

Military Escalation, Dangerous Crossroads in US-China Relations: Mike Pompeo Goes Wild

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, July 30, 2020

Region: [Asia](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

*Until this year, Trump hailed what he called “tremendous progress in our relationship” with China — boasting about an “outstanding” bond between him and **President Xi Jinping**.*

He claimed that a “giant trade deal” in the making would enhance US relations with China.

Before dubious “Wuhan virus” claims replaced Xi’s “great discipline” in dealing with COVID-19 outbreaks, Trump congratulated China’s president for “lead(ing) a very successful operation” against the virus.

In recent months, things changed dramatically. “(M)y good friend” Xi Jinping became a reinvented “yellow peril,” China now considered US public enemy No. 1 — despite no threat posed by its leadership or military.

Last week, Pompeo accused China of “designs for hegemony over other nations (sic)” — how the US operates worldwide in sharp contrast to how China seeks cooperative relations with other countries.

Pompeo claims that China poses a “threat (to) our economy...our liberty...the future of free democracies around the world (sic),” adding:

Beijing’s “ultimate ambition...isn’t to trade with the United States. It is to raid the United



States (sic).”

China is a “Frankenstein...aggress(or) in its hostility to freedom everywhere else (sic).”

While war between two thermonuclear powers is highly unlikely, escalating cold war, initiated by Trump regime hardliners, risks possibly turning things hot.

Weeks earlier, US war secretary Esper threatened China, saying the US is engaged in a new “era of ‘great power competition,’ and that means we need to focus more on high intensity

warfare going forward.”

Indicating that greater numbers of US forces will be deployed to the Asia/Pacific, he said Washington’s “longterm challenges are China No. 1 and Russia No. 2,” adding:

“(W)hat we see happening out there is a China that continues to grow its military strength, its economic power, its commercial activity, and it’s doing so, in many ways, illicitly (sic) — or it’s using the international rules-based order against us to continue this growth, to acquire technology, and to do the things that really undermine our sovereignty (sic), that undermine the rule of law (sic), that really question (its) commitment to human rights (sic).”

Ramping up US military forces in the Asia/Pacific to “compete with China” is a euphemism for escalating cold war that could turn hot by accident or design ahead.

Knowing how US hegemonic aims threaten China, Xi last year ordered stepped up military training and exercises, saying China’s armed forces must “prepare for a comprehensive military struggle from a new starting point,” adding:

“Preparation for war and combat must be deepened to ensure an efficient response in times of emergency.”

In mid-July, former Italian diplomat **Marco Carnelos** said with “Trump facing an uphill (reelection) battle...(i)s an October surprise in the offing?”

He and hardliners surrounding him “point to (Beijing) as the main threat to US national security (sic)” — a dramatic turnaround from decades of growing economic ties.

Intense China bashing is part of the US political landscape, the same true about Trump regime hostility toward Iran.

Carnelos asked whether DJT “may authorize limited strikes against Iran” as part of his reelection strategy.

False flags are a longstanding US tradition since the mid-19th century.

Ahead of November elections, could Trump regime hardliners plan one against China in the South China Sea or Iran in the Persian Gulf as a pretext to retaliate militarily in hopes of boosting DJT’s reelection chances?

Post-9/11, the mother of all false flags, GW Bush’s approval rating rose almost overnight from 51 to 85%, boosted by a rally ‘round the flag effect.

Will a similar false flag be used against China or Iran to help Trump’s flagging campaign without pushing things too far toward war with nations able to hit back hard if attacked aggressively?

Geopolitically and for the most part domestically, it matters little whether Trump or Biden is elected in November.

When US elections are held, notably federal ones, dirty business as usual wins every time.

Both right wings of the US war party/money party operate the same way on major issues mattering most.

On Tuesday, China's Global Times (GT) said Beijing "will definitely retaliate" to defend its national security against a US military provocation if occurs.

Geopolitical analyst Jin Canrong believes that along with Trump's mishandled coronavirus response, "hostility against China among US elites and policymakers, which we didn't expect, will also make the US more aggressive," adding:

"Direct China-US military conflicts, or even the severance of diplomatic ties, which used to be unimaginable, are being discussed more frequently by the mainstream media outlets and scholars, so the danger of military conflicts exists and is growing."

US Professor Emeritus **Ezra Stone** expressed a similar view, saying while "(n)obody wants" a Sino/US military confrontation, "and everybody would lose if a war erupts...look at what happened in (the run-up to) WW I."

Small incidents mushroomed to more serious ones. Numerous countries on both sides became involved.

From the guns of August 1914 to the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month in 1918, an entire generation of youth was lost.

What happened twice before can happen again despite no one wanting belligerence if occurs to go this far — especially not in the nuclear age.

Minor incidents risk escalation to more serious ones — notably because of longstanding US hegemonic aims.

The presence of large numbers of US land, sea, and aerial forces in East Asia where they don't belong risks unthinkable war that could go global if things are pushed too far.

Provocative US military exercises and regular reconnaissance flights near China's territory risk possible confrontation.

If it happens by accident or design, all bets are off.

While war between the US and China is highly unlikely, provocatively pushing the envelope by the Trump regime could make the unthinkable possible.

A Final Comment

Sino/US geopolitical policies are worlds apart.

China seeks cooperative relations with other nations, confrontation with none.

The US drive for hegemony aims to achieve unchallenged global dominance by whatever it takes to achieve its objectives — endless wars by hot and other means its favored strategies.

China prioritizes world peace and stability. The US wages forever wars against one nation after another threatening no one.

If war erupts in East Asia or escalates in the Middle East, it'll be made-in-the-USA.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Award-winning author **Stephen Lendman** lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)

His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

Featured image is from Pixabay

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants

permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca