

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد
بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم
از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

By Walter Mignolo
10.04.2023

Xi Jinping's moves



Sources: Page/12

President **Xi Jinping's** visit to Moscow, the first after he was elected president of the People's Republic of China for the third time, was an orchestrated and decisive event in the mutation of the unipolar world order towards a multipolar order. The moves of the "collective West" – the North Atlantic – to prevent at least ruining the visit were obvious. The most notorious was the decision by the International Criminal Court to issue an arrest warrant for **Vladimir Putin** for war crimes. The order was issued on March 17. Xi Jinping's meeting with his Russian counterpart Putin began on March 20.

That day the newspapers of Europe and the United States recalled the **unilateral invasion of Iraq**, which both China and Russia challenged in the United Nations Security Council, led by two musketeers and a stone guest: George W. Bush, Tony Blair and José María Aznar. There was consensus in the international press, stating what was already known,

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

but which needs to be remembered. The invasion was a violation of international law legitimized by a fiction: the possession of weapons of mass destruction.

Xi Jinping's meeting with Putin, on the day of the twentieth anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, it was not at all accidental. Not only that, but, when scheduling the visit for that day, having announced in advance whereas one of the items on the agenda was the solution of the crisis in **Ukraine**, suggested to anyone who would see it that the West's condemnation of the Russian invasion of Ukraine was another of the many manifestations of the Double standards: who has the right to invade and violate sovereignty national and who does not. What remains pending is who holds the Truth without parentheses to justify and condemn. So the move called into question, on the one hand, the alleged illegitimacy of the Russian invasion as it is forced by the design of the North Atlantic to "contain" (and if possible, dismantle) Russia. Therefore, defending Russia's sovereignty triggered the invasion of Russia. Ukraine in defense of Russian national security threatened by the **NATO** operations scheduled in Ukraine, since the 2014 coup, when Russia annexed Crimea.

And, on the other hand, it was a lack of knowledge – by both leaders – of the order issued by the International Criminal Court judging Putin as war criminal and having remained silent about the crimes of war committed in Iraq. The fact that former President **George W. Bush** declared, in 2008, that it was a mistake to have assumed that **Saddam Hussein** possessed weapons of mass destruction, does not exonerate him of the crimes. Nor does his statement convince that he would not have known in the moment of invasion. What Saddam Hussein did not possess weapons of mass destruction ensured the success of the invasion. The European press can, wants or must forget these Connections. China and Russia do not forget them. It was like this for a long time: Whoever attacks forgets or pretends to forget, those who suffer aggression do not They never forget it.

But that's not all. The Chinese Foreign Ministry released the document "**China's Position on the Political Settlement of the Ukraine Crisis**", dated February 24, 2023. That is, the day of the first anniversary of the start of the military operation in Ukraine. The operation special military in Ukraine, in the official vocabulary of Russia (invasion, in the vocabulary of state communiqués and the press Western), occurred twenty days after, in Beijing and before of the initiation of the 2022 Olympic Games, Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin signed an agreement ushering in "the new era of relations international and sustainable global development". [1](#)

The historic meeting of Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin in Moscow, ignoring judicial and media efforts to discredit the Second, and win the sympathy of the first, failed once again. Give the impression that especially the U.S. government has not It is still understood that the cooperation of China and Russia is inalienable and unalterable. It also gives the impression that the government of the United States United considers itself to possess the truth without parentheses and of the Divine universal justice. These are "natural" consequences of unipolar and universal epistemic political hegemony.

Iran and Saudi Arabia

Both China's recent mediation to restore peaceful, political, economic and diplomatic relations between **Iran and Saudi Arabia**, like the historic meeting in Moscow on March 20, they are milestones unequivocal of China's irrepressible role in the emerging world order multipolar. At this point only a nuclear conflagration could Stop. At first glance, the significance and ramifications of agreement signed by Iran and Saudi Arabia, mediated by diplomacy China, they are huge. First, the simple and firm fact at the same time of that China has taken the initiative to promote cooperation instead of of the competition. Secondly, the non-trivial fact that States United States has not had any participation in the dialogues between Saudi Arabia, Iran and China. Third, that **Israel**, now In the hands of the extreme right, it has not participated and, even more, that its relations with Saudi Arabia to contain Iran's influence in Western Asia (Middle East in the perspective of the West) no longer They will be what they were. Xi Jinping's move removes the board after of **Joe Biden's** move connecting Poland with Ukraine. [3](#)

