression of being constantly on the move, evolving from one approach to the other: from the economy to the military, to technology, to investments abroad, to the attraction of talents, to the diffusion of Chinese culture. It has changed from copying the West to innovating autonomously; from opening up its economy to the world to protecting its national market from predatory capitalists; from bilateral agreements to new multilateral organizations; from asserting local interests (the China Seas, Hong Kong, Xinjiang, Tibet, Taiwan) to developing global interests in Eurasia, Africa, Latin America, and the Arctic; from criticizing traditional enemies (e.g. Japan and India) to negotiating with them, etc. Thereby, China confirms that ‘the essence of strategy is on the one hand to gradually trap the competitor into a fixed position [i.e. from which it cannot escape] upon which the strategist can act, and on the other hand to constantly change its position in order to make its own strategy incomprehensible to the competitor’ ... and when he starts to understand it, it is too late.²⁰ Today the US, in its intent to inflict a strategic defeat to Russia, is reduced to support a failed, criminal, corrupt, non-democratic state that since 2014 has practised, and is still practicing today, criminal activities against its own people (i.e. Ukrainians of Russian origin – a frequent accusation used by the US against countries it has labelled as its enemies (for example, China, Russia, Syria, Libya, Iraq and others) and practising itself criminal activities such as the sabotage of the Nord Streams 1 and 2 pipelines.

¹⁹ André Chieng, *La pratique de la Chine, en compagnie de François Jullien*, Paris: Grasset, 2006, pp. 181–182, 196, 210, 214, 218–223, 225.

²⁰ Chieng 2006, op. cit., p. 210; Jullien, François, *Propensity of Things. Towards a History of Efficacy in China*. New York, Zone Books, 1995, Chap. 1.

2.2 How the silent transformations paved the way to the multi-polar world

In my books and especially in this one I have pointed to the changes that occurred since the beginning of the XXI century that have been the consequence of actions undertaken by China especially when it started 'to go abroad'. Clearly these actions represented an attack to the US-led international order:

- (1) development of bilateral swap agreements using national currencies instead of the USD;
- (2) since at least the 2008 financial crisis the US dollar has been contested by China as the world's major reserve and trade currency;
- (3) since at least the end of the Cold War, World Bank data shows that Western economies have been in a constant process of being caught up and finally surpassed by the rest of the world, especially China, India, the BRICS+, etc. in terms of share of world GDP and of imports+exports, as well as in technology; a clear example of the combination of silent transformations and China's policy actions both at home and abroad; this should be evaluated in conjunction of the fact that since the end of WW2 the US has not won a single war, even if all of them were fought against third-fifth rank armies (especially if by 'winning the war' we mean: 'winning the war and the peace' without which war is certainly a failure);
- (4) the creation of organizations that contest the existing US-led organizations: BRICS (with its Bank) Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and Belt and Road Initiative (with its development Bank).

It is clear that these events were not taken seriously enough by the US leadership. Then, suddenly, 3 events popped up in the news, strongly suggesting that the international system was in transition from the unipolar world dominated by the US to a multi polar world, hence the subtitle of my 2022 book: 'From the End of History to the End of Empire'. But this trend has been already evident for several years, as I demonstrated in a book written in 2017, published in 2018 under the significative title: China Reclaims World Power Status. Putting

an End to the World America Made.²¹ These 3 events took the form of some clearer messages delivered to the U.S. establishment:

1. the Alaska meeting between American and Chinese top diplomats (19 March 2021),
2. the Geneva meeting between Biden and Putin (16 June 2021).
3. on July 1, 2021, on the anniversary of the foundation of the Communist Party of China, President Xi Jinping by implicitly referring to Mao's 1949 statement: 'Ours will no longer be a nation subject to insult and humiliation; we have stood up,' warned the West: 'the Chinese people had stood up, and the time in which the Chinese nation could be bullied and abused by others has gone forever.'

China and Russia, the two 'existential threats' to the US, made it very clear that they were not going to kowtow to the U.S. When accused of violating universal values, they both fought back, reminding the U.S. of its troubled past, as well as to its current violations of these same values, both at home and abroad. In my 2022 book, I commented that 'these three events witnessed an epochal change in the relations between the U.S., China, and Russia.

Finally, In August 2021, just a few weeks after Xi Jinping's speech of 1 July 2021, the chaotic and humiliating withdrawal of the U.S. from Afghanistan, showed that the exceptionally efficient US army was defeated by a 'bunch of peasants' after a 20 years-long war. The US withdrawal has accelerated the cooperation between China, Pakistan and Afghanistan. The importance of this cooperation for China is twofold. First as China has a short but nevertheless important border with Afghanistan, this cooperation will make it possible to better control the transfer of jihadists to the Xinjiang Province that has been used (and is still used) by the US to foment Uighur separatist movements. Second, Afghanistan is one of the dimensions of the BRI, i.e. China's grand strategy. One of the most important components of the BRI, the China-Pakistan corridor, connects the Road Belt, from Kashgar–Xinjiang to the Maritime Road in Gwadar, a port city on the southwestern coast of Pakistan, thus avoiding the Malacca Strait and the U.S. navy.

²¹ Paolo Urio, *China Reclaims World Power Stats. Putting an End to the World America Made*, London & New York, Routledge, 2018, pp. 129–143. Chinese translations: Paolo Urio, 无声的变化:中国重新成为世界大国的战略选择, China Intercontinental Press, 2022, pp. 146-163.

3. The acceleration of the making of the new multi-polar world: China's strategy at its best

After the beginning of the Ukrainian crisis (December 2021 – February 2022) China's strategy accelerated dramatically, and so has been the transition to a multi-polar world.

Two major events occurred at the beginning and at the end of this acceleration phase of the China- Russia diplomacy that sealed the transition to the multi-polar world, meaning that the two countries gave to this movement its irreversible character: first, the Joint Memorandum of February 2, 2022, published a few weeks before the Russian invasion of Ukraine and after the US refused in December 2021 to discuss Russia's proposal to set up a new security framework in Europe, based upon the 'principle of indivisible security', and, second, the Joint Memorandum of March 21, 2023, preceded by two articles authored by Xi Jinping (published in Russia in Russian) and by Vladimir Putin (published in Chinese in China) on the occasion of their 3-day meeting in Moscow. If the West had still some doubts about the strength of the China-Russia strategic partnership, this meeting should have no further any illusions.

The February 2, 2022 Joint statement, entitled 'Joint Statement on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development', has been received by the Western mainstream media and politicians with scepticism, to say the least. It is in fact the definition of a strategic partnership that summarises and clarifies the statements issued by the two countries separately during previous years. It states very clearly that they do not accept to continue evolving within a world created by the West (especially the US) based upon rules the West has unilaterally established and imposed upon the rest of the world for the purpose of satisfying its own national interests. The 2 countries' aim is to protect the United Nations-driven international architecture and the international law-based world order, to seek genuine multipolarity with the United Nations and its Security Council playing a central and coordinating role, to promote more democratic international relations, and ensure peace, stability, and sustainable development across the world'. Meaning: from the 'US-led-rule-based-liberal international order' to a 'multipolar-law-based-order guaranteed by the United Nations'. By this statement, China and Russia established themselves as the leaders of the transition to a multi-polar world capable of attracting countries from the Global South willing to escape the US dictatorship.

The China-Russia Partnership is at the core of the changes that started to develop very fast during this phase. But it does not look like the ‘partnerships’ that developed before the 2 world wars that had the intent of defeating the enemy in two ‘imperialist zero-sum games wars’. And this was clearly the result of WW2: Germany, Japan and Italy lost everything. This is not the purpose of the China-Russia Partnership, that has 2 interconnected goals:

1. defence against the US’s will to maintain its domination over the rest of the world, including its allies, who, as the Ukrainian war is demonstrating, are treated as vassals, i.e., are menaced to be punished and are in fact punished whenever they do not obey the Empire’s orders;
2. attract within the organizations they have set up (BRICS, Shanghai Security Organization - SCO, and Belt and Road Initiative - BRI) countries that are also willing to escape the US domination and want to improve the living conditions of their citizens freely, i.e. with no conditions attached to the way they organize their polity, economy and society, the only criteria being mutual respect, peaceful cooperation and win-win endeavours, within the framework of international laws within the framework of the United Nations.

‘This clearly means that these objectives must be implemented outside the framework within which the West has implemented its relationships with the rest of the world since the discovery of the Americas: colonial and imperial relationships that put first the interest of the colonisers and of the imperialists. On the contrary, the China-Russia joint statement of February 2, 2022, does not announce a zero-sum game whose goal would be the destruction of the US. It simply means that China and Russia (followed by the great majority of countries outside the Western sphere) do not want to be treated as existential enemies, to be destroyed within an international order where the US is allowed to continue to be the hegemonic country imposing its will, its values, and its interests all over the world. It also means to set up a new international order in which cooperation dominates and conflicts are to be settled through negotiation and mutual understanding. It is the US irrational refusal to discuss the remaking of the world order that forced China and Russia to undertake their long march toward a world more respectful of the differences that history produced, by taking into consideration the existence of other ways of thinking, of doing, and of organizing society,

polity and economy within sovereign and independent states. In other words, a more democratic international system.

3.1 The Ukrainian war accelerator

It is clear that the transition towards a multilateral world has been accelerated by the Ukrainian war. In fact, the Ukrainian crisis has further confirmed that the epochal change mentioned above was becoming a reality. It is the reaction of the Global South led by China and Russia to the US Empire foreign policy that, based upon the unshakable faith in its eternal superiority, threatens and actually uses force (military, economic, cultural) under the cover of democracy and human rights to impose its will on the world. The dominant Western narrative on the Ukrainian war is that Russia is the aggressor. Granted, Russia invaded Ukraine. But this has been the reaction of Russia to decades of Western aggressions in all the possible forms after the fall of the Soviet Union:

1. lying and not keeping promises: after Russia would accept the re-unification of Germany, NATO would not move an inch toward Russia; in successive waves the US, NATO and its ally-vassal, the European Union, have expanded up to the borders of Russia;
2. arrogantly dismissing all Russia's many suggestions, based upon the 'principle of indivisible security', to associate it with the management of security in Europe, thus imposing unilaterally the US' need for security (several thousand miles from its national borders), and not recognising Russia's need for security close to its borders;
3. after the fall of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Soviet Union-led Warsaw Pact, keeping the NATO military alliance and developing, in several European members close to Russia and far away from the US, all kind of lethal armaments, including nuclear arms;
4. militarily attacking, defeating and dismembering Russia's ally: Yugoslavia.
5. menacing of admitting into NATO two other countries at the border of Russia, Georgia and Ukraine: this menace was officially announced in 2008 and is valid still today;
6. installing several bio-laboratories in Ukraine close to the Russian borders, whose lethal products could be used against Russia;

7. invading²² one of Russia's neighbours, Ukraine, by finally organizing in 2014 a regime change that illegally overthrew a democratically elected pro-Russia president and bringing to power a pro-US puppet regime infiltrated by neo-Nazi activists;
8. supporting the criminal activities implemented by this regime against a large part of its own citizens of Russian origins; arming and training Ukraine military forces clearly in view of war against Russia (as suggested by the neo-conservatives that have dominated US foreign policy since at least the Clinton Administration - 1993-2001)
9. provoking that war at the end of 2022 when the US arrogantly refused any kind of negotiations, unless Russia would accept Ukraine to be part of NATO, which was clearly unacceptable for Russia if it wanted to safeguard its security;
10. supporting Ukraine in its war against Russia with the publicly admitted intent to inflict it a strategic defeat, thus possibly leading to the dismembering of Russia into several smaller states under the domination of the US;²³
11. using the 2014-2015 Minks agreements in a clearly fraudulent move for gaining time to allow the militarization of Ukraine by the US and NATO;²⁴

²² In the book, pp. 231-32, building upon Diana Johnston's analysis of the US intervention in Yugoslavia in the 1990s, I have argued that using military means is not the only way of invading a country. Whereas for the US establishment (especially for the neo-cons) this is officially the only way a country can invade another country, there are clearly other ways of doing so, such as invasions by NGOs, economic advisers and investors, especially if the purpose is to lead to a regime change, as this is clearly the goal the US had in the past and has still today for many countries (especially China) and also in Ukraine since at least 2014. The US way of defining invasion is therefore rather restrictive and do not correspond to reality. Or should one explain this by reference to the U.S. will to simply 'expand' all over the world (one way or the other) anticipated by Jefferson since the beginning of the 19th century (see beginning of Chapter 2 section 'American Ideology, Past and Present' and above, p. 3) where 'expansion' very clearly is not considered as an 'invasion' but as a liberation of the ignorant and oppressed people, facilitated where needed by targeted use of force?

