Abraham Accords, Indo-Pacific Accord and the US-Led Nexus of Curtailment: Threat to Regional Security, and Joint Counter Strategy

Shabana Syed[*] and Zainab Ahmed[**]

Abstract

The Abraham Accords emerged against a background of a new geostrategic reality of shifting balances of power towards Eurasia. They have served to elevate Israel and cause divisions among Muslims to intensify the Arab-Iran conflict. The Accords also signaled that the US could now direct its focus on China, which it considers an existential threat for its global hegemony. Asia-Pacific region is fast transforming through economic growth led by China, and economists have heralded this phenomenon as the emergence of the 'New Asian Century.' This paper argues that the US might resort to create constructive chaos in the region through its alliance with Israel and India. Washington has put this strategy in place since 2001 and it has been successful in taming the region in its favor. In continuation to the War on Terror (WoT) policies that targeted Muslim nations, the US reinvigorated its Pivot to Asia' policy which targets China, Russia, Iran, and Pakistan. A major threat for Washington is the expansion and recognition of Beijing's ambitious Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) that will transform the global geopolitical landscape, connecting it with 65 countries across the globe. China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) being a major project in the framework of transnational connectivity has huge potential for Pakistan. India is playing a key role as a lynchpin for the US in the region and is perturbed equally from the rise of China, and regional development projects of the latter. China, Russia, Pakistan and Iran need to devise a joint regional strategy to safeguard their collective interests. If the US fails in its objective to contain China and its developing alliances, it will attempt to destabilize the region through the strategy of constructive chaos.

Keywords: Abraham Accords, Indo-Pacific, Asia-Pacific, Curtailment, Arab-Israel-India Nexus, BRI.

Introduction

The global politics is transforming, and the Twenty-first Century marks the era of China-US rivalry. The unipolar world order established after

[*] Geostrategic Analyst; affiliated with the Golden Ring Economic Forum (GREF), Lahore, Pakistan.
[**] PhD; Visiting Lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore; Senior Research Fellow, Golden Ring Economic Forum (GREF), Lahore, Pakistan.

the Cold War is receding to multipolarity where the Asia-Pacific is plausibly the theatre of competition. The region of Asia-Pacific, which the US strictly denotes as 'Indo-Pacific,' is critically important to contain China. In order to encircle China, the curtailment of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is a prerequisite for the primary significance of the Asia-Pacific region in it. Re-emergence of Russia is also a threat to the US policy of Chinese encirclement. Pakistan becomes strategically very important in the vision of BRI as it is home to the CPEC– the buckle of the BRI initiative. Iran is strategically very important being at the cusp of the Strait of Hormuz (SOH) and its rivalry with the Arab countries brings Israel closer to the latter. The Abraham Accords Peace Agreements[1] make Israel a direct actor in the Asia-Pacific. India-US strategic partnership is not a new phenomenon but the converged interest of containing China has brought both the states militarily and strategically more close. The evolving Arab-Israel-India-US nexus naturally binds Pakistan, China, Iran and Russia in a regional security framework directly threatening their interests. These developments require a joint long term strategy from these four countries which are directly affected by the encirclement of this nexus. Israel's continued and unchecked aggression in Palestine clearly demonstrates that it does not have any near future policy to placate its efforts to completely control the lands in the West Bank and Gaza. This situation does not raise any hope of rapprochement in this region with Iran or Pakistan as they have clear policies on Palestine issue.

Abraham Accords and Inevitability of Conflict

The "Abraham Accords Peace Agreement: Treaty of Peace, Diplomatic Relations and Full Normalization Between the United Arab Emirates and the State of Israel" was reached on August 13, 2020 between the United Arab Emirates, Israel and United States, with Bahrain, Sudan and Morocco following suit. One of the objectives of the agreement is 'Aspiring to realize the vision of a Middle East region that is stable, peaceful and prosperous, for the benefit of all States and peoples in the region.' The treaty outlined a new 'Strategic Agenda for the Middle East' whereby all 'Parties stand ready to join with the United States to develop' and work together 'to advance regional security and stability, pursue regional economic opportunities, promote a culture of peace across the region, and consider joint aid and development programs.'[2] Abraham Accords is the part of the new 'Strategic Agenda for the Middle East' outlined by the US following the War on Terror (WoT 2001) as a continuum of a long term US strategy to contain China, and those nations who believe that 'autocracy is the best way forward.'[3] President Biden's speech at the Munich Security Conference, 2021, was clear US 'exceptionalism' targeting countries they labeled as 'autocracies,' i.e.

China, Iran, Russia, and North Korea. In a speech titled "A Foreign Policy for the American People" US Secretary of State Anthony Blinken was explicit in maintaining a position of unipolarity when he stated that the US was facing economic, military and technological challenges posed by China to 'the stable and open international system – all the rules, values, and relationships that make the world work the way we want it to, because it ultimately serves the interests and reflects the values of the American people."[4]

The Atlantic Council, one of the US' most powerful think tanks, published *The Longer Telegram: Toward a new American China Strategy* (2021),[5] which interestingly argues that while China has an integrated operational strategy, the US has no planned strategy regarding China and needs one to assert the US dominance. The study ignores the fact that the policy to 'contain' China was outlined by the former US National Security Advisor (1977 to 1981) Zbigniew Brzezinski in *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (1997)[6] a foundational book influencing future US foreign policies. The book outlines an integrated Eurasian geostrategy to counter threats to US as a world power by China and an inevitably resurgent Russia. He cites Hitler and Stalin's shared notion that 'Eurasia is the centre of the world' and that the one 'who controls Eurasia controls the world.'

In step with Brzezinski's strategy suggestions, the Atlantic Council's report also argues that the US must retain self-belief in its global supremacy and in the process assemble a supporting global coalition. Following the Brezinski's pointed 'containment,' the George Bush administration, led by war hawks like Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney, strategized for an eventual war with China and the destruction of the Middle East through 'constructive chaos' part of the WoT policy.

This paper will propose that the trail of geostrategic positioning from the Abraham Accords to building a supporting coalition in South Asia and Pacific region on behalf of the US, is a long term plan for an impending war with China and in the process the US will escalate regional conflicts, which we are witnessing at present with a threat of a looming war between US-backed Ukraine and Russia.[7] Regional threats will continue to escalate as US, India and its allies continue to oppose China's grand yet peaceful multipolar strategy along with the growing tide of a resistance economy emerging via China's BRI, in which Pakistan will play a crucial part.

In 2011, a landmark 'Pivot to Asia' strategy was announced by the then US President Obama citing China as an 'existential threat' along

with Post-Soviet Russia.[8] This pivot involved huge contingents of US naval forces transferred to Asia and the Pacific. Today more than 400 American military bases encircle China with missiles, bombers, warships and, above all, nuclear weapons–from Australia through the Pacific to Japan, Korea and across Eurasia to Afghanistan and India, the bases form, according to a US strategist, 'the perfect noose."[9] A US Defence Department website states there are around 4800 Defence sites in nearly every corner of the world.[10]

Already the need for a war has been put forward by influential think tanks like the RAND Corporation whose report titled *War with China: Thinking Through the Unthinkable* assesses issues regarding a future war.[11] The study, commissioned by the US Army, provides further evidence that a war with China might be planned and being prepared for in the upper echelons of the American military-intelligence apparatus.[12] The planned war is part of US' plan to counteract not only the emergence of China as a superpower economically but also militarily. The RAND report suggests that it will be a pre-emptive strike, a form of strategic deterrence. It opens the Summary of this report saying, 'As its military advantage declines, the United States will be less confident that a war with China will conform to its plans.'[13] It points out that the US economy was already overshadowed by China and with the establishment of BRI, China will be connected with a growing number of countries across the globe. Resultantly, China will economically and militarily dominate the geopolitical landscape.

According to the neorealists, the structure of international relations is primarily influenced by how states seek security.[14] The school of thought regarding defensive realism argues that states are restrained in their pursuit of power and only seek power to the extent that creates a balance; while the school of offensive realism, which American political scientist John Mearsheimer advocates, argues that states are insatiable for power, their 'ultimate goal is to be the hegemon in the system.' Mearsheimer explains how states have little proof of other nations' benign intentions; therefore, they do not restrict to maintaining a balance of power alone to ensure security. The only way for a state to maximize its security, and thus increase its chance of survival, is to boost its power to become less likely to be attacked and more likely to win if it is attacked.[15] The US falls into Mearsheimer's category of 'offensive realism.'