Moreover, the deal implies a notable turn for Saudi Arabia. -led by Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman- with impact in West Asia (Middle East). Relationships Saudi Arabia's close ties with the United States and Israel tend to be replaced by close relations with China and Iran. However That's not all. Saudi Arabia's collaboration with Russia, both members **OPEC's** strong forces were decisive – and at the same time disobedient – in the face of Biden's threats to punish Riyadh for cutting production oil, thus aggravating the closure of the pipeline that supplied the 40 percent of gas to the European Union. This occurred before the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline was sabotaged. But that's not all. On 9 March, one day before Iran and Saudi Arabia signed the Mutual collaboration in Beijing, Prince Faisal bin Farhan Al Saud, Saudi Foreign Minister Travels to Moscow for Talks with his Russian counterpart, Serge Lavrov. Previously, Saudi Arabia It had applied together with Turkey and Egypt, for membership in the **BRICS** group, while Iran had already signed the memorandum of the **Shanghai Cooperation Organization**.

Cooperation or confrontation

To have reached this point without affirming that the States involved are "Authoritarian states" might suggest to the reader that I am taking party for authoritarianism, which is not consistent with the **decolonial perspective** that I maintain. The decolonial perspective is supposed to doom all authoritarianism and promote democracy. The problem is that today **the Chinese authoritarianism promotes multipolarity and cooperation, while neoliberal democracy strives to preserve order unipolar through war**. Which implies imposing an order Homogeneous planetary according to the North Atlantic model (USA, USA, NATO, European Union) through sanctions and arms increases. Whereas the first China-led orientation promotes cooperation, second, U.S.-led promotes war.

So the equation is upset: while China manages peace and cooperation, the United States promotes war. Something strange is Happening. It is no longer possible to understand the change of epoch while maintaining the Binary logic of the time of change: either you are with me or you are with my Enemies. The decolonial attitude in this case is neither. But this, it will be said, is washing your hands and not taking sides. No exactly. It is really **taking sides by rejecting the trap of binary logic**, detach ourselves from the hegemonic logic during the epoch of changes and begin to understand that "authoritarian" states in policies domestic can reorient democratic international relations, while "democratic" states in domestic policies They can promote war in international relations. In this In the field, decoloniality invites us to review the budgets that They justify permanent war to contain the "axes of evil" that we are Threaten. Not falling into the trap is already taking sides, in addition to being a Healthy and liberating attitude. Such an attitude invites us to recognize, Like it or not, "multipolar authoritarian" states are Consequences of "unipolar democratic" homogenization designs.

The *Wall Street Journal* published an article on May 11 with a revealing title: ["Xi Jinping Bring's China Reform Era to and End."](#) The columnist, Linglei Wei, the paper's chief China affairs correspondent, highlights the end of the five decades of reforms introduced by Deng Xiopeng towards the end of the 70s. It also stresses that the moves of Xi Jinping highlights the leadership of the Communist Party in all governance aspects. Which marks not only the end of the period of rather, it **closes China's opening to the West**. In the West it is common to criticize Chinese authoritarianism in contrast to the democracy of the "free world". However, democracy in the hands of the imperial states ceased to be such long ago, if ever. Was. And, by contagion, in many States that preserve legacies Colonial. For Wei, this overturn closes the international order that We met in the last four decades

and concludes by suggesting that the Change of course brings with it the eventual uncertainty of order global. The uncertainty is already notorious since the collapse of the Union Soviet and the presumed end of history. The uncertainty began by 2001, long before China made the radical turn in the third investiture of Xi Jinping.

For its part, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic People's China – led by the new foreign secretary, Qing Gang- published, last February, a document entitled "[The hegemony of the United States and its dangers](#)". The document, analytical as well as descriptive, concludes with these In words: "States and their governments must respect each other and treat each other as Equal. States with greater resources must behave in a way that commensurate with their status and take the lead in finding a new model of State-to-State relations characterized by dialogue and association, not by confrontation (...) China opposes all forms of hegemonism and power politics, and rejects interference in the internal affairs of other countries. The United States must make a Serious soul-searching. It must critically examine what it has done, let go of their arrogance and prejudice, and abandon their practices hegemonic, dominant and intimidating." We find ourselves, suddenly, with **an authoritarian state that proposes harmonious inter-state relations and a democratic state that promotes war**. The first has behind it the cosmic logic of *yin-yang*, while that the second has behind it the Aristotelian binary logic transferred to The binary logic of Christian theology. The first proposes the Dialogue and mutually beneficial agreements ("win-win" is the expression of Xi Jinping), while the second proposes competition, the conflict and zero-sum play.

Point of no return

What is at stake is a process of no return, of which Russia's invasion of Ukraine is another obvious sign, "**the irresistible shift of global power eastwards**" that Singaporean diplomat and historian **Kishore Mahbubani** had already detected in 2008. In the book whose subtitle I have just Paraphrasing, Maharani includes a significant chapter entitled "Dewesternization", which connects with multipolarity. For me On the other hand, I have explored this idea on several occasions in the field of Latin America. [One of them](#) was published in **Pagina/12**, in December 2011.

