

**Mike Pompeo's influence on American
diplomacy: A research of the relationship
between China and the United States**

学位类型：学术型

论文作者：Mary Huaitalla Núñez

学 号 ： IRW201958011

培养单位：国际关系学院

专业名称：国际关系

指导教师：QIAO LIANG

二〇二一年六月

学位论文原创性声明

本人郑重声明：所呈交的学位论文，是本人在导师的指导下，独立进行研究工作所取得的成果。除文中已经注明引用的内容外，本论文不含任何其他个人或集体已经发表或撰写过的作品成果。对本文所涉及的研究工作做出重要贡献的个人和集体，均已在文中以明确方式标明。本人完全意识到本声明的法律责任由本人承担。

特此声明

学位论文版权使用授权书

本人完全了解对外经济贸易大学关于收集、保存、使用学位论文的规定，同意如下各项内容：按照学校要求提交学位论文的印刷本和电子版本；学校有权保留学位论文的印刷本和电子版，并采用影印、缩印、扫描、数字化或其它手段保存论文；学校有权提供目录检索以及提供本学位论文全文或部分的阅览服务；学校有权按照有关规定向国家有关部门或者机构送交论文；学校可以采用影印、缩印或者其它方式合理使用学位论文，或将学位论文的内容编入相关数据库供检索；保密的学位论文在解密后遵守此规定。

学位论文作者签名：



2021年 05月 27日

导师签名：

年 月 日

摘要

美国外交已经发展多年。然而随着前国务卿蓬佩奥的一系列外交活动，使得美国的外交政策发生了变化。因此，我选择美国前国务卿蓬佩奥作为我的研究对象，分析他在国际领域，特别是在与中国的外交活动中产生的影响。

为此，本研究旨在分析前国务卿蓬佩奥在外交方面的活动。具体而言，我将重点讨论他的公共外交战略是如何改变美国传统外交的，更确切地说是中美国际关系中的外交战略。

主要研究的问题是：蓬佩奥对美国外交，特别是中美关系的影响是什么？我用了定性数据进行分析论证。论文具有探索性、历史性、分析性和解释性等特点。本文将重点集中在资料收集，以及分析蓬佩奥的公共外交对美国传统外交的影响，并将美国外交和蓬佩奥的外交活动，用国际关系理论进行分析；也用蓬佩奥和他的前任雷克斯·蒂勒森的外交活动进行比较。需要指出的是，特朗普的外交政策也是由蓬佩奥执导的。

研究表明，如果蓬佩奥通过社交网络进行的外交交流，的确与历史上的传统外交语言惯例一样连贯一致，那么就两种可能性。第一种可能性是：社交媒体的外交风格可能会破坏甚至取代传统外交惯例，并可能在国际关系中挑起矛盾冲突。第二种可能性是：它可以导致在数字化外交中制定新的规则或协议。所有这一切都可以在有关传统外交的现有框架和原则内，采取逐步改变和调整的形式。它可能代表着与公认的行为模式、规范和外交规则的根本决裂，开始出现根本性的不同。

更具体地说明蓬佩奥的对华外交。蓬佩奥可能会消极地利用他的私人外交关系。中美两国都需要实事求是地看待双边关系。中美两国在任何时候都可能有密切的关系，并且需要通过避免任何威胁其整体和平与繁荣的冲突来控制分歧。正因为如此，保持中美之间的平衡，将在多年之中仍然是世界上最重要的双边关系。

结论：通过中美两国之间的案例，我们可以推断，蓬佩奥在美国外交中的影响。美国在过去三年中外交风格和战略的变化，是迈克·蓬佩奥，意图确保政治稳定以及维持美国在国际关系领域的经济和军事霸权这一目的，而不惜可能产生全球性的代价或后果。

关键词：外交关系；迈克·蓬佩奥；蓬佩奥主义；美国外交；强制性外交；公共外交；中美关系

Abstract

I considered that American diplomacy has evolved over the years, but it has been changing with the former Secretary of State's actions, Mike Pompeo. Therefore, the analysis of the influences of his actions in the international area specifically with China, are objects of study that I consider attractive in international relations.

For that reason, this research aims to analyze the practice of former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in diplomacy. Specifically, I will focus on how his public diplomatic strategy has changed traditional American diplomacy, more precisely in the international relations between China and the United States.

So, the main question is: What are the influences of Pompeo's diplomacy on American diplomatic relations, specifically the relationship between China and the United States? So, I used qualitative data. The type of thesis is exploratory, with historical, analytical, and interpretative characteristics. I will focus on data collection and the analysis of Pompeo public diplomacy's influences on traditional American diplomacy, as well as analyze American diplomacy and Pompeo behavior into International relations theories; The diplomacy of Pompeo and his predecessor Rex Tillerson will be compared. Likewise, Trump's foreign policy was directed by Pompeo.