The violent history of the first stage of decolonization led into the second phase in which 'the army of command wielded its power less through military hardware,' and more through the dollar. With the decline of old Imperialism, globalization of capital accumulation gathered as a

new economic force, a new type of sovereignty. Today, 'Empire manages hybrid identities, flexible hierarchies, and plural exchanges through modulating networks of command.' Expanding on Michel Foucault's concept of disciplinary rule, Hardt and Negri expose how the Anglo-centric empire's objective is to rule not only the political and economic but also the social life in its entirety, and to propagate peace while 'the practice of Empire is continually bathed in blood.'[16] According to Hardt and Negri the resurgence of imperialism and Orientalism, after the 1991 Gulf war is linked to a 'rebirth of Empire' and renewed interest in the concept of 'bellum Justum' or 'just war,' cloaked in the form of 'exporting democracy' and 'human rights.'[17] President Obama's policies exemplified this when in 2009 he spoke of 'New Beginnings' and reaching out to the Muslim world, however, during his tenure the US bombed no less than seven Muslim countries. Just in 2016 alone his regime dropped more than 26,171 bombs.[18] Brzezinski expresses the underlying belief defining American exceptionalism when he states 'A world without US primacy will be a world with more violence and disorder… the sustained international primacy of the United States is central to the welfare and security of Americans and to the future of freedom, democracy, open economies, and international order in the world.'[19] The continuum of policies can be observed in President Biden's posturing, promising 'diplomacy, not military action, will always come first.' Earlier, he has undiplomatically called President Putin a 'Killer' and sanctioned China. Scott Ritter, former United Nations (UN) weapons inspector and Marine Corps intelligence officer tweeted, 'All it took was 48 hours …more troops to Iraq, regime change in Syria and an expansion of NATO that knowingly triggers conflict with Russia. Biden has been and will always be a warmonger.'[20]

This mindset of the American establishment has received thorough reviews and criticism on almost all of its aspects. Anatol Lieven, professor and author of *America Right or Wrong: An Anatomy of American Nationalism (*2012), for example, suggests that the US should avoid considering Beijing's ambitions as existential threat. He warns that when a State is on a permanent war footing 'this breeds in turn continual international tension and domestic repression, along with a cultural atmosphere of fanaticism, hysteria, and conspiratorial thinking in all the countries concerned.'[21] This has to be read in the context that the US has been at war 93 percent of the time since its inception in 1776.[22] The demonization of China has only replaced the hysteria that targeted Iran and Russia for several decades.

It is believed that the US has a fine system in place to fabricate wars. Former Chief of Staff to Secretary of State Colin Powell and retired U.S. Army Col. Lawrence Wilkerson in 2015 revealed that it was 'CIA

manufactured evidence' that had led to Iraq war, and that it was only another in such instances after 'other examples of misused or manufactured intelligence in U.S. relations with Vietnam, Chile, Guatemala, and Lebanon.'[23]

While no military offensive has taken place, it is very clear that US is actively engaged in a hybrid war against China that uses several tools including the mainstream and social media platforms. In order to curtail China's technological outreach, Meng Wanzhou, a Huawei executive was arrested in 2018 in Vancouver on charges of fraud and conspiracy in the US. China responded by arresting two Canadian nationals. In the same context, the United Kingdom (UK), was pursued by Australia and the US to announce that it would reduce the presence of Huawei technology in its 5G network to zero. *The South China Morning Post* in 2020 reported that these events were seen by Beijing as political warfare 'waged with the world's oldest intelligence alliance, the Five Eyes.'[24] The intelligence alliance, Five Eyes (FVEY), of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, UK, and the US is part of the multilateral UK-US Agreement for joint- cooperation in signals intelligence.[25]

Another manifestation of the hybrid campaign was seen in a rather racist attribution of the Coronavirus outbreak by the former US President Donald Trump when he alleged that the pandemic originated from the Wuhan Institute of Virology and that China may have allowed the outbreak to spread beyond its borders.[26] The aspersions cast by him might have been tactical to create fear with international traders. The racist pattern against the oriental lands and people became more visible when the US was attacking Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, its key ally Israel was target killing Palestinians during the WoT, and Islamophobic attacks against Muslims had become a prominent feature in the Western countries.

In the broad context of US-China tug of war at several fronts, Abraham Accords shape the new strategy in the Middle east as the Israeli state is normalized for Arabs and some Muslim governments despite the occupation and human rights violations.

Normalization: Who Benefits?

The Abraham Accords benefited the geostrategic agenda set out to disable potential challengers to the US' world hegemony and its ally Israel. However, the driving force behind the policies in the Middle East emanated from Washington based pro-Israel lobbies and think tanks. President Trump and his pro-Israel Senior Adviser, Jared Kushner, termed Abraham Accords as 'historic,' while the *New York Times*

journalist Thomas Friedman, applauded it as 'a geopolitical earthquake.'[27] The real purpose of the Abraham Accords was less about Palestinian rights and more about Gulf States going public and expanding their existing ties with Israel. Regional intelligence can now be shared more easily, especially on Iran, while Gulf Sheikhs were eager to gain access to Israeli hi-tech, US military technology and weapons systems. A few weeks after the Accords, Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence and Israel's Weizmann Institute of Science had signed an agreement to collaborate on the development of artificial intelligence (AI). The agreement, the first of its kind to be signed between higher education institutes from the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Israel, includes plans for student exchange programs. Meanwhile, the Group 42, a UAE company, opened its offices in Israel to assist Israeli companies to expand their operations in the Middle East.[28] A member of the Abu Dhabi ruling family bought a major stake in the Beitar Jerusalem football team, whose supporters are fiercely anti-Arab and support the takeover of East Jerusalem by settlers.

Abraham Accords do not necessarily enjoy public support. Protests and opposition to the deal have been suppressed all over the Arab world. The now-dissolved, Bahrain's main opposition bloc Al-Wefaq National Islamic Society has estimated that more than 95 percent of Bahrainis would voice their opposition to normalization deal, given the opportunity to do so, but the ruling monarchy use draconian tactics to quell dissent.[29] The Arab countries which were reluctant to join were given incentives based on economic gains. Sudan was induced to sign the accords after promises that it would be removed from Washington's list of 'terror-supporting' states, opening the door to debt relief and aid. Morocco became the fourth Arab state to normalize ties with Israel after the Trump administration agreed to recognize its occupation of Western Sahara.

The main beneficiary of the Accords was Israel. The agreement not only normalized relations between Israel and Arab countries, it also normalized and legitimized Israel's occupation of Palestinian lands, isolating the Palestinians. According to Johnathan Cook, journalist, and author of *Israel and Clash of Civilisations*, 'The abandonment of annexation, temporarily or otherwise,' will not 'interrupt Israel's continuing capture' of Palestinian lands 'nor its relentless campaign of ethnic cleansing.'[30] He argues 'Netanyahu has demonstrated…Israel could violate international law, steal land, commit war crimes - and western and Arab states would stomach it all. Israel would have to pay no price for its behaviour.'[31] However, Israel's actions have far reaching repercussions, especially in occupied lands like Illegally Indian Occupied

Jammu & Kashmir (IIoJ&K) where the actions of Indian Prime Minister Modi-led BJP government continue to follow the Israeli model and hoping the world will turn a blind eye to it as well.

Threats to Regional Security

Implications of Israel Joining 'Arab NATO'

The Accords emerged out of a geostrategic necessity highlighted by a Washington-based Israeli think tank Hudson Institute's report titled, *The Eastern Mediterranean in the New Era of Major-Power Competition: Prospects for U.S.- Israeli Cooperation.*[32] The report pointed out that US' pivot to Asia will create a 'power vacuum,' in the Middle East encouraging 'Iran to intensify its efforts to expand its influence in the Eastern Mediterranean.' The report suggests that the Sunni Arab states are afraid of Iran's growing influence and therefore will normalize relations with Israel[33] which, in turn, can fulfil its long-term wish to be included in United States Central Command (CENTCOM). Until now, Israel had belonged to US military's European Command, or United States European Command (EUCOM) rather than the Middle Eastern Central Command where the US believed that Israel's membership would have caused friction between the US and Arab states. Israel's long-standing goal has been to force the Pentagon to restructure CENTCOM and pressure had mounted from pro-Israel lobby groups in Washington in the final months of the Trump administration. The Hudson Institute report 2019 urged the US to take this step:

> It is neither necessary, advantageous nor historically justified to exclude Israel from efforts by the Central Command to bolster its military plans through regional cooperation. Israel's inclusion in the Central Command's area of responsibility could add to the ability of both states to respond effectively in a crisis. Today, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Bahrain, and other Gulf Arab states are publicly breaking down barriers to their own direct and open cooperation with Israel against Iran, Islamic State, and other Islamist extremist groups.