²³ See for example Paul Craig Roberts, 'The US Government's Plan to Partition Russia Into Small States', *Global Research*, June 27, 2022, <https://www.globalresearch.ca/us-government-plan-partition-russia-small-states/5784622>. This is not something new for the US. At the end of WW2, the US envisaged several plans for dismembering Germany in several small states and for reducing it to an agricultural country by dismantling its industrial basis (especially its armaments industries) thereby avoiding the resurgence of an aggressive German foreign policy. These projects were quickly set aside when the US understood the interest it had to reintegrate Germany into the Western camp as a strong economic partner, able to help the US to face a possible war with the Soviet Union. The US favoured Germany economic development, its integration within the European Union, the reunification between Western and Eastern Germany and its rearmament (under conditions) and its accession to NATO. Contrary to promises made to Russia, the US favoured the access to NATO of the former Soviet Republics of Eastern Europe, up to the border of Russia. Under the Clinton administration (1993-2001) the US undertook several military interventions in Eastern Europe (including an illegal war, as only the UN Security Council can legally mandate a military intervention, which the US did not obtain) with the clear goal of dismantling the last communist country in Europe, Yugoslavia (possibly an ally of Russia), thereby further weakening the new Russian State that emerged after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. At the same time, the US started a series of policy moves to weaken Russia. The purpose of NATO 'is to keep the Soviet Union (and Russia) out, the Americans in, and the Germans down', as summarized by Lord Hastings Lionel Ismay, NATO's first Secretary General. The present US policy in Ukraine shows that the US remains faithful to this statement.

12. forbidding the Ukrainian regime to pursue negotiations with Russia in view of a cease-fire and eventually a peace treaty;²⁵ following this, the President of Ukraine passed a decree formally excluding to negotiate with Putin's Russia;
13. along all that process, publicly demonizing Russia and its leader, publicly declaring that Putin 'must go' (a clear hint to the goal of provoking a regime change in Russia).

In spite of an unprecedented number of sanctions, the Russian economy has not collapsed, on the contrary, the sanctions have backfired on the West. It is the West that is experiencing an extraordinary economic crisis. This reflects the ignorance and incompetence of the US and the EU leadership, incapable of evaluating the improvements realized by Russia's economy since the end of the 1990s. The same can be said about the Russian military, that has been, and is still today under-evaluated by Western observers, in spite of the reality on the battlefield.²⁶ Clearly, Ukraine is not winning the war. Moreover, contrary to the Western narrative, Russia is not isolated, it is the West that is in the process of isolating itself from the 'Global South'. With a population of about 13% of the world total, being in the process of being caught-up and in some important domains even overtaken by the Global South, e.g., for GDP, import-export, industrial output, technology (especially military technology), the quality of diplomacy and long-term strategy, the US-led crusade against China and Russia (in fact against the rest of the world) is promising nothing good for the Western citizens.

As time went by, the US, NATO and the EU made it clear, on several occasions, that they were ready to support Ukraine, 'as long as it takes', to fight on their behalf the proxy war

²⁴ See for example Ted Snider, 'The Minsk Deception and the Planned War in Donbas', *AntiWar.com*, 23 March 2023, https://original.antiwar.com/ted_snider/2023/03/19/the-minsk-deception-and-the-planned-war-in-donbas/.

²⁵ See for example Dave DeCamp, 'Former Israeli PM Bennett Says US "Blocked" His Attempts at a Russia-Ukraine Peace Deal', *AntiWar.com*, 5 February 2023, <https://news.antiwar.com/2023/02/05/former-israeli-pm-bennett-says-us-blocked-his-attempts-at-a-russia-ukraine-peace-deal/>.

²⁶ See the analyses of former members of the US military and Intelligence: former Colonels Douglas Macgregor and Richard Blake (who has also been member of the US Parliament), former Marine Corps intelligence officer Scott Ritter, former Marine veteran Brian Berletic, former CIA analysts Ray McGovern and Larry Johnson, former CIA Case Officer Phil Giraldi, available on the internet and/or on YouTube. It is also interesting to consult the books of Andrei Martyanov who explains how the art of war has changed during the last decades and how Russia has developed a military force supervisor to that of the US, especially supersonic missiles: Martyanov, Andrei (2018). *Losing Military Supremacy. The Myopia of American Strategic Planning*. Atlanta: Clarity Press. Martyanov, Andrei (2019). *The Real Revolution in Military Affairs*. Atlanta: Clarity Press. Martyanov, Andrei (2021). *Disintegration. Indicators of the Coming American Collapse*. Atlanta: Clarity Press. Recent analyses by Martyanov are available on the internet.

they instigated against Russia since at least the coup d'état of 2014. Not only actions were implemented by the US and its allies, but we also witnessed the use of an unbelievably aggressive language stating publicly, for example, that Putin is a killer, that he must go, meaning that the proxy war in Ukraine has the goal of provoking a spontaneous regime change in Russia, that Russia must undergo a strategic defeat. The goal of this strategic defeat, as publicly stated, would be to forbid Russia to invade other countries in Europe, whereas the real goal is to reduce Russia to the mercy of the Western alliance and very likely to return it to the wonderful Yeltsin years (1990s), when Russia was devastated by hordes of foreign and Russian speculators that drastically reduced its GDP and dramatically increased the poverty rate of its population. Russia understood that this was the real goal of the West, i.e., an existential threat.

Moreover, as the US became finally aware of the fast-developing threat against its domination, it was dramatically increasing its hostility not only against Russia but also against China by encouraging independentist movements in Taiwan, by increasing a formidable number of sanctions against its two 'existential enemies', and by threatening to sanction countries that would not condemn Russia for its invasion of Ukraine. Verbal aggression against Putin was also extended to Xi Jinping. For example, President Biden, during his January Report on the State of the Union, suddenly burst out shouting: 'Name me a world leader who would change places with Xi Jinping. Name me one. Name me one!'²⁷ When one remembers that at the beginning of the Biden administration, his newly appointed secretary of State proudly declared: 'President Biden has pledged to lead with diplomacy because it's the best way to deal with today's challenges.'²⁸ I have shown in this book that the reality of US foreign policy is miles away from being based primarily on diplomacy. In fact, the behaviour of US 'diplomats' is typically the one of ideologically driven warmongers. The Ukrainian war is just the last tragic event that clearly unmask the hypocrisy of the US

²⁷ Full Transcript of President Biden Full Transcript of Biden's State of the Union Address, *New York Times*, 8 February 2023, <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/08/us/politics/biden-state-of-the-union-transcript.html?login=email&auth=login-email>. It is interesting to note that the official website of the White House did not reproduce this speech in full and the passage quoted above has been deleted: Remarks of President Joe Biden – State of the Union Address as Prepared for Delivery, *The White House*, 7 February 2023, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/02/07/remarks-of-president-joe-biden-state-of-the-union-address-as-prepared-for-delivery/>

²⁸ See Chapter 1 of this book, section: 'The myth that the US always behaves according to international law and respects human rights.'

today's establishment dominated by neo-conservatives. The consequence is that China has very well understood that there is a similarity between the US policy using Ukraine as a proxy against Russia, and the US policy using Taiwan as a proxy against China: if Russia falls, then the US would attack China ... unless the US arrogance and illusions would drive it to simultaneously attacking Russia and China.²⁹

Finally, it became clear that not only the US was not ready to negotiate with Russia a cease-fire leading hopefully to peace, but was in fact forbidding Ukraine's President Zelensky to negotiate with Russia, and encouraged him 'to fight until the last Ukrainian soldier'. Under pressure from the US and the Ukrainian ultranationalists (in fact neo-Nazis) Zelensky introduced in a Presidential decree forbidding Ukraine to negotiate with Putin's Russia. Zelensky and other high-ranked Ukrainian officials have frequently stated that Ukraine's goal is to retake all the territories occupied by Russia since February 2022, including Crimea.

Giving the developments during the first year of the Ukrainian war, it became clear to China and Russia that in order to achieve the goals stated in the February 2, 2022, Joint Statement, they had to accelerate the movement towards the new multi polar world. In fact, between February and March 2023 China and Russia diplomacies (very likely within a coordinate strategy) have produced an unbelievable number of changes in the international order, that considerably weakens the US position. Those diplomatic moves led to the signing of the 21 March 2023 Joint statement that gave to the movement towards a new multi-polar world its irreversible character. But before we comment upon this document, let us see how we got there.

3.2 From bilateral trade swap agreements to strategic partnerships and the attack on the US dollar

It is impossible in the framework of this Postscriptum to analyse in depth these agreements and projects. A whole book would probably not be enough. I will instead outline the general

²⁹ In fact, the US uses several countries as proxy against China', as it has the habit of infiltrating into many countries around China to foment all sorts of hostilities (including riots) against the incumbent governments should they not comply with the US interests with the purpose of leading to regime change, as it happened in May 2023 in Thailand, that so far has developed substantial cooperation with China, especially in infrastructure constructions, security and provision of armaments, within the Belt and Road Initiative.

trend and its importance pointing to the birth of a new network of economic, financial, security and cultural exchanges outside the West and its allies, that in fact signifies the end of the unipolar world America made.³⁰

3.2.1 *The inevitable de facto alliance between China and Russia*

My first remark is that China is at the centre of these changes, because it is the most powerful country facing the domination of the US, in terms of population (both for quantity and quality), economy, military, science and technology, and public management. The strategic partnership with Russia is further strengthening its power basis necessary for driving the changes towards a multi-polar order. The West has systematically tried to express doubts about the solidity of this partnership, betting on the supposed conflicting strategic goals of the two partners. Moreover, it has also strongly suggested that Russia will inevitably play the role of the junior partner, becoming under the domination of China. This is another point that shows how the West has lost touch with reality.

In spite of its spectacular improvements in all power resources, China has still to improve on some points, such as microchips, some strategic weaponries, and agriculture. Moreover, for sustaining the development of its economy, both as a power resource and for providing to the Chinese people the ‘good life’ (美好生活 měi hào shēnghuó) they deserve, China needs to import from reliable partners the massive quantities of energy resources it needs for sustaining its economic development. Hence the development of three overlapping strategic partnerships with two of the major oil and gas producers, i.e., the strategic partnerships between China and Russia, China and Saudi Arabia, and Russia and Saudi Arabia. This is where the *de facto* alliance between China and Russia becomes essential for understanding the re-making of the world geo-strategic structure. The two countries are beautifully complementary. China can offer the size and the skills of its population, the size and quality of its economy, its advances in technology such as Artificial Intelligence, the efficiency of its public management and the sophistication of its strategy and diplomacy, its geographical position. Russia can offer its advance in the technology of several strategic weaponries (e.g.

