

---

**Geopolitics: The Days That Shake the World**

By: Mauricio Escuela  
09/02/2025



The first ten days of President Trump in power have been as tumultuous as they have been harsh for some of the most vulnerable communities affected by his policies. Both in foreign and domestic policy, the MAGA movement has set out to redefine these fields through social engineering. Domestically, the issue of immigration is marking a dangerous illiberal trend in which the far right of that country is inscribed: a rejection of everything that is not white, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant. In geopolitical terms, expansionism dominates at least in discourse, along with a rupture in good relations with traditional allies, who are treated as an economic burden.

More than once, analyses of the president's policies clash with a Trumpist base that refuses to have its narratives dismantled and accepts only the reality dictated by his rhetoric. Anything that is said and does not align with their desired direction is immediately dismissed. In this way, the debate is not far from the cancel culture established by the progressive liberal faction of the Democratic Party, which has

caused great harm in terms of openness and discussion of narratives. Thus, both parties are following identical discursive strategies to maintain a base and fight for societal hegemony. The post-liberal mark is evident in the absence of institutions within political factions that are capable of leading such groups to a serious position within democracy and to respect differing opinions.

Does cancellation have a political alignment? It seems to be the moment to rethink the West in light of emerging legal and social frameworks that transform it from a place where identity was built through debate and contradiction —traditionally since ancient Greece— into one that bets on dogma, immobility, and political constructs that tend toward oligarchic rule. Even Biden, upon leaving the White House, warned of the danger posed by a small group concentrating power, threatening the liberal division of state institutions. It is important to remember that this nation, which currently stands as the center of the West and its paradigm, is a union of states where respect for certain institutions established by the foundational treaty must prevail. When such considerations are disregarded, processes of separation may arise, as seen with the prospect of California's secession by 2028.

What is happening in the West is a rupture of the liberal social contract that has existed since the bourgeois revolutions, tied to the geopolitical shift toward a multipolar world that will make it impossible for the U.S. to sustain its public debt by printing more unbacked money. As the U.S. trade deficit grows, it creates a fiscal deficit that prevents control of the currency, leading to its sharp decline. The dollars produced find no home in the internal market because industrial activity does not back them. The solution is to export the currency, forcing the world to provide goods to the U.S. in exchange for printed paper. But for how long? The militarization of the financial system and the imposition of the dollar are existential necessities for Washington. This turns the U.S. into a fragile giant, vulnerable to any significant upheaval that could impact its very identity as a union of states. California, the world's fifth-largest economy and the largest within the U.S., will not pay a debt that impoverishes it, nor will it bear the cost of supporting other states that, in a geopolitical scenario without dollar dominance, would be at a third-world level.

Faced with trade deficits with China and other countries, including Russia, the U.S. has stubbornly embraced protectionism, ignoring the era of interconnection where sustainability is impossible without a globalized framework. This seems like a reckless move, especially when it translates into tariffs that raise prices for ordinary U.S. citizens, leading to an unstoppable decline in living standards and the consumer ideology that underpins the union's consensus. In other words, isolating to boost a specific competitive sector in the domestic economy will only impoverish citizens, make the market less diverse and advanced, and leave the U.S. at a disadvantage in technology transfer. China's move with Deep Seek in the last week of January 2025 is a sign of what awaits Americans with protectionist measures. Not only is the new Asian artificial intelligence superior and cheaper, but in four days it destabilized Western market shares through its advantages and open-source code, overshadowing the efforts of Nvidia, the supposedly leading U.S. corporation.

Artificial Intelligence, the issue defining power in the new century, is a debate happening among elites and was part of Trump's presidency proposals to "Make America Great Again." That is, a technological leap that would leave competitors behind, unable to move from their positions, and place the U.S. once again at the forefront. But what we are seeing is that China, with its smart power, infrastructure advantage, and commercial dominance, is forcing the U.S. into a disadvantaged race. Historically, for an empire to flourish, it must create a society that supports it, translating into educational and cultural resources. Chinese society currently possesses the exact design for the age of Artificial Intelligence and has solved the problems that could place it at a disadvantage. From study conditions, infrastructure, access to technologies, and company foundations to effective financing, the Asian power has not wasted time on factional disputes or the cultural gender battle that exhausts the West.

The paradox of history is that while the West becomes illiberal and protectionist politically and economically, China and the emerging world are moving from statism to market openness and open-source software. And although the libertarian slogans of the right and center-right claim that the U.S. and Europe continue to shape the world's political reality,

the truth is that the political classes in these regions are increasingly showing less autonomy and more erratic measures that endanger the rule of law and market stability. Protectionism, coupled with racial and ethnic protectionism that expels immigrants, can only remind us that in this era, such forms are incompatible with the liberal morality proclaimed as triumphant in 1991, thus completely debunking the famous "end of history." Human events continue in a spiral, and while we see a decline in the West, there is a rise in the East regarding the debate over which values should accompany the prevailing system in this century, especially if by 2028 China becomes the world's leading superpower.