The decision to bring Israel inside the US military command in the Middle East is best viewed – from Washington's perspective as Israel being left in charge of Middle East while US focuses on China and Asia. The Pivot to Asia strategy materialized with Israeli-US collusion and has the backing of the strongest influential lobbying group, American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), which has a hundred thousand members including key US policymakers. AIPAC has a profound influence

on US foreign policy. In 2011, 'when the Palestinians announced that they would petition the U.N. for statehood, AIPAC helped persuade four hundred and forty-six members of Congress to co-sponsor resolutions opposing the idea.'[34]

Building Alliances and Weakening Unity

Since the Balfour Declaration between the British Empire and the Zionists in 1917, and the West's support for creating a national home for Jewish people, the region has already seen three Arab-Israeli wars and the displacement of millions of refugees and an untold number of deaths. The first two countries to normalize relations with Israel were Egypt and Jordan. However, it was the Arab Spring which destabilized the political order in the Middle East and exposed the aspirations of the Arab masses against their dictatorships. Movements like Muslim brotherhood with their demands for an Islamic democracy, plus, the Iranian Islamic revolution in 1979 had profound implications for the Sheikhs in Gulf, who felt their power base threatened. They realized that to preserve their sheikhdoms they needed US Israeli protection, and this led to many covert inter-relations involving Arab sheikhs importing Israeli weaponry and surveillance technology.

Jonathan Cook seems to make a lot of sense in this context when he argues that Israel's inclusion in Central Command 'will further harm the Palestinian cause, drive a wedge between Arab states and raise the heat on Iran' by giving Israel major strategic gains.[35] The Pivot to Asia did not mean that the US had turned away from the Middle East; rather it meant that now Israel will be the key driver of US foreign policy in the region. The Abraham Accords and the inclusion of Israel in CENTCOM have profound implications for any potential conflict with China or Iran, whether overt or covert. The Accords are divisive and have given a strong blow to any aspirations of Arab or Islamic unity and have successfully neutralized the Arab voice in the Palestinian struggle. They helped the Middle Eastern NATO bloc consisting of Arab countries to be led by Israel against the so-called Iranian expansionism.

It is becoming clear that the conflicts in the Middle East will continue as Israel continues to bomb Syria, Lebanon, and Gaza and the Israeli Prime Minister Naftali Bennett urges the US to attack Iran.[36]

The far-reaching implications connect to the Asia-Pacific region and constitute part of a grand strategy in which India gets prominence. Not only did the Arab countries join the US, Israel, India nexus, the Muslim world watched in shock when Prime Minister Modi visited the UAE

in 2020 after introduction of the Citizenship Amendment Act that grossly discriminated against Muslims and the UAE Sheikhs remained comfortably unperturbed on such move, rather Modi was greeted as a 'brother' and awarded the UAE's highest civilian award.[37] This may be interpreted as an action in line with the Accords with Israel as India is its close ally, a major buyer of Israeli weaponry, partner in intelligence and surveillance, and the two US' lynchpins in their respective areas.

Pakistan has been acting as a counterbalance in the region for Indian hegemonic designs. In the new settings, Islamabad would find it hard to rely on the Muslim Gulf in any conflict or even the conflict of interests with India, especially now that Israel will dictate CENTCOM responses. If the Gulf and Arab countries under the US influence would offer any financial support or loan to Pakistan, it is more likely to be used to the detriment of Pakistan in a balancing act by these states with India. The effects might also reach the many Pakistanis working in the region. The UAE's support for Saudi Arabia's actions in Yemen has had an adverse-effect on Yemenis living in the Gulf with reduced opportunities and increased surveillance.

The 'Asian NATO'

Building Alliances and Weakening Unity

On March 13, 2021, President Biden hosted Quadrilateral Security Dialogue with the prime ministers of Australia, India, and Japan.[38] US National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan, who sat in on the summit, declared 'these four leaders made a massive joint commitment today' and that 'We have taken the Quad to a new level,' the motto of the Quad being a 'Free and open Indo-Pacific.'[39] According to the RAND report *Implementing Restraint: Changes in U.S. Regional Security Policies to Operationalize a Realist Grand Strategy of Restraint*, the Trump administration had used the free and open Indo-Pacific (FOIP) construct as a guiding principle for its new era of great power competition with China, incorporating language about FOIP into the 2017 National Security Strategy of the US and the 2018 National Defence Strategy of the US.[40]

The Quad resurrected itself in 2017, reasserting its role as the 'Asian Arc of Democracy,' the parallels to the NATO transatlantic alliance draw themselves.[41] Tactically, the Quad was revived by Trump in 2017 for several reasons: the growing power of China, India's economic and strategic reach, and more importantly, the Indian Ocean as a strategic trade corridor which carries almost two-thirds of global oil shipments and cargo. The mere fact the Quad uses the term Indo-Pacific instead of the Asian Pacific is a sign of the group's political nature. The term Indo-Pacific

is in itself contentious, as pointed out by Shiv Shankar Menon, India's security adviser, who had stated in 2013 'Indo-Pacific' was 'not one geopolitical unit,' and that in 'terms of geopolitics, capabilities, and various navies' the region 'still consists of three distinct areas: the Indian Ocean, the western Pacific, and the seas near China, (namely, the South China Sea, the East Sea, and the Sea of Japan."[42] The US clearly wanted India to have dominance in the region, a concept Prime Minister Modi lapped up as it fitted into his Hindu supremacy narrative. Modi was so keen to embrace the term that he even established an Indo-Pacific division in the Ministry of External Affairs.[43]

The US too continues to develop its alliance. In a flurry of international activity, it has added more countries to the Quad. The 'Quad Plus' could potentially play a central role in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) as the region is becoming one of the most crucial geopolitical and economic areas of the world. Concurrently, a rise in security concerns related to vital sea lines of communication (SLOC) and routes, aggressive maritime militarization, and the struggle for natural resources have threatened the transformation of the IOR.[44]

The 'Free and Open Indo-Pacific' concept has been viewed by Beijing as a US-led containment strategy directed against China.[45] Russia and Iran too view it as the Asian NATO under the US' dictates that has been making its strategic presence felt across the region. To show its renewed commitment, Australia joined the US and Japan in the India-led 24th Malabar Naval Exercise in November 2020, marking the group's first joint military exercise.

Examining the US and China in the framework of international relations of 'defensive realism' and 'offensive realism' schools of thought, one can argue that China, Iran, Russia, and Pakistan belong to the former.[46] While the latter term applies to the nexus of US, India and Israel. The strategy outlined by Brzezinski[47] is part of a continuum advocates 'a greater emphasis on the emergence of increasingly important but strategically compatible partners who, prompted by American leadership, might help to shape a more cooperative trans-Eurasian security system'[48] Brzezinski argues that 'since America's unprecedented power is bound to diminish over time, the priority must be to manage the rise of other regional powers in ways that do not threaten America's global primacy.'[49]

India at Forefront of US' 'Containing China' Strategy

Strategic Significance of India

US' continued confrontation against China has bolstered India's position economically and politically. Washington has ignored Prime Minister Modi's human rights violations in IIOJ&K and India, and that the non-partisan human rights watchdog Amnesty International had to halt its operations in India as they found the country too dangerous to work in due to intimidation and attacks by the Indian police and security services.[50] However, Prime Minister Narendra Modi emboldened by Israeli and US support, went on to outrageously violate UN resolutions and international law by revoking the special status of the disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir to illegally claim its annexation. The Pivot to Asia and the Quad's focus on the Indo-Pacific has benefited Delhi, economically and militarily. Australia's foreign policy white paper, for instance, declared that India was important as a bilateral partner and a country 'that will influence the shape of the regional order' and 'now sits in the front rank of Australia's international partnerships.'[51] US' FOIP concept envisions India as one of the four critical democratic 'anchors' in the region. While Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has repeatedly stated that he sees India as central to Japan's foreign policy. India's potentially crucial role in the 'Indo-Pacific' has helped deepen support and cooperation from the US and its allies in terms of development finance, security assistance, and capacity building.

US Boosts India's Military

According to a report by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) 2020, India is the second largest arms importer in the world, next only to Saudi Arabia.[52] The US and India have been strengthening their strategic partnership, through defence agreements, in response to their perceived rivals: China and Pakistan. The four main US-India agreements include the General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA, 2002); Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA, 2016); Communications Compatibility and Security Agreement (COMCASA, 2018); and finally, Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement (BECA, 2020). US-India cooperation is facilitated by the LEMOA, implementation of the Helicopter Operations from Ships other than Aircraft Carriers (HOSTAC) program, and signing of the COMCASA, which would allow greater interoperability and technology transfer. Joint military exercises of India and the US—such as Tiger Triumph, the first bilateral tri-service amphibious military exercise between the two nations—has greatly enhanced India's confidence

indicating that any of its belligerent actions in the region will receive West's support.[53]

Constructive Chaos and Asia

Manufactured Chaos

While the US forms and strengthens alliances and agreements with India, Japan, Australia and countries in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) bloc to contain China, BRI and CPEC are expanding the Chinese zone of influence with the involvement of Russia, Iran and many European and Asian countries. If US fails in its objectives through current initiatives, it might resort to creating constructive chaos which will impede trade and China's economic success and dominance.