On several occasions I highlighted the consolidation of States disobedients who delegitimize the modern/colonial hegemony that postulates and defends abstract universals in knowledge and Political-economic unipolarity in the global order. When they do so, they close The cycle of the westernization of the world that lasted from 1500 to around 2000. An example of the first case is the recent statement by the President of

France, **Emanuel Macron**, to justify the forced retirement law by saying that the reform is not a luxury but a necessity of the nation. The universal abstract "nation" justifies the imposition of a law rejected by 75 per cent of the population. While the West's refusal to engage in dialogue with China's proposal to mediate the Ukrainian crisis reveals the latter, on the grounds that China is not an impartial state. Meanwhile, China maintains that no NATO state can mediate in the resolution of the crisis because they cannot be impartial.

Underneath North Atlantic accusations of China and Russia, and vice versa, circulating in the press and in official communications, What is at stake are "**cosmologies**" (**cosmovisions**, cosmo-experiences) irreconcilable, although intertwined in different moments of 500 years of Western expansion; that is, **globalization**. Cosmologies that regulate knowing, feeling, acting. In the Entanglement lie the problem and the many difficulties for understand dewesternization and multipolarity since in the The logic of the West boils down to binarism.

Win-win

Xi Jinping's insistence on the "win-win" formula does not suit the Western "**zero-sum**" political formula, according to which someone has to win and someone has to lose. The "win-win" formula is the political, economic and military version of the constant flow of *yin-yang*, while the "zero sum" is the political-economic version of the Aristotelian binary of the excluded third, materialized by Christian theology in its practices – justified by St. Thomas Aquinas in his canonical *Summa Theologica*.

Now, the political version "win-win" finds its foundation in the complementarity of *yin-yang*, It parallels the political version that questions the alleged universality of international relations hegemonized by The West since the sixteenth century. The zero-sum policy was already in place implicit, not announced in these terms, in Western expansion, Theologically and economically mercantilist, ever since. What I know Developed with politics "zero sum" is a fabric of power that It consists of **domination/exploitation** and **oppression/conflict**. Undoubtedly, conflicts arose in the sixteenth century and did not stop exist. What happened in recent decades is that the structure of government known as monarchical state first and nation state, then, and the economy of accumulation known as capitalism (commodity, industrial, technological), were two fundamental instruments of the expansion, exploitation and oppression. So the form State and the Economic form capitalism were "appropriated" and updated in Long-

standing but disobedient local cultural memories and legacies with respect to the expansive and homogenizing designs of the West.

China's position in the Ukraine crisis is not to get involved or take sides in the conflict. This is not to say that their position is not close to Russia's, since both states understand that the provocation of NATO, in the service of the US and the European Union, using Ukraine (with their own consent) to "contain" (if not dismantle) Russia provoked the Russian invasion. From then on, the struggle whose resolution is not in sight consists of the insistence of the North Atlantic to maintain the unipolar global order and the denial of China, Russia and Iran resolutely, of Turkey and India still ambiguously, and of other states that maintain an attitude of not supporting sanctions and of approaching the irreversible political and economic shift towards the East.

Now Well, Chinese cosmology is different from that of the West, no doubt. No is opposite. It's just different. That it is opposite is the version of Occident. And it is not the only one different from Western cosmology. But they have been intertwined since the Opium War. Until the middle of the century XIX were distinct, but not binarily opposed, cosmologies. As were also African cosmologies before 1652, when the West He began to infiltrate and chain, denying, what was there. That by This did not cease to exist, but coexisted as a difference, but the difference invented by the West to build its very nature. And how it was the civilizations of the continent that for Europe was a New World.

So, from the sixteenth century, **the West chained all coexisting cosmologies and subordinated them to its own cosmology**. That is, it globalized its provincial universality. Which was an achievement. But at the same time, he promoted the resurrection of civilizations. Chained. And that is what is happening today with China, Russia and Iran. These as Europe did at the time, they appropriated the achievements of The West to reconstitute what the West overthrown. Do not return to past – obviously, who can think of if not postmodern critics, on the contrary, to reconstitute the past in the present and, in that reconstituted present, lay the foundations for their futures. I do not know It deals with hybridity, but with cosmologies entangled in differentials of Power: colonial differences and imperial differences, the second mounted on the first. The U.S. struggle with China is mounted on the imperial difference. China never suffered from settler colonialism, like India. But he did not escape the colonality, which does not need settlement colonies. In contrast, India Yes, it suffered from the colonial power differential, which marked its dependence on England. Argentina did not suffer from French colonies

and English settlement. But after independence from Spain, Coloniality trapped her in the political, economic and intellectuals from England and France.