Serious analysts, such as the renowned financier Ray Dalio, warned at this year's World Economic Forum in Davos about the danger of rising debt in Western countries. This has a dire impact on social spending and, consequently, on economic growth and the maintenance of traditional powers in their positions. The case of the United Kingdom, with its political, social, and economic instability, is iconic, especially for a country once considered a model of the liberal capitalist system and the financial center par excellence. What happens if the City of London falls? The effect on Western markets would be as devastating as the suspicion that the dollar might not be the currency of this century. All of this leads liberals to adopt alarms that translate politically into illiberal measures: border closures, halting unregulated global exchange, protectionism for national businesses, monopolies, concentration of power, elimination of political checks and balances, and a bet on authoritarianism rather than open democracy and coexistence. This explains Trump's rise and the acceptance of his ideas and measures in the West. But none of this will stop the expansion of the new world, just as British protectionism in its colonies in the 20th century did not stop the entry of U.S. products and competition into those markets.

The West's defeat in the race for Artificial Intelligence could be the breaking point of a new world order. So far, it must be noted that the costs for the U.S. are much higher, and we already know what happened to the Soviet Union when it had to pay beyond its means for a space and atomic race with the West: the spending impoverished its economy and competitiveness in the markets, turning it into a third-



world country with first-world technology in several industrial and technological areas. But the result was ideological defeat and the collapse of the political system through implosion.

In all of this, there is an element of inexact prediction and analytical balance that must be considered when elaborating geopolitical trends. Trump has said that he will base his international projection exclusively on total powers for his country and the restoration of its superpower status. Can he achieve it? In the decline of the United States, the interests of globalist financiers are also weighing heavily, whose sole objective is the preservation of their group and family status, alongside the project of a world government that safeguards wealth for that elite and manages to contain populations through demographic decline. But this agenda does not seem to be Trump's, who is betting on protectionism, the business forces of the oligarchic conglomerate, and the far-right factions of society with their projection of racial and ethnic purity. These are two versions of the same empire seeking its sustenance: in one, globalist capital prevails, with the export of the dollar and its unlimited printing despite debt and devaluation, stock market actions, and the movement of companies to profitable markets; in the other, protectionism, tax cuts for nationals, and tariff hikes for foreigners, threats to domestic companies to return to the U.S., the appropriation of resources from other nations through militarism to generate internal market expansion opportunities and access to raw materials, and the rejection of woke gender policies that were the way globalism created its ideological hegemony to keep society under fear and control. All of this is on the table, and the clash of factions is not over, with all that it implies internally and externally for the United States.

Drawing a parallel, we must look at the crisis of the British Empire when two factions were in conflict within its political class. On one side, the position of protectionist control over colonies and the exclusion of opportunities for local bourgeoisies to create their own industrial value or engage commercially with other capitalist states, leading to impoverishment, backwardness, and governance problems in those territories. On the other side, within the British Empire itself, there was a reformist faction that knew it was impossible for England to remain the

sole accessor to markets, raw materials, and competition in its colonies, and thus pushed for local autonomy that would allow some development from which the metropolis could benefit through cultural and political ties. Saving the distances, the clash between reformists and conservatives in the Empire was settled in the two world wars, which forced England to industrialize its colonies, especially India, for wartime contributions, and thus enter the sphere of U.S. influence. The solution of the British Commonwealth came too late, and by its implementation, England was already indebted to the United States.

The cultural, political, and geopolitical combat between globalism and post-liberalism (or post-globalism) is characteristic of this liquid modernity we live in, which at times seems like pre-modernity. That is, the appearance of power markers that can be called feudal or even slave-like is evident. The denigration of human beings as "inferior" due to their origin or lack of legal documents reminds us of Rome's treatment of foreigners. The classification of citizens into identities (something done by both wokism and Trumpism) takes us back to the Middle Ages and its immovable stratification of social categories. The disintegration of the liberal order has not given way to something new, despite the ongoing global replacement of superpowers. But in terms of political philosophy, we are moving within the classifications of the 20th century and its perpetual crisis. If the United States was the liberal mecca, China emerges as the heir to the debate between socialism and capitalism, a debate that continues within its society. And from all of this, we receive signals that we should consider when analyzing where humanity is heading. It seems that the struggle between factions and geopolitical oppositions divides, classify, and label us, halting the evolution of contradictions.

The 21st century could be one of replacement, but also of a warlike rupture or the emergence of a new model of political management; all of this is on the table and makes this moment more interesting. For now, the first days of Trump serve to elaborate analytical frameworks and adhere to the liberal crisis as the cause underpinning the chaos of his administration and the social consequences we are already seeing. Politics is not based on whims or perceptions; it does not depend on desires, no matter how powerful one may be. Here, we must evaluate

the balances, ruptures, contradictions, and the advance or retreat of great forces.

**Translated by Sergio A. Paneque Díaz / CubaSí Translation Staff**

---