A RAND Corporation's study titled, *War with China: Thinking through the Unthinkable*, argues that a war with China is inevitable to ensure US hegemony.[54] It suggests that the war will readdress the shifting balance, and 'that fighting would start and remain in East Asia, where potential Sino-U.S. flash points and nearly all Chinese forces are located. Each side's increasingly far-flung disposition of forces and growing ability to track and attack opposing forces could turn much of the Western Pacific into a 'war zone,' with grave economic consequences'[55] The US army commissioned report suggests that war would not affect US' homeland but destabilize the East Asian area and destroy all countries' military and economic progress. It would destroy the planned BRI and neutralize any threats emanating from China, Russia, Pakistan and Iran; the report cites Glick and Taylor whose research shows that 'there is an 80 percent immediate drop in trade between adversaries when war commences. There was a 96 percent drop in trade in World War I and a 97 percent decline in trade in World War II, trade between adversaries in these wars was 'almost totally destroyed.'[56]

The US General Wesley Clark in 2007 in an interview with Amy Goodman on *Democracy Now* (2007)[57] had stated that the Bush Administration just after 9/11, had outlined the destruction of '7 countries in 5 years' nearly all in the Middle East and Muslim countries. It is important to note that six out of seven countries have had their infrastructure destroyed, and most of the population traumatized, displaced, disabled or dead—only Iran is left at present. In fact, the forces of constructive chaos were successfully implemented systematically after 9/11, destabilizing six countries, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and Syria. The strategy of 'Greater Middle East'

was first spoken out by the former US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Prime Minister Netanyahu in 2006 justifying Israel's war on Lebanon, which involved destroying infrastructure through a bombing campaign to such an extent that would hinder functionality of countries, ensuring that it takes them years to get back on their feet. Washington and Tel Aviv believed that unleashing the forces of constructive chaos would generate conditions of violence and warfare throughout the region so that the US, UK, and Israel could redraw the map of the Middle East in accordance with their geostrategic needs and objectives.[58]

Currently, the US continues to confront China at every level; its focus is on China's technological reach and prevention of its access to Western markets. In addition to banning Chinese companies from doing business in the US – it has sought to pressure nations around the globe to deny China the market access. This is a desperate attempt to secure US market shares through threats and intimidation rather than through innovation and competitive business strategies.[59] The US is also carrying out media campaigns against China to create a cultural 'atmosphere of fanaticism, hysteria, and conspiratorial thinking in all the countries concerned.'[60]

The violence in Libya in 2011 was part of the wider 'Arab Spring' with opposition groups, fronts posing as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and even armed factions all backed by the US and prepared years in advance to carry out a region-wide campaign of destabilization, regime change, military intervention, and occupation.[61] According Steve Clemens, Senator John McCain, infamous for liaising with members of Al Qaeda-linked groups like Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) 'promised at the 2011 Halifax International Security Forum, the Arab Spring would spread – deliberately and as part of Washington's desire to encircle, contain, and eventually overthrow the political and economic orders of Iran, Russia, and China,' McCain stated: 'A year ago, Ben-Ali and Gaddafi were not in power. Assad won't be in power this time next year. This Arab Spring is a virus that will attack Moscow and Beijing.'[62] Clemons states when McCain 'declared US-engineered conflict would eventually reach Moscow and Beijing' he meant it would 'first need to arrive in and erode the stability of nations along the peripheries of both Russia and China. And this is a process that has continued ever since, with US-backed 'colour revolution' attacking Ukraine in 2013-2014, Belarus more recently and both within China and along its peripheries.'

Clemons points to 'deadly separatism in China's Xinjiang region, violent riots in Hong Kong, opposition groups in Thailand openly opposed to close relations between Bangkok and Beijing – and now the crisis in Myanmar.'[63] His comments are especially interesting since Myanmar

serves a major role in China's Belt & Road Initiative (BRI) as it will be hosting the China-Myanmar Economic Corridor (CMEC), an ASEAN equivalent of BRI's flagship, CPEC, which will allow China to connect to the Afro-Asian 'Indian' Ocean without facing US-Indian disruptions in the South China Sea (SCS) and Strait of Malacca (SOM).

India Implements Constructive Chaos in Pakistan to Derail CPEC

Whether the US will implement constructive chaos strategy in the Asia-Pacific region is not out of the equation, considering that Indian Spies and CIA operatives have already been exposed by Pakistani security services and media.[64] The US has been working closely with India because 'India isn't just an ordinary country in US foreign policy planning' due to its 'demographic and economic capabilities' but mainly for its geostrategic position being a 'counterweight' to China.[65] In the US Army War College monograph (2016), *The Pivot to Asia: Can It Serve as the Foundation for American Grand Strategy in the 21st Century*,[66] Washington noted that China had its own Indo-Pacific perspective manifested through Maritime Silk Road, and the so-called 'string of pearls' network of port facilities in the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea. This, coupled with the Indian strategic position between the SOM and the Persian Gulf, enhances India's strategic importance as the ultimate pivot state in the US' pivot strategy.[67] As a result, India receives increased support in several forms, including improvements in its maritime power projection capability, multilateral defence-cooperation, and joint naval exercises with ASEAN governments and Australia.[68] Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Morgulov had indicated at the 3rd Russian-Indian forum of Research Centres in December 2018 claiming that the US was using India as a pawn to contain China and the ideas promoted by Washington, Tokyo and Canberra were 'aimed at containing major regional powers and drawing dividing lines by creating closed groups and interests rather than at positive development and open cooperation in the Indian and Pacific oceans.'[69]

This scenario poses the biggest danger to Pakistan. This should set alarm bells for Pakistan as several US reports including the RAND 2021 report *Implementing Restraint: Changes in U.S. Regional Security Policies to Operationalize a Realist Grand Strategy of Restraint* mention Pakistan's nuclear facilities which need to be 'controlled.'[70] The logical conclusion is that as the US and Israel have targeted Iran with threats of war, along with a pre-planned war with China, the US, Israel and India nexus can only proceed after Pakistan is denuclearized. Another reason of concern for the US and India is Pakistan's close alliance with China which has been strengthened through CPEC. In a broader context, there

are sufficient reasons to believe that India was applying constructive chaos in Pakistan even while Pakistan was allied to US' WoT after 9/11. Simultaneously, the US Drone attacks not only were targeting Afghanistan but also Pakistan. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is estimated to have carried out more than 300 drone strikes in the tribal belt of Pakistan from 2004 till 2011, killing more than 2,000 people."[71] The extent to which destabilizing tactics have been implemented in Pakistan, was exposed when CIA operative Raymond Davis was caught in 2011 with suspicious details of a network of sabotage and terror.

Likewise, Indian Spy Kulbhushan Yadav was arrested in March 2016 through whom it was exposed that several Research & Analysis Wing (RAW) spies had infiltrated Pakistan, operating in every sphere, funding terrorist activities to destabilize the country.[72] Baluchistan Home Minister Sarfraz Bugti had said that Yadav was obviously working for RAW and remained in contact with the Baloch Separatists and militants, fuelling sectarian violence in the province and the country. He added that Yadav was caught financially supporting militants and admitted his involvements in Karachi's riots, while naval combat training was being given to Baloch separatists, in an attempt to target the ports of Gwadar and Karachi. According to Lieutenant General Asim Saleem Bajwa, a retired Pakistani three-star General, serving till recently as Chairman of CPEC Authority, Yadav's goal was to sabotage the CPEC with the Gwadar port as a special target.[73] According to former US Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary of State Colin Powell and retired US Army Col. Lawrence Wilkerson's speech at Ron Paul Institute, US' presence in Afghanistan had less to do with the Taliban and more about ensuring the US hard power close to the BRI and the nuclear stockpile in Pakistan. He said that the Washington wanted to leap on that stockpile and stabilize it if it could. The third reason was provided by the 20 million Uygur population who could be used to destabilize China.[74]