³⁰ Information about these agreements is easily obtainable on the official websites of the concerned states, international organizations, and the media.

hypersonic missiles, artillery, air defence systems, icebreakers ships), its agriculture, and its natural resources such as oil and gas. Moreover, Russia is a remarkable asset for the development of China's BRI, as it can provide the contribution of its Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) comprising Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia. In fact, the 2 countries have already decided to coordinate and eventually integrate the BRI and the EAEU. Even more interestingly, Russia can contribute to maintain stability in the countries in Central Asia through which the BRI is planned to transit to reach the Middle East and Europe, and with which Russia has better knowledge and relationships than China.

This is particularly important as the US has shown very clearly that it is not going to give up its 'number 1 power status' without fighting, especially if the neo-conservatives manage to keep their grip over the US foreign policy. And one of the major means it is still capable of implementing is its strategy of penetrating countries it wants to convert to supporting its national interests with pseudo-NGO (in fact agents of the US establishment), with the purpose of provoking a regime change. The US has embarked on this strategy on a world-scale since at least the end of WW2 (and in fact is still trying to implement it today) not only in some of parts of China (Tibet, Xinjiang, Hong Kong and Taiwan) but also in practically all the Asian countries around China.³¹ The US can support this strategy by weaponizing the US dollar, as we shall see below. For example, we have witnessed at the moment of writing the implementation of this strategy towards Thailand where the US heavily interfered in the recent national elections that defeated the incumbent government favourable to cooperation with China and brought to power a coalition of parties hostile to China and favourable to the US.³²

³¹ In fact, the US has used this strategy already at the end of the XIX century, when it organized a regime change in the Hawaii, that paved the way to the annexation of this country in 1898; see Stephen Kinzer, *Overthrow: America's Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq*, New York, Times Books, 2006.

³² See the comments of US geopolitical analyst and debunker, former US marine officer Brian Berletic before Thai elections, 'US Meddling in Thai Elections: Seeking to Create an Anti-China Proxy', *New Eastern Outlook*, 16 March 2023 (<https://journal-neo.org/2023/03/16/us-meddling-in-thai-elections-seeking-to-create-an-anti-china-proxy/>). See his comments after the elections on his YouTube website *The New Atlas*: 'US Proxies Win Thai 2023 General Elections - Thai-Chinese Relations at Risk', 15 May 2023, US Proxies Win Thai 2023 General Elections - Thai-Chinese Relations at Risk, <https://www.youtube.com/>. See also the website of the NED (National Endowment for Democracy) a faked NGO, in fact an organization financed by the US government: <https://www.ned.org/>. Under 'Thailand' see the list of grants given to local Thai organizations: <https://www.ned.org/region/asia/thailand-2021/>. Berletic has been also interviewed by the Chinese Television CGTN.

Moreover, China and Russia are strongly against the Biden's opposition between 'democracy and authoritarianism', a contemporary version of the traditional US opposition between 'WE-the GOOD and THEM-the BAD'. Quite intelligently they have unmasked the arrogance and absurdity of this opposition, by showing that in fact it masks the opposition between the Western civilization (led by the US) wanting to impose its will upon the rest of the world, with the threat and, if necessary, the actual use of force, and the Global South civilizations (led by China and Russia) wanting to create 'a world of shared destiny'.

Finally, the two countries consider themselves not only as a state, but also, and maybe above all, as a civilization, that gives them a remarkably strong cultural and social cohesion.³³ The power of attraction of this 'tandem', not only for the Global South, but also for some members of the European elite has become evident during the Ukrainian crisis, as is attested by the US strategy to avoid losing its grips over allies and partners in Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere.

It is in this context that an increasing number of different types of agreements have been signed between members of the BRICS and the SCO organizations as well as between BRICS and SCO members and non-members.

3.2.2 *From financial swap agreements to strategic partnerships*

These agreements are an answer of the Global South to the unbelievably aggressive US policy towards Russia aiming at inflicting on it a strategic defeat leading to the overthrow of Putin and the dismemberment of Russia into a number of smaller countries under the control of the US Empire.³⁴ Add to this the US bullying and the blackmailing of practically all the

³³ For China, in the West this opinion is convincingly sustained by the British scholar Martin Jacques in his book *When China Rules the World: The End of the Western World and the Birth of a New Global Order*, London Penguin Books (second edition). See his interviews by CGTN (English edition) and his website: <http://www.martinjacques.com/>. For the same interpretation of Russia society as a civilizational state, see Putin's Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly, February 21, 2023, <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/70565>.

³⁴ See for example Paul Craig Roberts, 'The US Government's Plan to Partition Russia Into Small States', *Global Research*, June 27, 2022, <https://www.globalresearch.ca/us-government-plan-partition-russia-small-states/5784622>.

countries of the planet for the purpose of forcing them to condemn Russia's invasion of Ukraine, and the freezing of billions of Russian assets, labelled in USD and deposited in Western banks, with the threat of these assets being confiscated.³⁵ This US strategy was supported by the extraordinary international status of the USD established at the end of WW2, that the US has been used increasingly as a foreign policy weapon through a systematic use of sanctions imposed upon countries that would not comply with the Empire's dictates.³⁶ The conclusion is easy: 'if the Empire can confiscate the assets labelled in US dollars from the other major nuclear power, Russia, it will be easy for it to confiscate our own assets'. Inevitably this led several countries of the Global South's to accept the proposal put forward by Russia and China not only to pay their trade in their own national currencies, but also, and more significantly, to get rid of and increasing part of their US reserve currency and to set up an alternative financial international order based upon an international reserve currency other than the USD.

The first acceleration toward the new financial international order has been the signing or the development of an increasing number of bilateral trade swap agreements, both in number and in scope (i.e. volume of trade not paid in USD). These agreements allow to circumvent the USD by paying trade in the national currencies instead of the USD. Several of these agreements have in fact developed into trilateral swap agreements between 3 countries, either between BRICS-members or between BRICS-members with non-BRICS members. The former constitutes a strengthening of the BRICS, the latter an opening of the BRICS to other countries, this being eventually a first step to BRICS memberships and therefore another way of strengthening the BRICS. Examples of the former: Russia-India, Russia-China; example of the latter: Brazil (member of BRICS) – Argentina (non-member of BRICS) to which one

³⁵ Not to mention the US aggressiveness toward China concerning Taiwan.

³⁶ This is what the former President of France, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing (1974-1981) has labelled 'the exorbitant US Privilege'.

must add an agreement between China (Member of BRICS) and Argentina. Let us note that Argentina has manifested its interest in joining the BRICS.³⁷

Moreover, several of these trade agreements have been further developed into strategic partnerships covering a large array of strategic domains, such as trade in oil/gas paid in national currencies instead of USD, investments in infrastructure and in renewable energy, transfer of technology, etc. Again, these partnerships can be either between members of existing organizations such as the BRICS and the SCO, or between members of these organizations and non-members states. Examples of the first: China-Russia, Russia-India, and of the second: China-Saudi Arabia and China-Iran. Note that these partnerships paved the way to Iran and Saudi Arabia to membership with BRICS and SCO. Here again, some bilateral strategic partnerships can evolve into trilateral partnerships, e.g. China-Iran, Russia-Iran, China-Russia. Russia and Saudi Arabia seem also to be evolving into a trilateral partnership with China, that is paving the way to the selling of Saudi energy in currencies other than the USD, thus confirming the 180-degree change of the Saudi foreign policy away from their traditional partner-master, the USA, and toward China and Russia. This is of course a very strong move toward the end of the US hegemony that has been based (in addition to military power) on the selling of oil and gas in USD by practically all the exporters of these goods.³⁸ Similarly, the trilateral partnership between China, Russia and Iran is a significant defeat of the US policy in the Middle East. Moreover, both Saudi Arabia and Iran are two essential components of the China-lead BRI.

³⁷ Let me mention that at least 20 countries are considering joining or have already applied for joining the BRICS and/or the SCO. For BRICS, in addition to the present 5 members (China, Russia, India, Brazil and South Africa) Saudi Arabia and Iran have formally asked to join; countries that have expressed interest in joining include Argentina, Algeria, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Bahrain, Indonesia, Nigeria, Afghanistan. Thailand has also manifested its interests, but after the recent elections (in fact a regime change fomented by the US) it is not likely to formally ask for joining. For SCO, in addition to the present members 8 (China, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Pakistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), four Observer States are interested in acceding to full membership (Afghanistan, Belarus, Iran, and Mongolia) as well as six “Dialogue Partners” (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Turkey). Bangladesh, Bahrain, Israel and Saudi Arabia submitted applications for joining the SCO; Qatar, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Nepal, Turkey, Cambodia have manifested interest in joining SCO.

³⁸ Let me remind the reader that when some of these countries announced the intention to sell their oil/gas in other currencies than the USD, they have been brutally attacked by the US either by war, proxy war, or subversion and regime change. For example: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Venezuela.

3.2.3 The importance of the Belt and Road Initiative - BRI

In Chapter 3 I have commented upon the importance of the BRI, i.e., China's Grand Strategy, and the fear that this grandiose endeavour has produced within the US establishment. Today more than 150 countries in all continents are part of the BRI one way or the other.

Here I would like to add some additional comments given the recent development of the BRI, the increasing number of countries that would be part of it, and the recent reactions of the US.

Whereas the majority of the BRI corridors ran horizontally between East and West across the Eurasian continent, 2 very important corridors ran North to South. In this book I have already mentioned the China-Pakistan corridor, that connects the Road Belt, from Kashgar–Xinjiang to the Maritime Road in Gwadar, a port city on the southwestern coast of Pakistan, thus avoiding the Malacca Strait and the U.S. navy. The other North-South corridor is the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC) linking Russia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Iran and India, that recently developed an additional eastern extension stretching from Russia to Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan and India. Clearly Russia, India and Iran are the major economic drivers of this corridor. First, when completed it will allow a connection between India and Russia (that since the Ukrainian war have considerably developed their trade) to avoid the Suez Canal Route to reach mainly by road Saint Petersburg and Moscow after contouring Europe: a considerable gain in time and cost. Second, it shows the importance of Iran that is at the intersection of INSTC and the horizontal corridors of the BRI. The advantage of de facto alliance between China, Russia and Iran is therefore demonstrated. If we add the recent agreements between China, Russia and Saudi Arabia, we see that these four countries, soon to become all members of the BRICS, will constitute a powerful alliance based upon common economic interests. This synergy will further be sustained already this year when Iran and Saudi Arabia will join the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) that deal mainly with security problems.

Of course, these developments, that contribute significantly to the reshaping of the international order, have been contested by the West, especially the US and Europe. We have seen in the book that already in 2011 a 'New Silk Road' project was advanced with much fanfare by the then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton but was never realized. More recently several projects were put forwards, first by the newly elected President Biden in 2020: the 'Build Back Better' project to face China-led BRI was supported by Canada and the UK.

