

US Decides Whether or Not Kiev Should Negotiate Peace

By [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Global Research, March 20, 2023
[InfoBrics](#)

Region: [Europe](#), [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the **Translate Website** button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*The announcement of Chinese **President Xi Jinping's** visit to Moscow to meet **Vladimir Putin** is shaking Western war plans. After presenting a peace project, the Chinese government now demonstrates that it is considering Russian interests in the conflict as relevant, which is why the country's president decided to go to Moscow. As well known, peace and Russian interests are inadmissible points for the Collective West, which is why an important American official has already publicly declared that any Chinese peace proposal must be automatically rejected by Ukraine. The case shows quite clearly that the neo-Nazi regime in Kiev is just a proxy for NATO, not having the capacity to decide sovereignly whether or not to negotiate an agreement.*

According to **John Kirby**, spokesman for the White House National Security Council, **any Chinese ceasefire proposal must be considered unacceptable after Xi Jinping's visit to Moscow**. Kirby believes that the Chinese gesture and conversations with Putin in person before Zelensky demonstrate that Beijing is writing a peace proposal that takes into account only Russian interests, possibly seeking to ensure the preservation of Russian territorial gains so far. That, for Kirby, would make any dialogue unfeasible.

More than that, the spokesperson sees the growing Russian-Chinese cooperation as an attempt to end the "rules-based order" and reverse the legacy of post-WWII international society. According to him, Russia and China "don't like" the order built by the "US and its allies" and want to rewrite the world according to new guidelines with the current partnership being a part of this process.

"If, coming out of this meeting, there's some sort of call for a ceasefire, well that's just gonna be unacceptable, because all that's gonna do is ratify Russia's conquests to date. All that's gonna do is give Mr. Putin more time to refit, retrain, remain and try to plan for renewed offensives at a time of his choosing (...) We hope, and we've said this before - that President Xi will call and talk to President Zelensky, because we believe

the Chinese need to get the Ukrainian perspective here (...) There's no question [that Russia and China] are chafing against this international rules-based order that the United States and so many of our allies and partners have built up since the end of World War II. They don't like that. They'd like to rewrite the rules of the game globally and they have been increasing their cooperation and their relationship, certainly of late", Kirby said.

It is curious to analyze how Kirby tries to transform simple things into something absurd, illogical and condemnable. Indeed, Russia and China plan to change the current world order – not because they are averse to the idea of a world guided by diplomacy and international law, but because the order that has prevailed in recent decades is essentially unipolar. There are no real “rules” in the prevailing order – there is only the unilateral will of the US being imposed on all nations. This is obviously something the Russians and Chinese want to change, as they plan for their countries to have absolute sovereignty over their territories and preserve a regional zone of influence, without interference from foreign powers.

It is not about “not liking” what the “US and its allies” built in the post-WWII, but critically understanding that since the end of the Cold War the US has acted as a hegemonic power at the global level, with carte blanche to commit crimes, coups d'état, invasions and wars, while all other states have their freedom restricted by what is called “rules” – which are not applicable to Washington. This is something that needs to be changed and indeed Russian-Chinese cooperation works in this direction.

On the other hand, it is interesting to see how the US decides whether or not Kiev should negotiate peace. If Ukraine is indeed a sovereign state, as the West hypocritically claims when it condemns Russia's reintegration referendums in the east, then it is the Zelensky government that must decide whether or not to accept a ceasefire, regardless of the circumstances and imposed conditions. However, once again it is clear that the Kiev regime is only a proxy in NATO's war with Russia, having no authority to decide whether or not to continue fighting.

Indeed, it is absolutely rational for the Chinese to pay more attention to Russian interests and talk to Putin before Zelensky. Moscow is winning the war and the winning side naturally needs to have its interests heard first during a peace negotiation. This is a basic principle of diplomacy, but the West insists on ignoring it both because it needs to publicly maintain the “Ukrainian victory” narrative and because it wants the conflict to prolong indefinitely.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Lucas Leiroz is a journalist, researcher at the Center for Geostrategic Studies, geopolitical consultant. You can follow Lucas on [Twitter](#) and [Telegram](#).

Featured image is from InfoBrics

The original source of this article is [InfoBrics](#)
Copyright © [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#), [InfoBrics](#), 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

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