Blue Dot Network to Counter-BRI and CPEC

In order to counter the biggest threat to the region according to the US and India, hindering the building of alliances and encouraging 'a coalition of the willing,' the former introduced the Blue Dot Network (BDN) on November 4, 2019 at the Indo-Pacific Business Forum (IPBF) in Bangkok on the sidelines of the 35th ASEAN Summit. It is a multi-stakeholder initiative led by the US International Development Finance Corporation (DFC), Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) and Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) of Australia. According to a 2019 US Department of State report, *A Free and Open Indo-Pacific: Advancing a Shared Vision,* the US International Development Finance Corporation and the Blue Dot Network will bring together governments, the private

sector, and civil society under shared standards for global infrastructure development in developing and emerging economies.[75] With an ambitious India, the US-India partnership is developing to realize a US' Indo-Pacific vision. In his keynote address at Shangri-La Dialogue, 2018, Modi said 'Delhi has concerns not just about China-Pakistan Economic Corridor projects in territory that it claims, but also the terms as well as the strategic, political, and economic implications of China's BRI projects in Bangladesh, Maldives, Myanmar, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and the broader Indian Ocean region.'[76] The Blue Dot Network is expected to implement a system for infrastructure development, roads, ports, and bridges with a focus on the Asia-Pacific region. It is supposed to be a counter-initiative to China's BRI.[77] Brzezinski had advised the US to avoid states forming 'regional coalitions that seek to push America out of Eurasia,' and that Geopolitical pluralism becomes an enduring reality only when a network of pipeline and transportation routes links the region directly to major centers of global economic activity via the Mediterranean and Arabian seas, as well as overland.[78]

India US Strategic Allies

As geopolitical pluralism becomes a reality through China's BRI projects, with a network of pipelines transport and infrastructure creating regional connectivity and growth, India is still playing an ambivalent role. However, Sino-India ties and Pak-India relations have thawed. India has realized the potential economic and military strengths of China and the fact that US' economy is on decline, yet it will be difficult for Modi[79] and BJP's Hindu supremacist ideology to accept Pakistan and China as regional partners. The Indian Prime Minister is more attracted to US strategy in the Indo-Pacific region which intends to enhance its hegemonic ambitions. The fact is he appears to be adhering to Biden's 'America is back' slogan and US' pressure for India to stay in the former's camp. The relations between Russia and India have receded, at one time the latter bought defence weaponry from the former. Today, it procures arms mainly from the US and Israel. Washington's pressure on Modi to retain India appears to be working, even though the latter is aware to what extent the balance of power will shift after BRI and CPEC projects are implemented. The pressure exerted by the US was clearly observed when the Russian Foreign Minister on April 5-6, 2021 visited Delhi. It was the first time that a Russian foreign minister was not received by India's Prime Minister. This action could have been prompted by 'US Secretary of State Blinken announcing that Turkish officials and entities' will be sanctioned for 'Ankara's acquisition of the advanced S-400 Russian air defence system.'[80] According to Indian analyst M. K. Bhadrakumar it was a 'timely reminder for External Affairs Minister S. Jaishankar!' Another

reminder to India was in an article in the Washington based journal *Asian Review* that transmitted 'a sinister, ominous, barely-veiled warning to Delhi that it was about time Modi disengaged from the India-Russia relationship.'[81] Bhadrakumar states: 'India has already given up its fascination for Russian energy and has settled for US shale oil; Russia's status as India's number one arms supplier is being steadily replaced with American weaponry.'[82]

However, as India moves closer to US, Pakistan is reaping benefits from being a strategic key partner to China's BRI projects. India's plans to isolate the country have failed. Moscow's new alliance with Beijing also means it is a strategic partner to Islamabad as well. Pakistan's multi polar strategy, which was highlighted at the Islamabad Security Dialogue Conference is in 'harmony with Russia's Greater Eurasian Partnership (GEP) and China's Belt & Road Initiative (BRI), thereby enabling promising synergy between them.'[83] This recent alliance between Russia and Pakistan also targets the security concerns in Afghanistan after the US evacuates its forces, in an effort to ensure peace. The emerging 'Russian-Pakistani geostrategic convergence creates the potential for pioneering a Central Eurasian Corridor cantered on the planned Pakistan-Afghanistan-Uzbekistan (PAKAFUZ) railway, which will unlock a multitude of promising opportunities for the Afghan people upon its completion.'[84]

India's Hybrid War against Pakistan

As a US geostrategic military partner in the region, India would continue its hybrid war against Pakistan unabated, rather more vigorously as CPEC is seen as a Chinese strategic move in the US and it will strengthen Pakistan's regional standing. Recently India has shown interest in reducing tensions with Pakistan; however, without sustainable and long term measures such initiatives can only be construed as efforts to placate Pakistan, to lull any insecurities and continue a covert hybrid war to destabilize Pakistan and facilitate Washington in accessing its nuclear assets. Despite the fact that the date for complete withdrawal of the US troops from Afghanistan is just around the corner (August 31), the US is looking for alternate options due its vital interests in the region.[85] If it vacates, there have been several non-state mechanisms that the US military has previously demonstrated to disrupt and delegitimize a government through chaos, like its military contractors in the form of Blackwater or Xe Services. Afghanistan provides crucial footing for the US to contain China and Russia. Washington has a recent precedent of partially withdrawing from Iraq and then announcing in April 2021 that owing to the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) insurgency and Iran-backed militias it was not interested in withdrawing completely.[86]

While several countries are keenly interested in joining BRI, India is opting for the US camp despite latter's waning role as an Empire.[87] India might be using US' desperation for retaining power in the region as it is cognizant of the fact that the US would go to any extent in creating constructive chaos or an impending war to hinder BRI projects and China. Moreover, it would be willing to offer India any benefits that the latter might ask for.[88]

Development of Joint Strategy

Grievances and the 'Anti-Hegemonic Coalition'

After decolonization, a form of Neo-colonialism through capitalist networks continued to benefit the West. In this setting, the third world countries were treated as satellite states revolving around the US. Trade deals were offered to them that actually benefited the West, and aid packages and sanctions were employed to create the coalition of the willing. Korybko elaborates on the system that the West continues to employ to subdued weaker nations. According to him, it involves 'the weaponization of international financial institutions, traditional (usually military) and non-traditional (Colour Revolution) coups, information warfare, corruption, and so-called 'vaccine nationalism' to subjugate the world.'[89]

The US has identified BRI as an immediate threat which serves as an alternative to the South, creating new trade networks, building infrastructure encouraging economic potential in developing countries, offering low interest loans without strings attached. According to Alastair Crooke, a former British diplomat, founder and director of the Beirut-based Conflicts Forum in *China and Russia Launch a 'Global Resistance Economy'* (2021) the essence of China's resistance economy is based on Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* (c. 500 BCE) which advises 'To secure ourselves against defeat lies in our own hands; yet the opportunity of defeating the enemy is provided by the enemy himself … therefore the clever combatant imposes his will; and does not allow the enemy's will to be imposed on him.' [90] This is creating an increased realization that the US' notion of China as the principal challenger to the US' global dominance, and of Russia as a major threat to the US-led world order, have made it imperative for Moscow and Beijing to work together even more closely on geopolitical, geo-economic and security issues.[91]

Furthermore, Brzezinski's warning is becoming a new reality. In his grand strategy, he had warned that the US has to ensure that no form of coalition emerges which will threaten US primacy, and stated that the

'most dangerous scenario would be a grand coalition of China, Russia, an 'anti-hegemonic' coalition united not by ideology but by complementary grievances.' He argued, 'It would be reminiscent in scale and scope of the challenge once posed by the Sino-Soviet bloc, though this time China would likely be the leader and Russia the follower.' He advises 'averting this contingency, however remote it may be, will require a display of U.S. geostrategic skill on the western, eastern, and southern perimeters of Eurasia simultaneously."[92] Brzezinski's 'most dangerous scenario' is the formation of a powerful grand 'anti-hegemonic' coalition of China, Russia, Iran Pakistan, Azerbaijan, Turkey, and many other ASEAN countries.

Moreover, the Alaska meeting (2021) which was followed two days later by a visit to China from Russian foreign minister Sergey Lavrov, was widely viewed as a sign of strengthening Chinese–Russian relations. This visit, which the Chinese framed as a response to US 'encirclement,' featured a discussion of moving away from use of the US dollar in trade.[93] *Reuters* had reported, 'Russia's top diplomat starts China visit with call to reduce U.S. dollar use."[94] US provocations led Beijing and Moscow to agree to stand together against Western sanctions, boost ties and reduce their dependence on the US dollar in international trade and settlements. One of the first persons to identify the geopolitical importance of Russia's resources was Halford Mackinder in a paper for the *Royal Geographical Society* in 1904 where he argues that 'control of the Heartland, which stretched from the Volga to the Yangtze, would control the 'World-Island'—a term that he used for Europe, Asia and Africa."[95] Over a century later, Mackinder's theory resonates with Russia and China orchestrating the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). With a developing bloc of Russia and China,[96] several developing countries with their 'grievances' are watching in anticipation to walk away from a declining US empire. With many ASEAN nations signing up to be part of the BRI initiative, Europe cannot afford to end its trading partnership with China, even though it is under serious pressure from the US. Europe is dependent on its commercial ties with the SCO and its energy reliance from Russia and Silk Road rail terminals in various European Union (EU) states indicate a prosperous future at a time when Europe is also in crises, especially after Brexit and the Coronavirus pandemic.