Then it was re-branded with a grandiose label ‘Build Back Better for the World’. Then in March 2021 Biden and Boris Johnson presented a new project well in tune with the ‘protect our environment time’: the ‘Green Belt Initiative’, but, as for the previous projects, no serious information about the content and the financing were given. Then, in September 2021 Ursula von der Leyen announced the ‘Global Green Gateway’, a European response to the BRI. But this project also faded away. Then in February 2022 came the war in Ukraine, and projects from the West assumed a clear anti Russia-China flavour with the clear intent to cut as many countries as possible from the BRI, and with ‘efforts to intimidate, bribe and threaten nations like Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Turkey into abandoning the concept of the Middle Corridor as a hub of China-led development ... (...) The leaders of the nations along the Middle Corridor have made it clear that they are happy to do business with Europe, but not at the expense of their relationships with either Russia or China’.³⁹

The difficulty these projects have experienced in proceeding beyond the grandiose declarations shows that the analyses of what the US can do to face the BRI performed by a team set up by the most important American think tank on foreign policy, the *Council on Foreign Relations*, are overall correct: ‘The United States cannot and should not respond to BRI symmetrically, attempting to match China dollar for dollar or project for project. Instead, the United States should focus on those areas where it can offer, either on its own or in concert with like-minded nations, a compelling alternative to BR.’ Furthermore, having noticed that ‘BRI also includes developed countries, with numerous U.S. allies participating’ the *Council on Foreign Relations*’ team concluded in 2021: ‘if these U.S. allies were to turn to BRI to build critical infra-structure, such as power grids, ports, or telecommunications networks, this could complicate U.S. contingency planning and make coming to the defence of its allies more difficult.’ Exactly.

As I am showing in this *Postscriptum*, the situation of the US within ‘the world it made’ has become problematic, to say the least, especially regarding its capacity to preserve the world it had created. Many moves by the US since at least the day Russia invaded Ukraine, and in fact

³⁹ Mathew Ehret, ‘Eurasia’s Middle Corridor: An Atlanticist frenzy to stifle Europe-Asia integration’, *The Cradle*, January 2, 2023, <https://thecradle.co/article-view/19949/eurasias-middle-corridor-an-atlanticist-frenzy-to-stifle-europe-asia-integration>. Ehret writes frequently on *The Cradle* about the BRI and related problems. See also Vali Kaleji, ‘Iran and Russia Cooperation in the Construction of Rasht-Astara: the Only Remaining Railway of the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC), Moscow, *The Valdai Club*, 30 March, 2023.

the overall orientation (or lack of orientation) of its foreign policy, are the many manifestations of US fear of the type I mentioned at the beginning of this book: ‘The Indians are coming!’ The problem is that this time it is almost the whole Global South that ‘is coming’: 7 billion people against 1 billion of the Global West. And now these 7 billion people are not coming with feathers on their heads, bows and arrows in their hands, and anger on their frightening faces. They are coming with their economy (developed for many, developing for others) their technology, armaments, intelligence, university training, diplomacy, strategy. Winchester rifles will not suffice to face them. Negotiate? No, the US does not negotiate; the US uses a proxy country to fight openly (and dying) on the battle field while US officials operate at distance in their offices and sitting rooms; the US infiltrates, subverts, changes the regime of countries it considers as its enemies and it does the same for countries that do not help the US to fight against those enemies (see Thailand mentioned above); the US sets up a propaganda based upon lies, and outlaws broadcasting from its enemies; the US spies on its enemies and also on those it calls its friends, allies or partners; the US marginalizes or even censors dissident voices; it sanctions countries that do not obey its orders; it implements the old Roman motto ‘*Divide et Impera*’ ... or, in other words: order from chaos. But what kind of order? A world in which one country dictates to the international community its own will, and menaces and eventually sanctions those who do not comply, is certainly not a free world.

At the moment of writing, I had information about the last US move against the BRI. At the beginning of May 2023, the National Security Adviser, Jake Sullivan (one of the infernal Quartet) managed to organize a meeting with representatives of Saudi Arabia, India and the United Arab Emirate, Israel apparently being part of the project, but not participating in the meeting in order to avoid creating useless problems. According to the *Times of Israel* the goal of the meeting was ‘to discuss a massive infrastructure project ... The four officials will discuss a rail and port network linking the Gulf states and India. (...)’⁴⁰ This is clearly a move to detach India from Russia and China. Given the development of cooperation between these 3 countries with Iran and Saudi Arabia within the BRICS and SCO organizations, the advancement of the completion of the INSTC corridor linking Russia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Iran and India, the difficulties the US is experiencing with its economy, and its incapacity to escape from the Ukrainian quagmire it has created, it will be difficult for the US to succeed in

⁴⁰ Lazar Berman, ‘Senior US official in Saudi Arabia to discuss massive rail project with UEA, India’, *The Times of Israel*, 7 May 2023, <https://www.timesofisrael.com/senior-us-official-in-saudi-arabia-to-discuss-massive-rail-project-with-uae-india/>.

stopping the long march of the BRI towards the unification of the Eurasian continent. It will take time, due mainly to the unbelievably suicidal European foreign policy, but clearly in the long run it cannot be stopped.

3.2.4 Towards a synergy between BRICS, SCO and BRI?

So, as I have introduced the BRI, let me point to its link with BRICS and SCO. BRICS deals mainly with economic development and win-win cooperation, investments and financial matters, SCO mainly with security (but also economic cooperation), BRI with infrastructure development, in principle on the new Belt and Road corridors, but in fact all over the world.⁴¹ Whereas these organizations have their own priorities, it is clear that their specific endeavours are inevitably changing, one way or the other, the overall structure of the international system; and this pleads in favour of the coordination, and maybe in the medium and long term, the harmonization of their strategies within a new integrated organization. In fact, a *de facto* partial integration is already realized as China, Russia, India, Iran and Saudi Arabia are at the core of both BRICS and SCO. And one should not forget the Russia-lead Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU). Western pundits and politicians have taken a malign pleasure in pointing out the contradictions and possible conflicts between China and Russia, in particular the competition between the EAEU and the BRI. Bad luck!⁴² At the occasion of their Moscow Meeting of March 2023, Presidents Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin, announced their will to coordinate the activities of the BRI and the EAEU (more on this meeting below).

Before we conclude with a general appreciation of these innovations, we have to take stock of the changes that occurred within a very important organization, OPEC that deals with the regulation of the production of energy, oil and gas. Until recently, this organization has been under the control of the US, thanks to several agreements concluded by the US with Saudi Arabia, the first already at the end of WW2, another in 1973 when the Saudi agreed to sell their energy in USD in exchange of American security protection. We have seen above that

⁴¹ One has to see the BRI website that gives information about BRI investments.

⁴² The same could be said about the US and EU efforts to try to drive India to condemn Russia's interventions in Ukraine, and to dissuade India from cooperating with China within the BRICS, where India, having developed massive agreements with Russia for trade to be paid in their currencies, seems to be very much interested in setting up a new international currency replacing the USD, notwithstanding its participation within the QUAD, the security organizations set up by the US, comprising the US, India, Australia and Japan.

Chinese and Russian diplomacy has tried to put an end to this US-Saudi partnership by establishing some strategic partnerships with the Saudi. But the first change occurred already in 2016, when OPEC admitted 10 other oil producers to create OPEC+, including Russia, one of the biggest producers of energy resources. This means that the power relation within this important economic domain has been changed to the advantage of Russia. Thanks to the Russia-China strategic partnership with Saudi Arabia, Russia could come to agreements with Saudi Arabia (as 2 of the greatest producers of these resources) to impose their will on the strategy of this sector, and this could be eventually to the detriment of the US.

So, an impressive new network of bilateral and multilateral swap agreements, of bilateral and multilaterals partnerships, of multilateral coordination within new organizations outside the Western sphere has developed, first little by little since the beginning of the XX Century and the 2008 financial crisis, and then at an accelerated pace since the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the irrational reaction of the US and its allies to this tragic event. Inevitably, the change in the distribution of power resources in favour of the Global South and its champions, China and Russia, of course, but also India and several new regional powers such as Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Brazil, has ended with the inevitable attack on the US dollar, the last power resource the US is still able to mobilize (apart from nuclear power and regime change strategy) to desperately defend its hegemonic position.

2.3.5 The decline of the US empire and the attack on the USD

It is interesting to note that after the US has experienced increasing difficulties in using economic resources and overt military means to impose its will, as the debacles in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria and Libya have demonstrated, and the coming debacle in Ukraine is about to demonstrate, it has started to increase covert military operations (that doubled under the Obama administration), proxy wars (Syria, Libya, Ukraine) and especially by weaponizing the USD, thanks to the dominant position of the USD as the major reserve currency, and the almost universal use of the USD for paying international trade. Moreover, thanks to its dominant position within the SWIFT, the US can be informed if countries under its primary

sanctions continue nevertheless trading with, and/or investing in, third countries.⁴³ The US can thus sanction the latter with secondary sanctions with the goal of dissuading them from further trading with or investing in the former. Let us note that these sanctions are illegal as in fact they are based upon the unilateral internationalization of the US legal system. The US implements sanctions by passing American laws that are imposed upon other countries, thereby violating their sovereignty as is guaranteed by international laws and the United Nations.

No wonder then that those countries had started using every opportunity to escape from US sanctions, i.e. from the US dictatorship. Several countries, starting with Russia and China, are seriously envisaging to further escape from the dominance of the US dollar, by setting up, in addition to the financial swap agreements, a new international currency based upon a basket of the member-states currencies, weighted according to their economic strength, and pegged to physical assets such as energy resources and gold, i.e., away from financial capitalism and back to productive capitalism.⁴⁴

It is well-known that after the Communist Party of China won the civil war in 1949, the US feared that communism could expand to other countries through what it called the ‘domino effect’. So, the US embarked in several foreign policy moves, including the wars of Korea and Vietnam. By doing so it spent well above its actual financial capacities to the point that in 1971 it was not any more in the position to guarantee the conversion of the USD into gold, as agreed at the end of WW2. So, President Nixon unilaterally put an end to the Gold Standard.

⁴³ The Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunications (SWIFT) system powers most international money and security transfers. SWIFT is a vast messaging network used by financial institutions to quickly, accurately, and securely send and receive information, such as money transfer instructions.

⁴⁴ Michael Hudson, *Super Imperialism. The Economic Strategy of American Empire*, London, Pluto Press, 2021 (Third Edition); Pepe Escobar, Exclusive: Russian geo-economics Tsar Sergey Glazyev introduces the new global financial system’, *The Cradle*, 14 April, 2022; Ellen Brown, ‘The Coming Global Financial Revolution’, *Seeking Alpha*, & April, 2022; Radhika Desai and Michael Hudson, ‘Beyond Dollar Creditocrazy: A Geopolitical Economy, Moscow, *Valdai Paper no. 116*, July 2021; see also two excellent articles by Zoltan Pozsar who was a senior adviser to the US Department of the Treasury, where he advised the Office of Debt Management and the Office of Financial Research, and served as the Treasury’s liaison to the FSB on matters of financial innovation. Zoltan was deeply involved in the response to the global financial crisis and the ensuing policy debate. He joined the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in August 2008 in charge of market intelligence for securitized credit markets and served as point person on market developments for senior Federal Reserve, US Treasury and White House officials throughout the crisis; then between 2015 and April 2023 he worked for the Swiss bank *Credit Suisse* as Managing Director, Investment Strategy and Research, ‘War and Currency Statecraft’, *Credit Suisse*, 29 December 2022 and ‘War and Commodity Encumbrance’, *Credit Suisse*, 27 December 2022; Alasdair Macleod, ‘Geopolitics: the world is splitting into two’, *goldmoney.com*, 18 August, 2022.