The research shows that if Pompeo's diplomatic communications through social networks are really as consistent and coherent as traditional conventions of diplomatic language have been throughout history, there are two possibilities. First of all, the style of diplomacy of social media could destabilize and even replace traditional diplomatic practices and potentially provoke conflicts in international relations. Secondly, it can lead to the development of new rules or agreements in digital diplomacy. All of this could take the form of gradual change and adaptation within existing frameworks and principles concerning traditional diplomacy. It could represent a fundamental break with accepted patterns of behavior, norms, and diplomacy rules to begin to be fundamentally different.

Thus, to be more specific about Pompeo's diplomacy against China, Pompeo may negatively use his private diplomacy. Both countries need to be realistic about how close their bilateral relationship may be at any given time and control their disagreements by avoiding any conflict that could threaten their overall peace and prosperity. That is why maintaining the balance between China and the United States will remain the most important bilateral relationship in the world for many years.

Finally, the conclusion is that the influences of Pompeo's diplomacy in the American diplomacy, applied to the case of China vs the United States, allows us to infer that the changes in the style and strategy of diplomacy by the United States during the last three years is a representation or a symbolic replica of Mike Pompeo's intention to ensure political, economic and military hegemony of the United States in the field of international relations, regardless of the global costs or consequences that the maintenance of this purpose may generate.

Keywords: diplomatic relations; Mike Pompeo; Pompeo doctrine; American diplomacy; coercive diplomacy; public diplomacy; the relationship between China-US.

CONTENTS

Originality Statement.....	2
Authorization for use of the copyright of the dissertation.....	3
Abstract (Chinese).....	4
Abstract (English).....	6
Introduction.....	11

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND

1.1. Research Question.....	18
1.2. Theoretical Framework.....	19
1.2.1. Diplomacy and its Historical Evolution	
1.2.2. International Relations Theory	
1.2.3. Diplomatic Methods for Dispute Resolution	
1.2.4. American Diplomacy's Distirical Characteristics	
1.3. Literature Review.....	42
1.4. Methodology.....	49

CHAPTER 2: U.S. FOREIGN POLICY UNDER POMPEO

2.1. American Foreign Policy.....	51
2.1.1. The U.S. Foreign Policy in Asia	
2.1.2. Trump's Foreign Policy	
2.2. Comparison between Pompeo and Tillerson into Trump's Administration.....	59
2.2. The U.S. Foreign Policy under Pompeo toward China.....	63

CHAPTER 3: POMPEO'S INFLUENCE UPON THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

3.1. Pompeo's Positions as Secretary of State.....	66
3.1.1. The importance of the secretary of State in Foreign Policy	
3.2. Pompeo's Personal Ideological Line in U.S. Foreign Policy.	68
3.3. Characteristics of Rex Tillerson and Mike Pompeo on American diplomacy.....	71

CHAPTER 4: POMPEO'S PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

4.1. American Diplomacy and Public Diplomacy.....	76
4.1.1. Public Diplomacy	
4.1.2. Coercive Diplomacy	

4.2.	Pompeo’s Public Diplomacy.....	80
4.2.1.	Characteristics of the Speech used by Mike Pompeo	
4.2.2.	What was Pompeo's diplomatic strategy using Public Diplomacy?	
4.3.	Pompeo’s Public Diplomacy toward China.....	86

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS ON SINO-U.S. BILATERAL RELATIONS

5.1.	Relationship between both Countries.....	91
5.1.1.	The bilateral relationship in various areas	
5.2.	Chinese Diplomatic Position.....	104
5.3.	How will the tensions between SINO-U.S. be mitigated?.....	108

CONCLUSIONS.....	111
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	116
Acknowledgments.....	127

INTRODUCTION

The emerging powers and countries and the consequent changes in the balance of power are identified as critical challenges in the international order and diplomatic relations. Each country develops its foreign policy, applies a diplomatic strategy depending on the country or the multilateral sphere, and prioritizes national interests. Therefore, it is interesting to investigate events that generate implications and possible changes in the dynamics of international relations carried out through the diplomatic relationship between countries with military and economic power, such as China and the United States.

Diplomacy is practiced concerning an ideological line that each State maintains as a form and style of negotiation, persuasion, and the official communication channel between international law subjects. Therefore, the State official who assumes the leadership of diplomacy, to direct the process of creation of foreign policy and the communication mechanism, as well as the diplomatic style, performs it under national interests that many times can become personal objectives for the power that reveals having the position of Secretary of State.

The new practice of diplomacy, which breaks the rules of traditional diplomacy, by using the media not to publicize a political decision but thoughts, conjectures, qualifications, and threats, leaves a precedent for coercive public diplomacy.

So this research analyzes the diplomatic practice and strategy of former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, as a representative of the United States government, and I will focus on how his diplomatic strategy has impacted a change or reconfiguration of traditional American diplomacy. It has led to a change in the order of international relations.

Likewise, I will also analyze Pompeo's coercive public diplomacy against China due to the commercial, military conflict, and other issues that arose. The relationship underwent severe negative changes since Pompeo took over as the head of American diplomacy.