Iran-China Pact: A Game Changer

The worst scenario for the US and Israel has been posed through the significant steps out of decades of isolation and severe sanctions for the demonised Iran. The country has signed a 25-year agreement with China.[97] By imposing sanctions on Iran, Russia, and China, by accusing

the countries of espionage, conducting cyber attacks, and initiating covert regime change actions, the US has forced these countries to unite with each other against Washington. Sun Tzu rightly pointed out that the 'Opportunity of defeating the enemy is provided by the enemy himself.'[98] Tehran rightly sees the agreement with China as a complete roadmap with strategic, political and economic clauses covering trade, economic and transportation cooperation.

Besides, Pakistan has its own of grievances against the US, more recently through the so-called WoT. The China-Iran strategic partnership will benefit Pakistan immensely. According to Korybko four factors that will unleash the Eurasian Century are 'CPEC, W-CPEC+, the recently improved trilateral coordination between Azerbaijan-Pakistan-Turkey, and Iran's inevitable incorporation into the former in order to create the TIPA regional integration network.'[99] SCO offers a model for the new collaborations and pose a great challenge to American economic power and technological supremacy. Russia and China are clearly determined to ditch the dollar. The Russian Central Bank and nearly all other central banks and governments in the SCO have been increasing their gold reserves for some time which could be an important clue as to how the representatives of three billion Euro-Asians—almost half the world's population—see the future of trans-Asian money.'[100] The challenges facing American hegemony are grave and there are more than twenty-one nations across Asia which are on the verge of merging with China's BRI while most European nations are trading in one form or another with China.

Conclusion

Constructive Chaos is an important strategy that the US has used to project its hegemonic agenda. It could not implement the *Pivot to Asia* strategy until the Middle East was destabilized through the WoT policies, the Palestinian marginalized and the Arab world brought into US and Israel's orbit through the Abraham Accords.

The mapped Eurasian region too is faced with threats which were outlined by Zbigniew Brzezinski, a person who has influenced US foreign policy for over 60 years (as a Counsellor to President Lyndon B. Johnson from 1966 to 1968 and National Security Advisor to President Jimmy Carter from 1977 to 1981). The 'most dangerous scenario'—i.e., formation of a coalition between China and Russia—as predicted by Brzezinski in 1997 is unfolding now with several South Asian countries joining the bloc due to oppression and exploitation through US imperialism and neo-colonialism.[101] The China, Russia, Pakistan, Iran bloc

of nuclear and well-armed countries will eventually transform the region through the BRI initiative that expands into Europe through a multilateral and multipolar strategy.

The Abraham Accords, which set out to divide the Sunni world against Shia Iran, may have achieved their objective as far as the supremacy of Israel in the region is concerned. However, Saudi Arabia and UAE are simultaneously expanding their economic relations with Beijing and may be on the same platform when it comes to China's BRI with several large scale construction and infrastructure projects such as the world's largest oil-fired power station by the Shandong Electric Power Corporation (SEPCO). After the *Saudi Chinese Investment Forum,* thirty-five bilateral economic cooperation agreements have been signed and bilateral trade has dramatically increased. Riyadh is already Beijing's largest oil supplier. Israel is intent on 'regime change' in Iran through war and it will be more concerned currently than any other country as all its efforts and maneuvring to create an anti-Iran anti-Shia bloc in the Middle East will be ineffective if these countries follow China's economic planning and become partners in the Silk Route.

Any threats to Pakistan or Iran have already been ostensibly tackled by the China-Russia Alliance. The two countries need to focus on implementing the BRI, focusing on innovative projects to aid building infrastructure, hospitals, colleges, factories and strengthening their economy. Pakistan's stability is crucial to the region but it will remain a main target for the US and India. The threats to Pakistan may continue to rise internally with proxies or through media and cyber campaigns.

In accordance with the strategy outlined by General Qiao Liang and Colonel Wang Xiangsui in 1999, China aims to avoid any direct military confrontation with the US.[102] Instead, it is waging a war through commercial, economic, and financial measures. While in the US 'the dissident discourse of permanent social war has itself become an 'official' state discourse' and 'ultimately finds expression as a discourse of state racism in the twentieth century.'[103] The US Army strategy, issued on March 16, 2021, advocates expanding the presence of US ground troops around the globe and increase its regional influence. The US army plans to transform itself to become a multi-domain capable force that is able to dominate adversaries in sustained large-scale combat operations by 2035, using the principle of 'soft power' within 'hard power.'[104]

There are sufficient reasons to predict that the US will resort to implementing the constructive chaos strategy. It has already published a report titled *Global Trends* which is produced every four years by the US government's National Intelligence Council, which states that 'India

and Pakistan may stumble into a large-scale war which neither side wants, especially following a terrorist attack.' It seems to indicate that a terrorist attack will apparently be from Pakistan and Delhi will have no choice but to react. The report also indicates that a 'security vacuum' would emerge if the US leaves Afghanistan leading to more conflict. More importantly, the report warns that 'a full-scale war could inflict damage that would have economic and political consequences for years.'[105] RAND Corporation too pictured similar scenarios in its study *War with China* (2016) which had concluded that such a war is inevitable to ensure US' hegemony. Simultaneously, the US continues to stoke fires hoping that conflict with Russia will bring Ukraine into NATO's fold and prevent Russia implementing Nord Stream 11 through Europe; it is also working covertly with Israel to continue bombing Syria and maneuvering to avoid total withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and Iraq. The list of such interventions goes on.

China's rise has been a major factor in saving the Global South from falling under the US neo-imperialist control during the Covid-19 pandemic. A joint strategy of states is required to build on what they have gained. The states that have managed to drift out of compelling US influence with China's help may increase coordination in the UN even to defy certain unilateral sanctions from Washington on some of these countries. Diversifying away from the dollar has already begun and China and its partners would continue economically integrating through BRI and promoting more people-to-people ties in the cultural, educational, and tourism spheres. In the meantime, the US and Western countries are carrying out 'pernicious information warfare attacks'[106] on China, Russia and Iran. However, this policy will not succeed as an anti-hegemonic coalition united by complementary grievances is already coming together to end centuries of exploitation through colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Notes

[1] US Department of State, Government of United States, "The Abraham Accords Declaration," September 15, 2020, https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Abraham-Accords-signed-FINAL-15-Sept-2020-508-1.pdf.
[2] US Department of State, Government of United States, "The Abraham Accords Declaration."
[3] Antony J. Blinken, "A Foreign Policy for American People" (speech, Washington, DC, March 3, 2021), https://www.state.gov/a-foreign-policy-for-the-american-people/; Antony J. Blinken and Lloyd J. Austin III, "America's Partnerships are 'Force Multipliers' in the World," *Washington Post*, March 14, 2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/03/14/americas-partnerships-are-force-multipliers-world/.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, AC, "The Longer Telegram: Toward a New American China Strategy" (paper, Atlantic Council, Washington, DC, 2021),

https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-Longer-Telegram-Toward-A-New-American-China-Strategy.pdf.

[6] Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).

[7] Andrew Korybko, "The US Alliance with India: Bipartisan Issue of Strategic Importance"
(Montreal: Global Research-Centre for Research on Globalization, 2020), https://www.globalresearch.ca/us-alliance-india-bipartisan-issue-grand-strategic-importance/5728084?pdf=5728084.

[8] Hassan Hosseini, Mohammad Ali Mousavi and Mohammad Khosh Haikal Azad, "Obama's 'Pivot to Asia' Policy (2011- 2016): The Case of China," *World Sociopolitical Studies* 2, no. 4 (2018): 633-674, http://dx.doi.org/10.22059/wsps.2019.257644.1056.

[9] John Pigler, "Confronting China," interview by T. J. Coles (Petrolia: Counterpunch, 2016), https://www.counterpunch.org/2016/10/28/confronting-china-an-interview-with-john-pilger/.

[10] Nick Turse, "Bases, Bases, Everywhere - Except in the Pentagon's Report," *Salon.com*, January 11, 2019, https://www.salon.com/2019/01/11/bases-bases-everywhere-except-in-the-pentagons-report_partner/.

[11] David C. Gompert, Astrid Stuth Cevallos and Cristina L. Garafola, *War with China: Thinking through the Unthinkable*, report (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2016), https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1140.html.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., ix.

[14] Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, The State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 159-179.

[15] John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001).

[16] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

[17] Ibid., 12.

[18] Medea Benjamin, "America Dropped 26,171 Bombs in 2016. What a Bloody End to Obama's Reign," *Guardian*, January 9, 2017,
https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/jan/09/america-dropped-26171-bombs-2016-obama-legacy.

[19] Hardt and Negri, *Empire*.