But the US needed to peg the USD to another material resource replacing Gold. This was done in 1973 by obtaining from the biggest oil producer, Saudi Arabia, to sell its oil in USD and to convince the other oil producers to do the same, in exchange of the US military protection of its country. It was the birth of the petrodollar era.⁴⁵

In order to escape from the US dominance based in part on the petrodollar, China started, as we have seen in this book (section: 'The challenge to the international role of the dollar'), to develop an alternative to the petrodollar, i.e. the petroyuan. On May 27, 2018 China, the biggest oil buyer, announced the opening of its crude-futures contract in the Shanghai International Energy Exchange (SIEE), that will allow trading oil in yuan. It started well, but the volume traded in Shanghai remained very small compared to what was traded in USD. Several Western media expressed serious doubts about the future of the SIEE. It was another mistake, as China does not have the habit of embarking in such a grandiose and difficult task with a short time horizon. It is another example of China strategy in the making. You do what you can, and this was the establishment of the Shanghai SIEE. Then you continue to do what you can do: you develop your economy and your technology, you develop a foreign policy based upon respect for other countries' ideology, culture and interests, you establish yourself as a reliable partner not seeking to interfere into other countries' internal matters, and you base cooperation on a 'win-win' approach. Then, when the silent transformations have done their work without your interfering and bring to the open the US hegemon's manifest weaknesses, you act. You present yourself as a peacemaker all over the world, including in the Middle East. You establish a strategic partnership with Russia, Iran and Saudi Arabia (another major oil producer), thus including in your partners not only Saudi Arabia, but also the other Middle East countries comprising the Gulf Cooperation Council. It will take time, maybe a decade, but the movement away from the petrodollar and toward the petroyuan or a new common currency, probably within the BRICS, is on its way.⁴⁶

Moreover, we have seen in the same section, the use of the U.S. dollar, the world's major reserve and trade currency, in conjunction with the control by the US of the SWIFT system used for financial transfers. Under the SWIFT system, thanks to the information thus

⁴⁵ The attentive reader has certainly remarked the 'mafia character' of this arrangement.

⁴⁶ See for example Vijay Prashad, 'The Petrodollar Long Goodbye', *Consortium News*, 15 December 2022, <https://consortiumnews.com/2022/12/15/the-petrodollars-long-goodbye/>. Prashad is the director of the Tricontinental: Institute for Social Research, and non-resident fellow at Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies, Renmin University of China.

acquired, the U.S. can block the transactions, seize money being transferred to countries under U.S. sanctions, threaten to exclude the companies concerned from the U.S. market, and eventually charge them with very severe fines, as it has done habitually in the past. Recently, as the West has excluded Russia from the SWIFT system, Russia and China, supported by other countries, started to implement an alternative to the SWIFT. It will take time, but it is on its way, make no mistake.

Some forecast (and some fear) that China will try to replace the USD with the yuan as a reserve currency. This is not very likely, at least in the foreseeable future, as for doing so China would necessarily allow the convertibility of the yuan, thus losing the control on the capital movements in and out the country. And this is something that has allowed so far China to have a sufficient control over its economy. In any case, China will be able to play a decisive role in the new financial international order thanks to the size and quality of its economy.

Add to all these financial agreements and moves to escape the dominance of the USD the brilliant achievements of the China-Russia *de facto* alliance:

1. the achievements of China's diplomacy, in particular the brokering of an agreement between long-term enemies such as Saudi Arabia and Iran and opening a new era of strategic cooperation between China and Saudi Arabia, in addition to the strategic partnership with Iran,
2. the agreement brokered by Russia between Syria and Saudi Arabia that, at the moment of writing, has led to the readmission of Syria within the Arab League,
3. the ongoing cooperation between Russia and Turkey for the settlement of the Syrian war by putting an end to the illegal presence on Syrian soil of foreign belligerents, including the US,
4. these moves are paving the way for the end of the Yemen war, to which the US has provided a devastating contribution in terms of destructions, deaths of civilians and one of the deadliest humanitarian crises of the XXI century.

Clearly these moves would not be possible without the coordination of China and Russia diplomacies and the cooperation between Russia and Turkey. They all signal the declining role of the US in its former 'garden of the Middle East'. Exit the hegemon that has fomented

conflicts and war in the region for decades, enter countries working for peace, true economic development based upon a win-win approach, with no strings attached aiming at interfering within the internal affairs of the countries concerned, which is in fact a new form of colonialism.

So, China and Russia are together working at the establishment of a world order where mutual respect and understanding, stability and wellbeing development based upon win-win cooperation, and a more democratic international order are the major values upon which should be based the peaceful coexistence of independent countries, free to organize their society, polity and economy according to their history and national conditions. This vision is clearly different from the American one based, since the beginning of the American republic, upon the partition between WE and the OTHER, with the consequence to qualify WE as the GOOD and the OTHER as the BAD. Clearly, this has led to an international order where the menace and the actual use of force in all its forms (military, economic, and cultural) are the main means for solving problems, competition, and conflicts.⁴⁷

We are back to the beginning of the sixteenth century when Spain started the drive of the West toward the conquest of the rest of the world starting with the conquest of South America. In Spain, this first manifestation of Western imperialism and colonialism generated the debate between the philosopher Juan Ginés de Sepulveda justifying this brutal conquest in the name of ‘civilization’, and the Catholic priest Bartolomé de Las Casas criticizing it in the name of humanity to which all human beings belong, including the Native Indians. Today, this opposition is again in action in the form of Biden’s opposition between ‘Democracy and Totalitarianism’. Today, war in all its forms against the savages Russians, Chinese, Iranians and the like, is rightful, as it was against the Native Indians of South and North America.

⁴⁷ I have discussed elsewhere the partition between hard power (based upon the use of military or economic means) and soft power (based upon cultural means). Sustaining that the implementation of power by using cultural means is ‘soft’ is an intellectual fraud. Power is a unitary phenomenon that is more or less hard in all of its manifestations. Moreover military, economic and cultural means of power are generally implemented simultaneously either as a threat or as an actual implementation. The Ukrainian crisis is an excellent example. See Paolo Urio, *China Reclaims World Power Stats. Putting an End to the World America Made*, London & New York, Routledge, 2019, pp. 36-82. Chinese translations: Paolo Urio, 无声的变化:中国重新成为世界大国的战略选择, China Intercontinental Press, 2022, pp. 42-92.

We are stuck within an international order that is the Biden's version of the 'Clash of Civilizations', to which China and Russia are answering with their own interpretation of this same clash: on the one side, a decadent Western civilization based upon arrogance, the threat and if necessary the actual uses of force, interference within the national affairs of sovereign countries, and on the other side the civilization China and Russia are offering to the world, based upon mutual respect, peaceful development, win-win endeavours between sovereign countries not interfering within the internal affairs of each other. Clearly China and Russia, with the rest of the Global South, are telling the West: that's enough. The Ukrainian crisis is telling the US and its allies-vassals that the time of arrogance and hubris is over. Should they not understand this and enter the time of illusions (as it is unfortunately already the case) they will simply postpone the inevitable fall of the US Empire. With what consequences for the people of the world?

3.3 How China and Russia hammer the final nail in the coffin of the unipolar world

Between February and March 2023 China and Russia published, separately or together, several documents that clearly showed to the West that these two leaders of the revolt against the unilateral world America made had understood that the West, led by the US, had no intention to negotiate not only a settlement of the Ukrainian conflict, but also, and more seriously, any revision of the Western-rule-based liberal international order. Moreover, as I have already mentioned, even in case of obtaining the signature of a formal agreement, the two countries understood that the US was 'not agreement capable'. Both official statements by the US officials and the actual behaviour of the US during at least the last 3 decades showed that the paramount goal of the US foreign policy was to safeguard by all means this international order, even at the detriment of its closest allies, i.e. Europe, as the sabotage of the Nord Streams 1 and 2 demonstrated. This would necessarily need either the integration of China and Russia within this world in a subordinate position (which has been the US goal during the years of the delirium of the 'end of history') or the final defeat of Russia and China. These documents are referred to, in chronological order in the following note.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ 20 February 2023, US Hegemony and its Perils, *China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs*; 21 February 2023, The global Security Initiative, *China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs*; 21 February 2023, Presidential Address to Federal Assembly (by Vladimir Putin), *The Kremlin*; 24 February 2023, China's Position on the Political Settlement of the Ukrainian Crisis, *China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs*; 19 March 2023, Vladimir Putin Article for People's Daily Newspaper, Russia and China: A Future-Bound Partnership, *China Daily*; 20 March 2023,

Hereafter I will analyse the main policy points developed in these documents and I will show how and why they put an end to the unipolar world the US made.

3.3.1 *China on the US hegemony and its perils*

First, the starting point, from which all the rest derives, is the analysis by China's Foreign Ministry of the *US hegemony and its perils*. By this document China tells the US: we know what you have been, what you are today and what you will be in the future. In a few pages, it is a remarkably well-researched in-depth enumeration of all the wrong deeds the US implemented to establish and maintain its domination all over the world, going back to the beginning of the American exceptional Republic. By reading this text I had the impression of revising a summary of what I have written on US ideology and its projection on foreign policy in my 2018, 2019 and 2022 books (see bibliography of this book). As I have sustained in my writings, China considers that 'expansion' has been the main driver of US foreign policy: since the declaration of independence (1776) 'the US has constantly sought expansion by force: it slaughtered the Indians, invaded Canada, waged a war against Mexico, instigated the American-Spanish war, and annexed Hawaii'.

It is not possible in this Postscriptum to discuss all the means, quoted in this document, the US has implemented to establish its hegemony. But let me quote the most important:

1. after WW2 the US provoked or launched the wars in Korea, Vietnam, the Gulf, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria;
2. the US keeps about 800 military bases abroad, 173,000 troops in 159 countries, and its military budget accounts for 40% of the world total;
3. political interferences, military interventions and regime subversions, colour revolutions (e.g. Cuba, Chile, Georgia, Ukraine, Philippines, Kyrgyzstan, Arab countries);

Full Text of Xi's signed Article on Russian Media, *China Daily*; 23 March 2023, Joint statement of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation on deepening the comprehensive strategic partnership of coordination in the new era, www.thepeoplesvoice.org.

4. the US overthrew democratically elected governments in many developing countries in the XX Century and immediately replaced them with pro-American puppet regimes;
5. US military interventions created 37 million refugees around the world, and the killing of thousands of civilians;
6. in several wars, the US used massive quantities of chemical and biological weapons as well as cluster bombs, fuel-air bombs, graphite bombs and depleted uranium bombs, causing enormous damage on civilian facilities, countless civilian casualties and lasting environmental pollution;
7. instigating regional disputes, and even directly launching war under the pretext of promoting democracy, freedom and human rights;
8. practicing a selective approach to international laws and rules, utilizing or discarding them as it sees fit to impose rules that serve its own interests in the name of a 'rules-based international order';
9. ramping up bloc politics and stoke conflict and confrontation;
10. abusing export controls and forcing unilateral sanctions upon others;
11. attempting to mould other countries and the world order with its own values and political system in the name of promoting democracy and human rights;
12. practising a 'Neo-Monroe Doctrine';
13. practising double standards on international rules, walking out from international treaties and organizations (e.g. United Nations Population Fund - UNFPA, UNESCO, Paris agreement on climate change, UN Human Rights Council, Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, Treaty of Open Skies:
14. opposing negotiations on a verification protocol for the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) and impeding international verification of countries' activities relating to biological weapons. As the only country in possession of a chemical weapons stockpile, the US has repeatedly delayed the destruction of chemical weapons and remains reluctant in fulfilling its obligations;
15. forcing regional countries to take sides;
16. the document mentions the economic and financial means the US uses to maintain its hegemony, by manipulating the weighted voting system within financial international organizations, by providing financing to countries while imposing conditions so that their economic policies would fall in line with the US strategy, suppressing competitors with economic coercion, e.g. when the US leveraged its

hegemonic financial power against Japan by imposing the Plaza Accord that; using American national laws implemented illegally and unilaterally upon other countries allowing the US to sanction these countries should they not comply with the US policies;

17. finally, the document mentions that by overstretching the use of the ‘concept of national security’, the US imposes sanctions on its competitors in high-tech sectors such as telecom, semiconductor, biotechnology, and artificial intelligence sectors.

