

US policy towards challengers

Johan Galtung

Johan Galtung established peace studies and founded the Transcend Network for Peace, Development and the Environment. He has a longstanding interest in China, which is highlighted in this schema of ten points bearing on current geopolitics.

The young US Republic, unwilling to share the Atlantic Seaboard with London, emerged victoriously in 1812 with a strong army centred in the South. Its manifest destiny pointed West, then also South, and, stepping into the shoes of the dying Spanish empire in 1898, to the whole world. Trade was needed for growth; in 1853 Admiral Perry opened Tokugawa Japan. The Japanese challenge was its closure. The Table opposite compares US policies to those of six challengers to US world hegemony: Japan, Germany, Italy, Russia, China, Islam. And Western Europe, formerly as colonialism, now as a potential No. 7 challenger. US policy is seen as five well-thought-through *proactio* and *reactio* – often ending with war or exclusion – to the challengers' five *actio*. But in the beginning there was fragmented latency, with no real threat.

Cohesion came to Japan, Germany and Italy as nation-states in the 1860s; in World War Two as an alliance. Cohesion came to Russia and China with the 1910 national and the 1917 Bolshevik revolutions; and to Islam as a Muslim Brotherhood in 1928. There was international presence: China-towns with capital, Trotskyism, missionary Islam; strong personalities.

The first US policy was positive-co-operative: the Taft-Katsura 1905 treaty with Japan (Philippines for USA, Korea for Japan); pro-Germany until the United States joined World War One victors as a latecomer in 1917; Italy steered by the mafia on both sides; investing in Russia, China; on Egypt's side in the 1956 war against colonising Israel-UK-France.

But the challengers bounced back, more

cohesive, with challenging ideologies and even stronger personalities up front. They demanded everything the West had: colonies, access to world markets, equality. And they were blocked by the colonial powers, above all by the United Kingdom, and by the US empire.

The second US policy pitted the challengers against each other. Japan was the guinea pig: against China in 1894-5, Russia in 1904-5, Germany in World War One; now against North Korea, China and all US enemies in the new 2015 alliance.

	<i>Japan</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Russia</i>	<i>China</i>	<i>Islam</i>
Latency	Tokugawa Perry	Duchies	City-states	Feudal	Ching dynasty	Colonies States
Cohesion	Meiji 1868	Il Reich 1870-71	Italia 1861	Bolshevism 1917	National 1910	Brothers 1928
Charisma	Collective	Bismarck	Garibaldi	Lenin Trotsky	Sun Yat sen	Qutb
Positive	Treaty 1905	Pro-German	Clientelism	Financing	Financing	Egypt 1956
Challengers	Militarism	Nazism	Fascism	Communism	Revolution	Islamism
Charisma	Collective	Hitler	Mussolini	Stalin, Putin	Mao, Deng	Nasser
Against each other	Against China, Russia, Germany, N Korea	Against USSR	Anti-Communist	Against Nazism China, Islam	Against Russia, Islam	Against Russia, China
Total war	Firebomb Nuclear	Firebomb	Regime change	Deterred by SCO	Deterred by SCO	Islamic State?
Negative bases	Okinawa	Ramstein	Aviano	Encircling	Encircling	Confusion
'Peace'	Occupation	Occupation	Clientelism	Exclusion	Exclusion	Exclusion

Nazi Germany was pitted against the Soviet Union, but survived; with the USA joining the victors as a latecomer also in World War Two. Then, against China; but Moscow-Beijing made the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) alliance, 1996-2001. Now both are pitted against Islam. However, imagine more Islam joins the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation?

The third US policy, if the second is not working, is total war.

World War Two was a success for the United States in Europe-Japan; the 'good war'. But now the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation deters the United States and the Islamic State seems stronger than expected.

The fourth and fifth US policies solidify victory and exclusion, with

bases encircling, containing, *de facto* occupying (Japan even pays for its own occupation). Calling it ‘peace’ is to abuse a noble idea.

The burden of containing Russia-China-Islam now falls on the United States and on Japan-Germany-Italy, with the bases and the risks (World War Two shadows). Nevertheless, the United States also needs fighting allies. Japan, more occupied than Germany, has been forced to join the USA. The pressure will also be on Germany and Europe.

Enters Europe: Germany-France with BeNeLux-Italy, and with Brexit [if UK votes to leave the European Union], no US Trojan horse. Fearing Russia is not paranoid given Europe’s three attacks on Russia. Enters Japan if the new alliance does not work. Fearing China is not paranoid given Japan’s three attacks on China.

There is much for the United States to play on. However, Russia and China are strong and less vulnerable than Europe-Japan and allies; with four Islamic SCO states and a huge potential for more of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) 57 members joining.

Could solving Ukraine, as a neutral federation of co-operating parts with a European House on top, and solving Japan’s island problems, with Russia, the Chinas and the Koreas with joint ownership of islands and a co-operative North-east Asian Community, be better than devastating wars? Also better than US policy of neither war nor peace, foregoing trade because of sanctions, boycott, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) – Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) – Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA), which are closed to Russia-China?

To the United States, this spells regional mega-challenges, not single state macro-challenges. Co-operation would make NATO and ANPO [Treaty of Mutual Co-operation and Security between the United States and Japan] meaningless. The United States without alliances and bases is a USA in North America only; and Chinese ‘Silk’ infrastructure connects only contiguous EurAsiaAfrica. As seen by the United States, this is to be avoided at all costs. Europe, like Japan, has to be forced. Stages 9 and 10 are already in place: Okinawa-Ramstein-Aviano can be turned against Japan-Germany-Italy, dual key Nuclear Sharing Systems for European theatre missiles can be reversed. *De facto* occupation can be made *de jure* by imposing secret accords. This can all be done with very few people knowing about it. *And may already have been done.*

For the United States, this is a non-starter; being isolated, bogged down by moral costs of killing, and economic costs of bases, leaving Russia-India-China, and ever more of Islam, to the Middle East North Africa (MENA)-Eurasia of their designs, spells defeat. And both Europe and

Japan will, sooner or later, revolt.

The time has come for an agonising reappraisal: join Germany, Japan and their neighbours for co-operation and peace with Russia-China-Islam.

The state system is waning; regions are waxing. Make them peaceful.

Source: <https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/09/us-policy-toward-challengers-10-points/>



Bertie and the Pagoda

'When I lived in China, I found the Chinese sense of humour extraordinarily congenial to me, and in fact it gave me great delight. I will give one instance. One rather hot day, two Chinese businessmen, both of them somewhat corpulent, invited me to spend a day in the country motoring with them. We went to visit a very famous, very ancient pagoda, which was in a somewhat dilapidated condition. There was a staircase up to the top and I went up, expecting them to follow me, but when I reached the top I saw them below in earnest conversation. When I got down again I said, 'Why didn't you come up?' And they said, 'Well, we debated with many very serious arguments pro and con, whether we should come up or whether we should not. But we decided that as the pagoda might at any moment crumble, it would be as well there should be some to bear witness how the philosopher died. And of course the whole truth was simply that the weather was hot and they were fat.'

Transcribed from Bertrand Russell's own audio recording