[20] Scott Ritter, "Biden and Blinken's Unprovoked Attacks on Russia and China Backfire…Because If You Live in a Glass House, Don't Throw Stones," *RT.com*, March 19, 2021, https://www.rt.com/op-ed/518651-biden-blinken-china-russia/.

[21] Anatol Lieven, "Stay Calm About China," *Foreign Policy*, August 26, 2020, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/26/china-existential-threat-united-states-xi-jinping/.

[22] "America Has Been at War 93% of the Time – 222 out of 239 Years – since 1776" (Montreal: Global Research-Centre for Research on Globalization, 2019), https://www.globalresearch.ca/america-has-been-at-war-93-of-the-time-222-out-of-239-years-since-1776/5565946.

[23] PSSIA, "Former Secretary of State Colin Powell's Chief of Staff Talks Candidly About Strategic Intelligence" (Penn State School of International Affairs, 2015).

[24] Sarah Zheng, "Why Is the Five Eyes Intelligence Alliance in Beijing's Cross Hairs?" *South China Morning Post*, June 20, 2020, https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3089564/why-five-eyes-intelligence-alliance-beijings-cross-hairs.

[25] James Cox, "Canada and the Five Eyes Intelligence Community" (paper, Canadian International Council, Toronto, 2012), https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.357.5576&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

[26] "Coronavirus: Trump Stands by China Lab Origin Theory for Virus," *BBC News*, May 1, 2020, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52496098.

[27] Hamid Dabashi, "How Israel-UAE Deal Obliterates the Illusion of Arab Unity," *Middle East Eye*, August 26, 2020, https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/how-israel-uae-deal-obliterates-illusion-arab-unity.

[28] Aarti Nagraj, "Abu Dhabi's Group 42 Becomes First UAE Company to Announce International Office in Israel," *Gulf Business*, September 10, 2020, https://gulfbusiness.com/abu-dhabis-group-42-becomes-first-uae-company-to-announce-international-office-in-israel/.
[29] Sondoss Al Assad, "Bahrain's Mounting Anger over the Monarchy's Official Formalization of Ties with Tel Aviv," *AltWorld*, October 20, 2020, https://thealtworld.com/sondoss_alassad/bahrains-mounting-anger-over-the-monarchys-official-formalization-of-ties-with-tel-aviv.
[30] Jonathan Cook, "The Planet Cannot Begin to Heal until We Rip the Mask Off the West's War Machine," *The Jonathan Cook Blog*, November 27, 2020, https://www.jonathan-cook.net/blog/2020-11-27/us-war-machine/.
[31] Jonathan Cook, "How the Israel-UAE Deal Puts the Bogus Peace Industry Back in Business," *Middle East Eye*, August 15, 2020, https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/how-israel-uae-deal-put-bogus-peace-industry-back-business.
[32] Shaul Chorev, Douglas J. Feith, Seth Cropsey, Jack Dorsett and Gary Roughead, *The Eastern Mediterranean in the New Era of Major-Power Competition: Prospects for U.S.-Israeli Cooperation*, report (Washington, DC: Hudson Institute, 2019), https://s3.amazonaws.com/media.hudson.org/Feith_The%20Eastern%20Mediterranean%20in%20the%20New%20Era%20of%20Major-Power%20Competition.pdf.
[33] Ibid., 8.
[34] Connie Bruck, "Friends of Israel," *New Yorker*, August 25, 2014, https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/09/01/friends-israel.
[35] Jonathan Cook, "Why Israel is Joining the Pentagon's 'Arab NATO'," *Middle East Eye*, February 2, 2021, https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/why-israel-joining-pentagon-arab-nato.
[36] Trevor Hunnicutt and Maayan Lubell, "Biden and Israeli PM Set to Discuss Iran Strategy at Meeting Next Week," *Reuters*, August 18, 2021, https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/israeli-pm-expects-meet-biden-this-month-discuss-iran-2021-08-18/.
[37] "UAE Honours PM Modi with Highest Civilian Award," *Hindu Business Line*, August 24, 2019, https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/news/uae-honours-pm-modi-with-highest-civilian-award/article29243453.ece?__cf_chl_captcha_tk__=pmd_z_83gPUU3kAW.R_i0gsLm6m74z46Zk0wqm2kYKXGNcA-1631606460-0-gqNtZGzNAxCjcnBszQjR.
[38] Tyler Durden, "Biden's Last Throw of Geopolitical Dice," *Zero Hedge*, March 26, 2021, https://www.zerohedge.com/geopolitical/bidens-last-throw-geopolitical-dice.
[39] US Department of State, GoUS, *A Free and Open Indo-Pacific: Advancing a Shared Vision*, report (Government of United States, 2019), https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Free-and-Open-Indo-Pacific-4Nov2019.pdf.
[40] Miranda Priebe, Bryan Rooney, Nathan Beauchamp-Mustafaga, Jeffrey Martini and Stephanie Pezard, *Implementing Restraint: Changes in U.S. Regional Security Policies to Operationalize a Realist Grand Strategy of Restraint*, report (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2021), https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RRA700/RRA739-1/RAND_RRA739-1.pdf.
[41] Park Joshua, "Why the US-Led Quad Alliance won't Realise its 'Asian NATO' Ambition against China," *South China Morning Post*, October 30, 2020, https://www.scmp.com/comment/opinion/article/3107469/why-us-led-quad-alliance-wont-realise-its-asian-nato-ambition.
[42] Shinvshankar Menon, "India's Foreign Affairs Strategy," Brookings India Impact Series (paper, Brookings Institution India Center, New Delhi, 2020), https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/India27s-foreign-affairs-strategy.pdf.
[43] Indrani Bagchi, "In a Show of Intent, External Affairs Ministry Sets up Indo-Pacific Wing," *Times of India*, April 15, 2019, https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/in-a-show-of-intent-external-affairs-ministry-sets-up-indo-pacific-wing/articleshow/68880720.cms.

[44] Poulomi Bhattacharya and Aruna Kumar Dash, "Drivers of Blue Economy in Asia and Pacific Island Countries: An Empirical Investigation of Tourism and Fisheries Sectors" (paper, Asian Development Bank Institute, Tokyo, 2020), https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/623236/adbi-wp1161.pdf.
[45] Felix Heiduk and Gudrun Wacker, "From Asia-Pacific to Indo-Pacific: Significance, Implementation, and Challenges" (paper, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik [German Institute for International and Security Affairs], Berlin, 2020), https://doi.org/10.18449/2020RP09.
[46] Lieven, "Stay Calm About China."
[47] Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*.
[48] David J. Berteau, Michael J. Green and Zack Cooper, *Assessing the Asia-Pacific Rebalance*, report (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2014), https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/legacy_files/files/publication/150105_Berteau_AssessingAsiaPacificRebal_Web.pdf.
[49] Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, 197.
[50] IMI, "Amnesty International India Halts Its Work on Upholding Human Rights-Amnesty International" (Kyiv: Institute of Mass Information, 2020), https://imi.org.ua/en/news/amnesty-international-india-halts-its-work-on-upholding-human-rights-amnesty-international-i35378.
[51] Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, GoA, "2017 Foreign Policy White Paper" (Government of Australia, 2017), https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/2017-foreign-policy-white-paper.pdf.
[52] Rajat Pandit, "2nd Biggest Arms Importer, India 23rd On Exporters' List," *Times of India*, March 10, 2020, http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/74559063.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst.
[53] Dinakar Peri, "LEMOA Fully Operational Now," *Hindu*, September 8, 2018, https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/lemoa-already-fully-operational/article24904359.ece?__cf_chl_captcha_tk__=pmd_fFgILyLCXio450aa8t7IAox9hMkPOaAAGqBaRFPtOt8-1631692426-0-gqNtZGzNAvujcnBszQgR.
[54] Gompert, Cevallos and Garafola, *War with China: Thinking through the Unthinkable*.
[55] Ibid., ix.
[56] Reuven Glick and Alan M. Taylor, "Collateral Damage: Trade Disruption and the Economic Impact of War," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 92, no. 1 (2010): 102-127 (109), https://www.jstor.org/stable/25651393.
[57] Wesley Clark, "Global Warfare: We're Going to Take out 7 Countries in 5 Years: Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan & Iran..," interview by Amy Goodman, *Democracy Now*, 2007, (Montreal: Global Research-Centre for Research on Globalization, 2020), https://www.globalresearch.ca/we-re-going-to-take-out-7-countries-in-5-years-iraq-syria-lebanon-libya-somalia-sudan-iran/5166, quoted in Brandon Turbeville, "'7 Countries in 5 Years':" 2007 Wesley Clark Interview Reveals US Plan To Go To War With Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Lebanon, Somalia, And Sudan," *Activist Post*, May 23, 2018, https://www.activistpost.com/2018/05/7-countries-in-5-years-2007-wesley-clark-interview-reveals-us-plan-to-go-to-war-with-iraq-iran-syria-libya-lebanon-somalia-and-sudan.html.
[58] Mahdi D. Nazemroaya, "Plans for Redrawing the Middle East: The Project for a 'New Middle East'" (Montreal: Global Research-Centre for Research on Globalization, 2006), https://www.globalresearch.ca/plans-for-redrawing-the-middle-east-the-project-for-a-new-middle-east/3882.
[59] Anthony Cartalucci, "US Seeks to Destroy Myanmar just as it Destroyed Libya in 2011," *AltWorld*, April 1, 2021, https://thealtworld.com/anthony_cartalucci/us-seeks-to-destroy-myanmar-just-as-it-destroyed-libya-in-2011; and Brian Berletic, "Myanmar, Libya, and Syria: Dangerous Parallels," *New Eastern Outlook*, March 31, 2021, https://journal-neo.org/2021/03/31/myanmar-libya-and-syria-dangerous-parallels/.
[60] Cartalucci, "US Seeks to Destroy Myanmar just as it Destroyed Libya in 2011."