The document’s conclusion is worth quoting in full:

‘While a just cause wins its champion wide support, an unjust one condemns its pursuer to be an outcast. The hegemonic, domineering, and bullying practices of using strength to intimidate the weak, taking from others by force and subterfuge, and playing zero-sum games are exerting grave harm. The historical trends of peace, development, cooperation, and mutual benefit are unstoppable. The United States has been overriding truth with its power and trampling justice to serve self-interest. These unilateral, egoistic and regressive hegemonic practices have drawn growing, intense criticism and opposition from the international community.

Countries need to respect each other and treat each other as equals. Big countries should behave in a manner befitting their status and take the lead in pursuing a new model of state-to-state relations featuring dialogue and partnership, not confrontation or alliance. China opposes all forms of hegemonism and power politics and rejects interference in other countries' internal affairs. The United States must conduct serious soul-searching. It must critically examine what it has done, let go of its arrogance and prejudice, and quit its hegemonic, domineering and bullying practices’.

3.3.2 *China’s global Security Initiative*

Second, the implicit values and principles on which the document on the *US hegemony and its perils* is based upon have been detailed by China in another document intitled: *The global Security Initiative (GSI)*. Clearly this is a Memorandum in favour of a multi-polar world. The

document starts by affirming that ‘the historical trends of peace, development and win-win cooperation are unstoppable’ and that GSI’s ‘aims to eliminate the root causes of international conflicts’ thanks to the implementation of the following six principles:

1. Stay committed to the vision of common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security. This implies to advocate a concept of common security, respecting and safeguarding the security of every country; a commitment to cooperation through political dialogue and peaceful negotiation; resolving conflicts through development and eliminating the breeding ground for insecurity.
2. Stay committed to respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, meaning to respect sovereign equality and non-interference in internal affairs of other countries and their right to independently choose social systems and development paths.
3. Stay committed to abiding by the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. The document considers that the various confrontations and injustices in the world today did not occur because the purposes and principles of the UN Charter are outdated, but because they are not effectively maintained and implemented. Therefore, it calls on all countries to practice true multilateralism; firmly uphold the international system with the UN at its core, the international order underpinned by international law and the basic norms of international relations underpinned by the UN Charter. The Cold War mentality, unilateralism, bloc confrontation and hegemonism contradict the spirit of the UN Charter and must be resisted and rejected.
4. Stay committed to taking the legitimate security concerns of all countries seriously. By putting forward the principle of ‘indivisible security’, the document affirms that Humanity is an indivisible security community. Security of one country should not come at the expense of that of others.
5. Stay committed to peacefully resolving differences and disputes between countries through dialogue and consultation. The document rejects the use of sanctions as abusing unilateral sanctions and long-arm jurisdiction does not solve a problem, but only creates more difficulties and complications.
6. Stay committed to maintaining security in both traditional and non-traditional domains. The document considers that today security is more interconnected, transnational and diverse. Traditional and non-traditional security threats have become intertwined. China encourages all countries to practice the principles of

extensive consultation, and to address also non-traditional security threats such as terrorism, climate change, cybersecurity and biosecurity.

The document further explains in a paragraph, that is in fact a summary of the six principles, that:

‘These six commitments are interlinked and mutually reinforcing and are an organic whole of dialectical unity. Among them, the vision of common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security provides conceptual guidance; respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries is the basic premise; abiding by the purposes and principles of the UN Charter is a primary benchmark; taking the legitimate security concerns of all countries seriously is an important principle, peacefully resolving differences and disputes between countries through dialogue and consultation is a must choice; and maintaining security in both traditional and non-traditional domains is an inherent requirement’.

The last parts of the document deal with priorities of cooperation and mechanisms of cooperation, that is not necessary to explicitly deal with in this Postscriptum, except for the Ukrainian crisis for which China reaffirms its principle to ‘Promote political settlement of international and regional hotspot issues (...) mainly through the means of facilitating peace talks, with fairness and practicality as the main attitude, and mainly following the approach of addressing both symptoms and root causes. Support political settlement of hotspot issues such as the Ukraine crisis through dialogue and negotiation’.

3.3.3 *China’s position on the settlement of the Ukrainian crisis*

This last point of the document on *China’s global Security Initiative* has been developed in a 12 points document intitled *China’s Position on the Political Settlement of the Ukrainian Crisis*. In this document China starts by posing two of the main principles already put forward in the *The global Security Initiative (GSI)* document: respecting the sovereignty of all countries, and abandoning the Cold War mentality. The purpose of the other points is clearly to support the first two points. They are based upon the practical attitude China already put forward in *The global Security Initiative*: ceasing hostilities, resuming peace talks, resolving the humanitarian crisis, protecting civilians and prisoners of war, keeping nuclear power plants

safe, reducing strategic risks, facilitating grain exports, stopping unilateral sanctions, keeping industrial and supply chains stable, and promoting post-conflict reconstruction.

Any reasonable person would consider this document as a valuable starting point for embarking the major actors of this crisis into peace talks that should put an end of a war that could have been avoided in December 2022 when the US, NATO and the EU arrogantly refused to discuss 2 international treaties put forward by Russia, based upon the principle of ‘indivisible security’. With no surprise the West dismissed China’s peace plan. Clearly, Cold War mentality and ‘zero-sum games’ are still the major dimensions of Western foreign policy, as is the opposition between WE and the OTHER, in the Biden variant: ‘Democracy vs Authoritarianism’.⁴⁹

At the moment of writing, China is nevertheless patiently working for finding a peaceful and shared solution to the Ukrainian tragedy. History will say if reasonable people are still capable within the West to put pressure on the Western elites so that they at last will cooperate with China to work in this direction.

3.3.4 *Putin’s address to the Federal Assembly*

During the same month of February, Russia has also published several documents among which it suffices to mention *Putin’s Presidential Address to Federal Assembly*. Inevitably, this speech deals in depth with the ongoing war in Ukraine. But for the purpose of this Postscriptum it is more interesting to see how Putin’s analysis is in tune with the Chinese analysis of the opposition between the Global West and the Global South within which China and Russia are playing the major role. Of course, as, contrary to China, Russia is in fact fighting a war instigated and planned by the USA, many of Putin’s criticisms against the West are based upon Russia’s experience in the Ukrainian war. Notwithstanding, Putin’s analysis is overall in tune with the Chinese documents I presented above, especially the necessary transition to a multi-polar world. Here are the main points developed in Putin’s analysis of the regional and international situation:

⁴⁹ This arrogant and irresponsible attitude has been confirmed by the decisions taken at the recent meeting of the G7. See: G7 Hiroshima Leaders’ Communiqué, *The White House*, 20 May 2023, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/05/20/g7-hiroshima-leaders-communicue/>

1. Trust between Russia and the West, especially the US, has gone.
2. Russia is, as China is, a civilizational state facing an existential threat from the US-led global West; Russia is an open country and at the same time, a distinct civilization. There is no claim to exclusivity or superiority in this statement, but this civilization of ours – that is what matters. Our ancestors passed it to us, and we must preserve it for our descendants and pass it on to them.
3. Putin stressed that the US and NATO are openly saying that their goal is to inflict a strategic defeat on Russia.
4. During the years that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union, the West never stopped trying to set the post-Soviet states on fire and, most importantly, finish off Russia as the largest surviving portion of the Russia state. They encouraged international terrorists to assault us, provoked regional conflicts along the perimeter of our borders, ignored our interests and tried to contain and suppress our economy.
5. The US is ‘not agreement capable’, and Putin gives many examples explaining why this is the case: of the three US-Russian weapons treaties, it abandoned two of them: the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF); more specifically, concerning the Ukraine crisis, the promises of Western leaders, their assurances that they were striving for peace in Donbass turned out to be a sham and outright lies.
6. Putin insists on the importance of the ‘principle of indivisible security’ in Europe, to which the US responded with NATO expansion to Russia’s borders, and in December 2021 rejected all fundamental points Russia presented in two draft agreements on security guarantee in Europe.
7. It is the US that supported the 2014 coup in Ukraine and started the war in 2014 by using Ukraine as a proxy against Russia.
8. Putin also deals with the troubled relations between the West and the rise of Nazism in Germany in the 1930s; and points out the resurgence of neo-Nazism in post WW2 Ukraine, a country that since at least the 2010s is supported by the US.
9. Putin also complains about the economic sanctions the West has imposed upon Russia, even if he is pleased to announce that this strategy has failed to weaken Russia’s economy.
10. The US invest in sowing unrest and encouraging coups in other countries around the world.

11. The US also continue to rob everyone under the guise of democracy and freedoms, to impose neoliberalism and essentially totalitarian values, to brand entire countries, to publicly insult their leaders.
12. Russia praises the Belt and Road Initiative, its horizontal, as well as its North-South INSSSTC corridor that connect Russia and India mainly on earth, as we have seen above.
13. Russia will continue working with its partners to create a sustainable, safe system of international settlements, which will be independent of the dollar and other Western reserve currencies.

3.3.4 The letters of Presidents Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin, 19-20 March 2023

These Chinese and Russian documents paved the way to the March 3-days long meeting in Moscow between Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin. The two letters the two leaders published before the meeting are not only the confirmation that China and Russia have reached a very well thought-out strategic agreement on several substantial aspects of the international order, but also a refutation of the possible divergences or even potential conflicts that, according to Western propaganda, may disrupt in the future this cooperation. Let us see the main points.

(a) Establishing cooperation based upon trust

‘Over the past 10 years, we have come a long way in our wide-range cooperation and made significant strides into a new era. We have met 40 times on bilateral and international occasions. Both countries uphold an independent foreign policy and see our relationship as a high priority in our diplomacy. There is a clear historical logic and strong internal driving force for the growth of China-Russia relations. Looking back on the extraordinary journey of China-Russia relations over the past 70 years and more, we feel strongly that our relationship has not reached easily where it is today, and that our friendship is growing steadily and must be cherished by us all. China and Russia have found a right path of state-to-state interactions. This is essential for the relationship to stand the test of changing international circumstances, a lesson borne out by both history and reality. Our two sides have cemented political mutual trust.’ (Xu Jinping).

‘We have reached an unprecedented level of trust in our political dialogue; our strategic cooperation has become truly comprehensive in nature and is standing on the brink of a new era. President Xi Jinping and I have met about 40 times and have always found time and opportunity to talk in a variety of official formats as well as at no-tie events.’(Putin).

(b) The necessary coordination of China’s and Russia’s foreign policies

‘Our two sides have had close coordination on the international stage and fulfilled our responsibilities as major countries. China and Russia are firmly committed to safeguarding the UN-centered international system, the international order underpinned by international law, and the basic norms of international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. We have stayed in close communication and coordination within the UN, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, BRICS, the G20 and other multilateral mechanisms, and worked together for a multi-polar world and greater democracy in international relations. We have been active in practicing true multilateralism, promoting the common values of humanity, and championing the building of a new type of international relations and a community with a shared future for mankind’. (Xi Jinping).