Hence also the rhetoric of the Communist Party and the government. China has appropriated not only the economy of accumulation but also the economy of accumulation but also the Also of his rhetoric: **the Western mantra of modernization**. Xi Jinping launched the "non-Western" model of modernization, which did not It is 'alternative modernisation', but it is an alternative to Western modernization. From its secular version from the century XVII, under the nickname of "progress and civilization", modernization The West assumed that the global model was the Western (in that moment led by England and France) and, therefore, the logic of "zero-sum". That is, progress and civilization presupposed "to let behind" tradition and barbarism. Domingo Faustino Sarmiento *dixit*. China's proposed modernization, modeled on *yin-yang*, neither leaves behind nor tries to civilize anyone, but to work together to "win-win". While the Western model It trumpets the unipolarity of its own civilization, the Chinese model It proclaims the multipolarity that respects each of the civilizations Coexisting.

Conflicts without war

Parallel to the rhetoric of the Communist Party and the Chinese government, Walks the political research that questions the unipolarity of international relations regulated by the West after the Treaty of Westphalia and modeled on the secular form of government of nation states, tripartition of powers and plurality (although in general there are always two) of political parties that dispute, through voting, the governmental conduct of the State. In the variety of proposals proposing the updating of regulations inter-rule of tribes or communities in ancient China, **Zhao Tingyan**, Philosopher and theorist of international relations, is one of the More interesting and, of course, controversial voices. Zhao proposes the Next: International relations today are modeled on basis of the nation-state and coupled to the variants of the designs Western, first Eurocentric and then reshaped by the Atlantic North through the creation of the United Nations. The "nations" united could not be called the United States because the name was already acquired, even though the United Nations was an American design which, after World War II, replaced the League of Nations led by the British Empire. That is, relationships international, which are actually interstate, are subject to the Survival of the unilateral world order. This is one of the reasons why which, recently, the Security Council of the Nations United rejected the Russian proposal to investigate the **sabotage of Nord Stream 2**, which, according to

Seymour Hersh's report, points to the US and Joe Biden as the main designers and responsible.

The world order, on the way advanced towards multipolarity, led For China, it can no longer continue under the obsolete model that gave good Results during the process of westernization of the world but what is invalid for de-Westernization. That is, for the processes of Reconstitution of civilizations destitute by regulations international data first digitized by Europe (League of Nations) and then by the United States (United Nations).

Zhao argues that the secular version of international relations it was not an ex nihilo creation of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, since it sinks its roots in Greek political philosophy (Plato and Aristotle), in the Christian political theology (Carl Schmitt), in the European Renaissance (Niccolò Machiavelli, in Italy, Francisco de Vitoria in Spain, Hugo Grotius in Holland) and at the dawn of the Enlightenment (John Locke). While this honorable and solid tradition is respectable, it is already unsustainable to govern the multipolar world order.

Zhao proposes, instead, to trace the traces of *Tianxia* (All under the sky), instead of from Greek cosmology, the policy of Aristotle and Plato's republic, a tradition that drag to this day by going through the names mentioned in the Previous paragraph. Basically, the legacy that Chinese tradition leaves us To rethink and remake international relations today is the way of agreements, and not that of war. That is why, in *the classic Art of War* (fourth century BC), Sun Tzu elaborates the devices of diplomatic deterrence, backed of course by military force.

The objectives are to avoid war at all costs. For the rest, The art of war is not based on the game of "zero sum" (invented in the theory of games used by the Rank Corporation during the Cold War), but in the complementarity of opposites, sustained by the *yin-yang*. *Tianxia* presupposes that everything under heaven must be in balance and harmony, which **does not mean that there are no conflicts, but that there is no war**. Needless to say, "heaven" in ancient Chinese cosmogony is equivalent to Greek "cosmos", since all that is under heaven in harmony is The moment after the disorder that in the Greek vocabulary was *chaos*.

Not everything is going smoothly and the controversies not only took place and are taking place in China, but fundamentally in the North Atlantic. But there is a difference, and not a small one. The debate in China is domestic *about* international relations. The malaise in the North Atlantic lies in the fact that Chinese political scientists and philosophers dare to question the hegemony of the world order already consecrated for two and a half centuries.

So Xi Jinping's moves, with the accompaniment of Vladimir Putin, are not intended to be *challenges* to the West, but self-defense and self-determination. NATO's confrontation with Russia in Ukraine, and NATO's and US's advance into Taiwan, are moved to protect unilateralism "threatened" by multipolarity.

Source: <https://www.pagina12.com.ar/538538-las-movidas-de-xi-jinping>

Rebellion 08.04.2023