[61] Steve Clemons, "The Arab Spring: 'A Virus That Will Attack Moscow and Beijing'," *Atlantic*, November 19, 2011, https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/11/the-arab-spring-a-virus-that-will-attack-moscow-and-beijing/248762/.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.
[64] "Forty-Five Arrested for Having Links with Davis," *Dawn*, February 28, 2011, https://www.dawn.com/news/609610/investigation-scope-broadened-in-davis-case-45-arrested.
[65] Andrew Korybko, "Why America Couldn't Win Its War in Afghanistan," *Express Tribune*, April 15, 2021, https://tribune.com.pk/article/97359/why-america-couldnt-win-its-war-in-afghanistan.
[66] Douglas T. Stuart, *The Pivot to Asia: Can it Serve as the Foundation for American Grand Strategy in the 21st Century?* (Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College Press, 2016), https://scholar.dickinson.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1571&context=faculty_publications.
[67] Robert D. Kaplan, *The Revenge of Geography: What The Map Tells Us About Coming Conflicts and The Battle Against Fate* (New York: Random House, 2012).
[68] Michael Hudson and Pepe Escobar, "In Quest of a Multi-Polar World," *Consortium News*, March 26, 2021, https://consortiumnews.com/2021/03/26/in-quest-of-a-multi-polar-world/.
[69] "Korybko: 25-Year Contract Message to US; Iran and China not to be 'Restrained'," *Tahlilbazaar.com*, April 16, 2021, https://www.tahlilbazaar.com/news/81847/Korybko-25-year-contract-message-to-US-Iran-China-not-to.
[70] Priebe, Rooney, Beauchamp-Mustafaga, Martini and Pezard, *Implementing Restraint: Changes in U.S. Regional Security Policies to Operationalize a Realist Grand Strategy of Restraint*.
[71] Orla Guerin, "US Drone Strike Victims in Pakistan Plan Legal Action," *BBC News*, November 1, 2011, https://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-south-asia-15532916.
[72] "Raw Agent Reveals More Spies Present to Destabilize Pakistan," *Geo News*, March 26, 2016, https://www.geo.tv/latest/102925-From-Kul-Bashan-Yadav-to-Mubarak-Patel-The-journey-of-a-RAW-agent.
[73] "Govt Airs Video of Indian Spy Admitting Involvement in Balochistan Insurgency," *Dawn*, March 29, 2016, https://www.dawn.com/news/1248669.
[74] "Time to End US 'Drama' over Xinjiang Rumors," *Global Times*, March 26, 2021, https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202103/1219553.shtml.
[75] US Department of State, GoUS, *A Free and Open Indo-Pacific: Advancing a Shared Vision*.
[76] Scott W. Harold, Tanvi Madan and Natalie Sambhi, *U.S.–Japan Alliance Conference: Regional Perspectives on the Quadrilateral Dialogue and the Free and Open Indo-Pacific*, report (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2020), https://doi.org/10.7249/CF414.
[77] Amrita Jash, "India in the Indo-Pacific: Reining in China in the New Theatre of Great Power Rivalry," *Think China*, September 18, 2020, https://www.thinkchina.sg/india-indo-pacific-reining-china-new-theatre-great-power-rivalry.
[78] Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*.
[79] Edwin Mora, "Modi Government Declares Chinese Kashmir Part of India," *BreitBart News*, August 7, 2019, https://www.breitbart.com/national-security/2019/08/07/modi-government-declares-chinese-kashmir-part-of-india/.
[80] Antony J. Blinken, "A Foreign Policy for American People" (speech, Washington, DC, March 3, 2021), https://www.state.gov/a-foreign-policy-for-the-american-people/.
[81] M. K. Bhadrakumar, "Whither India-Russia Ties?" *Indian Punchline*, April 7, 2021, https://www.indianpunchline.com/whither-india-russia-ties/.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Ibid.

[85] Editor's note: While this article was being finalized, the Taliban took over Kabul on August 15 and the US withdrew its forces after waging its longest war in Afghanistan.
[86] Meghann Myers, "'We're Going to Stay in Iraq,' Says Top US Middle East Commander," *Military Times*, April 23, 2021, https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2021/04/22/were-going-to-say-in-iraq-says-top-us-middle-east-commander/.
[87] Tim Craig, "'The United States is in Crisis': Report Tracks Thousands of Summer Protests, Most Nonviolent," *Washington Post*, September 3, 2020, https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/the-united-states-is-in-crisis-report-tracks-thousands-of-summer-protests-most-nonviolent/2020/09/03/b43c359a-edec-11ea-99a1-71343d03bc29_story.html.
[88] Enrique Mendizabal, "Think Tank Accountability: Are They Really Just Hired Guns or is it Slightly More Complicated Than That?" *On Think Tanks*, September 10, 2014, https://onthinktanks.org/articles/think-tank-accountability-are-they-really-just-hired-guns-or-is-it-slightly-more-complicated-than-that/.
[89] Andrew Korybko, "The Anti-Imperialist Struggle is Alive and Well in the 21st Century," *CGTN*, April 5, 2021, https://news.cgtn.com/news/2021-04-05/The-anti-imperialist-struggle-is-alive-and-well-in-the-21st-century-Zdx7Vn92Uw/index.html.
[90] Alastair Crooke, "China and Russia Launch a 'Global Resistance Economy" (Quito: Latin American Information Agency, 2021), https://www.alainet.org/en/articulo/211729.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*.
[93] Gabrielle Tétrault-Farber and Andrew Osborn, "Russia's Top Diplomat Starts China Visit with Call to Reduce U.S. Dollar Use," *Reuters*, March 22, 2021, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-china-usa-idUSKBN2BE0XH.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Alasdair Macleod, "Biden's Last Throw of Geo-Political Dice," *Goldmoney.com*, March 25, 2021, https://www.goldmoney.com/research/goldmoney-insights/biden-s-last-throw-of-geopolitical-dice.
[96] Tony Kevin, "Russia and China Tell Biden: The Old Days are Over," *Asia Times*, March 26, 2021, https://asiatimes.com/2021/03/russia-and-china-tell-biden-the-old-days-are-over/.
[97] Mike Harrison and Kevin Liffey, eds., "Iran and China Sign 25-Year Cooperation Agreement," *Reuters*, March 27, 2021, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-iran-china-idUSKBN2BJ0AD.
[98] William N. Shepherd and Thomas D. Smith, "Sun Tzu and the Art of Trial," *Litigation* 39, no. 1 (2013): 24-27, https://www.jstor.org/stable/ 24396780.
[99] Andrew Korybko, "The Atlantic Council's Anti-China Containment Strategy" (Montreal: Global Research-Centre for Research on Globalization, 2021), https://www.globalresearch.ca/atlantic-council-anti-chinese-containment-strategy-fail/5736087.
[100] Durden, "Biden's Last Throw of Geopolitical Dice."
[101] David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
[102] Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui, *Unrestricted Warfare* (Beijing: PLA Literature and Arts Publishing House, 1999), https://www.c4i.org/unrestricted.pdf.
[103] Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*, eds. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), https://archive.org/stream/01.MichelFoucaultSocietyMustBeDefended/01.%20Michel%20Foucault%20-%20Society%20must%20be%20defended_djvu.txt.
[104] James C. McConville, "Army Multi-Domain Transformation: Ready to Win in Competition and Conflict" (paper, US Department of Army, Washington, DC, 2021), https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1143195.pdf.
[105] Anwar Iqbal, "India, Pakistan may Stumble into Large-Scale War, Warns US Intel Report," *Dawn*, April 9, 2021, https://www.dawn.com/news/1617288.
[106] Korybko, "Why America Couldn't Win its War in Afghanistan."