‘We closely cooperate in international affairs and effectively coordinate our foreign policy positions, counter common threats, and respond to current challenges, standing shoulder to shoulder as a “rock amid a fast flowing stream.” We actively promote democratic multilateral structures such as the SCO and BRICS, which become more and more authoritative and influential and attract new partners and friends. Our countries, together with like-minded actors, have consistently advocated the shaping of a more just multipolar world order based on international law rather than certain “rules” serving the needs of the “golden billion.” Russia and China have consistently worked to create an equitable, open and inclusive regional and global security system that is not directed against third countries. In this regard, we note the constructive role of China's Global Security Initiative, which is in line with the Russian approaches in this area’. (Putin).

‘We need to make sustained efforts to synergize the Belt and Road Initiative and the Eurasian Economic Union, so as to provide more institutional support for bilateral and regional cooperation.’ (Xi Jinping).

‘The work aimed at coordinating the development of the Eurasian Economic Union with the One Belt, One Road Initiative also goes in this vein [of our cooperation]!’ (Putin).

(c) The birth of a multipolar international order and the refusal of domination by one country

‘The world today is going through profound changes unseen in a century. The historical trend of peace, development and win-win cooperation is unstoppable. The prevailing trends of world multi-polarity, economic globalization and greater democracy in international relations are irreversible. On the other hand, our world is confronted with complex and intertwined traditional and non-traditional security challenges, damaging acts of hegemony, domination and bullying, and long and tortuous global economic recovery.’ (Xi Jinping).

‘We can feel the geopolitical landscape in the outside world change dramatically. Sticking more stubbornly than ever to its obsolete dogmata and vanishing dominance, the “Collective West” is gambling on the fates of entire states and peoples. The US's policy of simultaneously deterring Russia and China, as well as all those who do not bend to the American dictation, is getting ever more fierce and aggressive. The international security and cooperation architecture is being dismantled. Russia has been labelled an “immediate threat” and China a “strategic competitor.”’ (Putin).

(d) China's and Russia's position on the Ukrainian crisis

‘Since last year, there has been an all-round escalation of the Ukraine crisis. China has all along upheld an objective and impartial position based on the merits of the issue, and actively promoted peace talks. I have put forth several proposals, i.e., observing the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, respect of the legitimate security concerns of all countries, supporting all efforts conducive to the peaceful settlement of the crisis, and ensuring the stability of global industrial and supply chains. They have become China's fundamental principles for addressing the Ukraine crisis.’ (Xi Jinping)

‘We appreciate the well-balanced stance on the events in Ukraine adopted by the PRC, as well as its understanding of their historical background and root causes. We welcome China's readiness to make a meaningful contribution to the settlement of the crisis. Like our friends in China, we advocate for the strict compliance with the UN Charter, respect for the norms of international law, including humanitarian law. We are committed to the principle of the indivisibility of security, which is being grossly violated by the NATO bloc.’ (Putin).

(e) The political and administrative instruments of the China-Russia strategic cooperation

Moreover, by insisting on their cooperation, the two leaders have very clearly informed the West that they have set up a very dense network of organizational and technical competencies in all domains for the purpose of coordinating and harmonizing their foreign policies. They have clearly understood that the US considers them both as the existential enemies of the US empire, and that it will do whatever it is still capable of implementing to safeguard its hegemony all over the world.⁵⁰ It is not simply a question of containment, it is a question of defeating strategically one enemy after the other. China has understood that if Russia is defeated, then the US Empire will move decisively in the Indo-Pacific. The reaction of Xi Jinping to the unbelievable arrogant and out of reality ‘suggestions’ President Macron and Ursula Von der Leyen presented recently in Beijing should left no uncertainty about China’s position in the international domain: the unipolar game is over: rules governing the international system established by the US since the end of WW2 to mainly serve its own national interests should be replaced by international laws under the authority of the United Nations in a new world order, within which China and Russia are in favour of a new model of major-countries relations based upon mutual respect, peaceful coexistence and win-win.⁵¹

⁵⁰ In this book I have quoted official US documents and public statements designating China and Russia as the ‘existential threat’ to the US-led international order.

⁵¹ As in Xi Jinping letter: Full Text of Xi’s signed Article on Russian Media, *China Daily*, 20 March 2023. It is true that on his way back to France, President Macron has clearly said that Europe should build a foreign policy independent from the US. This has provoked a vast movement of criticism from both the European and the American promoters of Atlanticism, and Macron had to clarify that his statement did not mean a schism between France (and Europe) and the US.

3.3.5 The 23 March Joint Statement of China and Russia Federation on deepening the comprehensive strategic partnership of coordination in the new era

The opinions of the two leaders we have summarized above, have been harmonized and developed within the *Joint Statement* of 23 March 2023. Everybody interested in appreciating how far has gone and how deep has become the strategic partnership between China and Russia, should read the whole text of the Joint Statement of 2023. Here I will point out what are, in my opinion, its major point.

Clearly, this is not a statement arrived at in the frenzy of reacting to the last provocations of the West. Provocations and the general ideological and policy framework in which provocations are embedded are mentioned in detail in the Joint Statement, as the two leaders had already done in their two letters.

(a) What is the nature of the China-Russia strategic partnership

The two leaders start by saying that China-Russia relation is not a military-political alliance similar to the Cold War era, but go beyond this model of state-to-state relations and have the nature of non-alignment, non-confrontation and non-targeting of third countries. Russia needs a prosperous and stable China, and China needs a strong and successful Russia.

(b) The rejection of the US unipolar "rules-based order"

Then two leaders point out the contradictions that developed within the international system: on the one side peace, development, cooperation and win-win cooperation are irresistible historical trends, the multipolar international pattern is taking shape at an accelerated pace, the status of emerging markets and developing countries has generally increased, and the number of regional powers with global influence and determined to defend their legitimate rights and interests is increasing; but on the other side, hegemonism, unilateralism and protectionism are still rampant, and the replacement of universally recognized principles and norms of international law with a "rules-based order" is unacceptable.

As the representatives of the two major countries opposed to the US strategy to diffuse its own values, the two leaders further develop upon the principles of independence and sovereignty: each country has the right to independently choose its development path due to its own history, culture and national conditions. There is no superior "democracy", and the two sides oppose the imposition of the West's own values, the hypocritical narrative of so-called "democracy against authoritarianism", and the use of democracy and freedom as an excuse and political tool to put pressure on other countries.

(c) The principles and values of the new multipolar international order

Then the *Joint Statement* refers to the principles and values that should be implemented with the goal of building a new type of international relations. Universality, openness, inclusiveness, non-discrimination should be upheld to achieve a multipolar world and sustainable development for all countries. China and Russia call on all countries to promote the common values of peace, development, fairness, justice, democracy in the international system, and freedom for all mankind, engagement in dialogue rather than confrontation, inclusiveness rather than exclusion, to live in harmony, and promote world peace and development. The principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, security, mutual benefits, a clear reference to the 'win-win approach' in international cooperation are also mentioned. The latter is further strengthened by referring to pragmatism, very likely to condemn policies based upon ideological considerations. All these principles should be sustained by a strategy based upon mutual understanding and not on confrontation.

The two sides support building an open world economy, upholding the multilateral trading system with the World Trade Organization at its core, promoting trade and investment liberalization and facilitation, calling for an open, fair, just and non-discriminatory development environment, opposing unilateralism and protectionist behaviour, and opposing "building walls and barriers," and also oppose unilateral sanctions and extreme pressure.

(d) What China and Russia will do for implementing the new world order

The two sides reaffirm their commitment to firmly uphold the international system with the United Nations at its core, the international order based on international law, the basic norms of international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, oppose all forms of hegemonism, unilateralism, power politics, the Cold War mentality, confrontation between camps, and small circles targeting specific countries.

The two sides also manifest, separately or together, their support for several policy options in tune with their will to promote a multipolar world. The two sides:

- (a) condemn all forms of terrorism, and the adoption of "double standards", and condemn the use of terrorist and extremist organizations to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries to achieve geopolitical goals under the pretext of combating international terrorism and extremism. Moreover, by referring to the last terrorist attack for achieving geopolitical goals, the two leaders demand an objective, impartial and professional investigation to be conducted into the Nord Stream pipeline explosion.
- (b) are strengthening cooperation for preventing "colour revolutions", in particular for cracking down on the "East Turkestan Islamic Movement", transnational organized crime, economic crimes, drug crimes and other law enforcement fields.
- (c) mentions their intention to further develop economic cooperation, trade and the necessary changes to introduce into the international financial system, such as the expansion of the use of local currencies in bilateral trade, investment, credit and other economic and trade activities. Clearly a reference to the introduction of the new reserve currency most likely within the BRICS.
- (d) are willing to continue to promote the parallel and coordinated development of the Belt and Road Initiative and the Greater Eurasian Partnership, promote the process of bilateral and multilateral integration, and benefit the people of all countries in Eurasia. The two sides will work together to actively promote the docking and cooperation between the "Belt and Road" and the Eurasian Economic Union, and strengthen the connectivity of Asia and Europe.
- (e) stand for maintaining peace and stability in the Middle East, support regional countries in strengthening their strategic autonomy, resolve hotspot issues through

dialogue and consultation, and oppose interference in the internal affairs of regional countries. They also welcomed the normalization of relations between Saudi Arabia and Iran through dialogue and supported a comprehensive and just settlement of the Palestinian issue on the basis of the two-state solution. Moreover, they Support Syria's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and promote a Syrian-led and Syrian-owned political settlement package, and stand for safeguarding Libya's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and promoting a political settlement process led by and owned by the people.

- (f) oppose any country or group of countries seeking military, political or other superiority that harms the legitimate security interests of other countries, and pointed out that the solution to the Ukraine crisis must respect the legitimate security concerns of all countries, and prevent confrontation [between] the camps [that] add fuel to the fire. And the Russian side spoke positively of China's objective and fair position on the Ukraine issue: Russia welcomes China's willingness to play an active role in resolving the Ukrainian crisis through political and diplomatic means, and welcomes the constructive propositions set out in the document "China's Position on the Political Settlement of the Ukrainian Crisis", and reiterated its commitment to resuming peace talks as soon as possible, and China appreciates this.
- (g) The two sides urge NATO to abide by its commitments as a regional and defensive organization, and call on NATO to respect the sovereignty, security, interests, diversity of civilizations, history and culture of other countries, and view the peaceful development of other countries objectively and fairly. The two sides expressed grave concern over NATO's continued strengthening of military-security ties with Asia-Pacific countries and the undermining of regional peace and stability. The two sides oppose the patchwork of closed and exclusive bloc structures in the Asia-Pacific region to create bloc politics and camp confrontation. The two sides pointed out that the United States adheres to the Cold War mentality and pursues the "Indo-Pacific Strategy", which has a negative impact on peace and stability in the region. China and Russia are committed to building an equal, open and inclusive Asia-Pacific security system that is not aimed at third countries, so as to maintain regional peace, stability and prosperity.
- (h) The two sides ask that all nuclear-weapon States should refrain from deploying nuclear weapons outside their territories and should withdraw their nuclear weapons deployed outside their territories.

- (i) will regularly organize joint maritime and air cruises and joint exercises and training, strengthen exchanges and cooperation between the two militaries, including under existing bilateral mechanisms, and further deepen military mutual trust.⁵²

This is clearly a very detailed Manifesto for the implementation of a multipolar world. The two countries show their determination not to accept to live in the unipolar world the US has created for establishing its domination over the rest of the world since the end of WW2. After that time the US has claimed for several decades to have been able to maintain peace and prosperity in Europe. Unfortunately, the decisions taken by the US since the collapse of the Soviet Union, to launch wars (several of them illegal), to interfere in the internal affairs of countries, to foment protest movements and regime change, to bullying countries that would not comply with its dictates, have considerably weakened its reputation at a time when the change in the distribution of power resources were giving to re-emerging powers such as China and Russia the means to contest its domination. This decline has been put to its final stage when the US, NATO and the EU provoked the Russian intervention in Ukraine. Refusing to negotiate with Russia's Putin, sending more and more sophisticated weapons to the Ukrainian regime (certainly not a democracy) so that it can fight, as long as it takes (i.e. until the last Ukrainian soldier), a war Ukraine and NATO are clearly unable to win, organizing an unbelievable propaganda campaign aimed at silencing and criminalizing opinions not complying with the dominant Western narrative, bullying countries that are not willing to condemn Russia, the US-led West has provoked the revolt of the Global South's countries that have found in China and Russia the new re-emerging powers able to lead to the emancipation of those countries. As someone wrote recently: in Moscow, Xi and Putin bury Pax Americana.⁵³

⁵² Other points concern the use of Biological Weapons and the politicization of the OPCW, the deployment of weapons by the US in Europe and the Asia-Pacific region, the transformation of outer space into a territory of military confrontation, and climate change. Moreover, the Russian side declared that it attaches great importance to China's global civilization initiative, and noted that China's idea of building a community of human destiny is of positive significance for strengthening the unity of the international community and joint efforts to address common challenges.

⁵³ Pepe Escobar, 'In Moscow, Xi and Putin Bury Pax Americana', March 22 2023, *The Unz Review*, <https://www.unz.com/pescobar/in-moscow-xi-and-putin-bury-pax-americana/>.

4. How to explain why the Global South is escaping the US domination and joins the multi-polar world set up by China and Russia

How to explain why the Global South has not condemned Russia in spite of heavy pressures, bullying, and threats from the US? One should not forget that the West (first Europe, then the US and Europe) has dominated the world for 5 centuries, in an aggressive manner it is inclined to forget. The first English immigrants who came to North America were Europeans who took with them the European ideology structured according to a mix of religious and secular beliefs. European civilization is certainly a great one. The problem is that, since at least the Renaissance, Europe has developed an ideology that led it to brutally dominate the rest of the world:

1. sense of superiority and belief in the exceptional character of European culture;
2. the right to diffuse European values (deemed to be universal) and thereby civilize the barbarians and the savages;
3. the belief that the expansion of European values is beneficial to mankind and historically inevitable.

Based upon this ideology, we have conquered the Americas; we dispossessed the savage Indians of their land; we have kept the ‘inferior race of the Negros’ in slavery for several centuries and used them as cheap labour in our overseas possessions. We have submitted Africa, the Middle East, and Asia to the dictatorship of our colonies, with numerous massacres, genocides, exploitations, and humiliations. Clearly, we left our values at home, and even there, life has not been good for everybody. We ended our expansion with the ‘apotheosis’ of 2 murderous World Wars. We witnessed the emancipation of our former colonies, and we lost them ... no problem, we replaced the dictatorship of the colonies with the dictatorship of the Washington Consensus, based upon the Bretton Wood institutions: World Bank, IMF, the GATT (later WTO) and, above all, the US Treasury and the domination of the USD. After WW2 we Europeans proceeded triumphantly into the American Century becoming the faithful vassals of the US. After the fall of the Soviet Union we followed the lead of the US believing that, as the end of history had come, every country and every civilization would adopt (*volens nolens*) liberal democracy and capitalism. Great! We became richer and richer, more powerful and ... greedier, ready to suppress opposition to the ‘course of history’.

Of course, the US has done its part (and a great one) in the leading position, by inventing and implementing the Washington Consensus, that allowed the West to continue exploiting its former colonies by giving them the illusion that they had freed themselves from colonialism and could develop their economy with the ‘benevolent support’ of the former colonizers.

5. But what about Europe today?

The American Empire is sinking and with it the Western civilization. It is the conclusion of two very different Western intellectuals: the American economist Michael Hudson and the French philosopher Michel Onfray.⁵⁴

We Europeans could have used our history, our diplomacy, our economy, and our geographical position (a peninsula of Asia) for establishing cooperation with the fast-developing rest of Eurasia that possesses civilizations as sophisticated and as respectable as ours. We have chosen to sink with the US. Certainly, the US will not disappear, and we will not disappear with it. But the time is over, when we used to go all over the world with our technology, our economy, and our weapons, leaving at home our civilizational values, violently establishing an impressive array of colonies (i.e. dictatorships) that allowed us to bring back home what we had stolen. Those countries WILL NOT FORGET.

So, we should not be surprised if an increasing number of countries we have colonized one way or the other for 5 centuries in Latin America, The Middle East, Africa and Asia, are no more willing to accept our dictates. Not only do they find in their history several good reasons for not trusting us, but today they can escape our domination by establishing partnerships with the new re-emerging powers (China and Russia) that can offer them better deals for developing their economy and for escaping from the illusion the West has offered them for such a long time. Ha-Joon Chang has qualified Western politicians as ‘bad Samaritans’, after analysing their policies toward developing countries.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Michel Onfray, *Décadence: Vie et mort du judéo-christianisme*, Paris, Flammarion, 2017; Michael Hudson, ‘The End of Western Civilization’, 13 July 2022, Michael Hudson website, <https://michael-hudson.com/2022/07/the-end-of-western-civilization/>.

⁵⁵ Ha-Joon Chang, *Bad Samaritans. The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalism*, New York, Bloomsbury Press.

We often quote India as an example of a successful colonization, as after independence it adopted Western-style economy and polity. But even India makes no exception. As Shashi Tharoor, former Under-Secretary-General of the UN, Congress MP in India, and former Minister writes in his book significantly entitled *Inglorious Empire. What the British Did to India*: ‘Indians can never afford to forget the conditions in which they found our country after two centuries of colonialism.’ In other words: we will NEVER FORGET.⁵⁶ And neither will the people of China, Russia, India, Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia, Pakistan, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Algeria, Serbia, Iran, Syria, Libya, Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen, and Latin America ... please, feel free to complete the list.

I was 17 years old in 1957 when six European countries signed the Treaties of Rome paving the way to the European Union. Our founding fathers told us that we would start by integrating our economies and later political integration would ‘naturally’ follow. It was the promise of a new federation, born from the ashes of the WW2 we initiated, different from both the Soviet Union and the US, peaceful, based upon our civilization and our own true values.

Probably we were too young, too naive, too ignorant. But I dare say that we have been betrayed. The EU has been transformed, economically, especially after the 1980s, and militarily after the fall of the Soviet Union, into a pathetic subsidiary of the US empire based upon the US-led neoliberal globalization, its wars, sanctions, bullying, and meddling in other countries’ national affairs in which we took part one way or the other. No political integration happened, no independence, not even a shadow of an autonomous foreign policy. Certainly, there have been some manifestations of independence, e.g., the French opposition to the Iraqi war, the joint venture between Germany and Russia for the Nord Stream 2 (later destroyed by the US), and the development of trade with Germany and China, of which the last manifestation has been the visit of Chancellor Scholz to Beijing as mentioned above.

But the Ukrainian crisis has shown the Europeans the crude reality: the US Empire hates its enemies to the point that, terrified by the prospect of losing its power to dominate the world,

⁵⁶ See the speeches of India President Narendra Modi and India Foreign minister Subrahmanyam Jaishankar opposing the bullying of the US and the EU to condemn Russia invasion of Ukraine: nobody can tell us what policy we should implement; we decide taking into consideration our national interests.

it is ready to irrationally take the risk not only of an economic epochal crisis that is already impacting the whole world, including the citizens of its European allies-vassals, but also of a nuclear catastrophe.

Moreover, the crisis has shown that the Empire does not even need allies, but vassals. As Henry Kissinger reportedly said: ‘to be the enemy of the US is dangerous, to be its ally is fatal’. The European oligarchy seems to be very happy to be ‘led’ (a magical word in the imperial prose of the US establishment) and even bullied by its overseas American master who is organizing a criminal proxy war far away from the battlefield (very likely witnessing it on TV screens). Why? Very likely because this servile posture guarantees the members of the EU oligarchy (politicians, senior civil servants, journalists, academics and think tanks) a comfortable standard of living in the upper 10% of the income distribution. They can easily pay 7 euros for a litre of gas. This has nothing to do with values.

Considering the cultural, economic, military and political catastrophe towards which the West is driving the world, one cannot help considering that the European and American oligarchies are manifesting today an unbelievable excellence in practicing incompetence, irrationality, selfishness, and arrogance: they are destroying Western civilization. The Western oligarchy is too full of itself, of its superiority, and of its comfort to consider, even for a brief moment, to look to other civilizations (as suggested by François Jullien and Joseph Chan)⁵⁷ for finding values that may save our own values from what has corrupted them: the search for power and domination, as well as personal obscene wealth. In a conference given in Beijing to the NDRC (National Development and Reform Commission) on November 5, 2015, I suggested that Eurasia, plus the Middle East, Europe and China, may one day constitute a bloc that would marginalize the US and its Asian allies (Japan and South Korea, Australia and New Zealand). Today, considering the consequences of the aggressive US foreign policy towards Russia and China, I strongly believe, as suggested above for Germany, that one day a new generation of European leaders will take stock of the geopolitical realities of Eurasia (in particular the development of BRICS, SCO, and BRI) and rebel against the incompetence, arrogance and selfishness of their American masters, as well as against the servility of their own European elite. The axis Europe-Russia-China (and India) is developing

⁵⁷ François Jullien, *Le dialogue entre cultures, du commun à l'universel*. Paris: Les Indes savantes, 2015; and Joseph Chan, *Confucian Perfectionism: A Political Philosophy for Modern Times*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2014.

within a multi-polar world that one day may expel the US from Eurasia. President Obama has been famous for having said in the 2000s that Russia was a regional power. Quite. By forging a *de facto* alliance with other Asian countries, China and Russia are on their way to create a new international multi-polar order that is already moving the centre of the world power away from the Atlantic zone towards Eurasia, reducing the status of the US to that of a regional power. Some call this: *historical nemesis*. In the new world order, there will be no dominant power as in the unipolar world America made, but several regional powers whose interactions will be based upon the principles of equality, sovereignty, mutual respect, shared indivisible security, and win-win common endeavours. The question is not if this will occur, but when. Of course, it will take time, but it is likely to happen in a not-too distant-future.⁵⁸ For the moment, we are living in an intermediate phase during which two competing blocs are taking form: one dominated by the US and comprising its vassals in Europe, in parts of Latin America and Asia, and the other dominated by the BRICS, SCO and BRI attracting countries from all over the Global South.⁵⁹ The analysis presented in my books, supplemented by this Postscriptum, strongly suggest who will be the winner of this competition.

Geneva,

31 March 2023

⁵⁸ Radhika Desai and Michael Hudson, 'The rise of US dollar imperialism, and why it failed', *Geopolitical Economy*, 26 February 2023, <https://geopoliticaleconomy.com/2023/02/26/us-dollar-imperialism-radhika-desai-michael-hudson/>.

⁵⁹ See for example Alasdair Macleod, 'Geopolitics: the world is splitting into two', *Goldmoney*, 18 August 2022, <https://www.goldmoney.com/research/geopolitics-the-world-is-splitting-into-two>, and the two articles by Zoltan Pozsar quoted above.