The work will be divided into five chapters:

The first chapter establishes the purpose of the research, the analysis of the theoretical framework of diplomatic relations and its historical evolution to define the concept of diplomacy and its application in the specific case of the United States, which maintains its status as a world superpower by combining the promotion of democratic values and the strength of American culture around the world with its military might. Those two avenues of influence are known as soft power and hard power. We will also briefly analyze the characteristics of American diplomacy. With the Literature review and the methodology used for the investigation, I will finish the first part.

In the second chapter, I analyze the US foreign policy under Pompeo and develop American foreign policy in Asia. Likewise, I will dedicate a subtitle to Trump's foreign policy-making mention of American foreign policy's evolution and permanent ideology that was discontinued since Pompeo assumed as Secretary of State. Therefore, we will compare Rex Tillerson and Mike Pompeo to show this change in American foreign policy during the Trump Administration. Finally, I will end this chapter with the United States foreign policy under Pompeo toward China, so, in this part, I am making mention of the National security and National Strategic Defense and a critical examination of Pompeo's personality.

The third chapter of this document will analyze Pompeo's influence upon the United States foreign policy like he was secretary of State and to transmit its foreign policy to the world, for which I also point out the structure of the State Department in the American government and the importance of the position of secretary of State in foreign policy because Pompeo had the responsibility of directing the process of creating foreign policy, as well as determining the type of diplomacy that is practiced as a diplomatic strategy. In addition, as this research is focused on changes that Pompeo's behavior made in the diplomacy, I will analyze the personal ideological line of Pompeo in American foreign policy. Finally, analyze the characteristics of Rex Tillerson and Mike Pompeo during their terms as heads of American diplomacy.

The fourth chapter analyzes Pompeo's public diplomacy, explaining the relationship and difference between traditional diplomacy and public diplomacy. In addition to coercive diplomacy, both used by Mike Pompeo during his term as Secretary of State of the United States, and that is why we also ask and answer about what was Pompeo's diplomatic strategy using public diplomacy? Moreover, Pompeo's characteristics of speech and finally understood the type of diplomatic public are Pompeo's strategy against China.

The fifth chapter will focus on something more particular: SINO US bilateral relations analysis, the world's two most important economic powers. First, I am analyzing the relationship between military policy, trade, and other issues, which have been generating challenges for both countries and worldwide. Next, I will analyze the Chinese diplomacy position, which will lead us to understand the implications and current relationship between the United States and China. Finally, I will finish with an analysis of how the tensions between both countries can be mitigated?

Finally, I will determine conclusions, highlighting the change from traditional American diplomacy to a type of coercive public diplomacy by Mike Pompeo, which was used as a political strategy and the most important aspects that have resulted in the practice of diplomacy by Mike Pompeo against China, and what are the implications in the relationship between the United States and China.

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND

In the current international system, we have found representative economic, political and social situations producing significant changes at the international level. For example, among these factors that affect the international order are the reappearance of movements that seemed to be in the background. Nationalist and protectionist, the issue of Brexit related to the United Kingdom's desire, against all odds, to withdraw from the European Union that surprised us on June 23, 2016; the refugee crisis that has presented not only human insecurity but also global insecurity; climate change and COVID-19, which has been affecting the world economically, politically and socially. These events demand the need for a new paradigm, for recent political and economic decisions to adapt to new complex situations.

Diplomatic relations between countries have also been affected by these events. As a consequence of globalization and the interdependent relationship of countries, decisions made in one country have repercussions in another. These repercussions cause the international order to change in aspects such as ideology, structure or procedure. Along with these events that have taken place on the international scene, it is essential to add the victory of Donald Trump in the November 2016 presidential elections in the United States, and since he appointed Mike Pompeo as Secretary of States, it is an event of great importance to developing the research line of this work.

Trump is an apprentice in the political field, during his life he had dedicated himself to the television and real estate sector, as we saw during his government, he uses threats and insults, he has great rhetorical skills in which he includes numerous rudeness, inaccuracies and even comments racists, in addition the contradictions and the deceptions do not suppose any problem to him. With this attitude and with his slogan "Make America Great Again" he managed to seize American power at the end of 2016, being the 45th president in the history of the United States. After this victory, a period of tension ended for the country in question and for the international community, and thus began a new stage for the United States.

Well, it stands out the Trump considered a unique and atypical character that breaks with the traditional characteristics that most American presidents have had. These differences are reflected in the political sphere, not only through his performance but also through his speech. Even though Donald Trump clearly understands the importance and power of the United States in the world order, in 2018, he appointed Mike Pompeo as Secretary of State.

The latter is not an apprentice in the political sphere and uses his figure verbal and corporal expression. The way to exercise power is a procedure of even greater importance for the country to continue to preserve its national and international dominance.

The United States and China relations were in a political freeze, caused by the rise of communism lead by Mao in 1949 (Cheng, 2012), which the United States tried to disrupt and weaken (Nathan, 2009). The United States did this by encouraging their allies (Japan, South Korea, etc.) to refrain from forming diplomatic relations with “Communist China”, prohibiting Americans from travelling to China, etc. (Nathan, 2009).

Since the end of the Second World War, international relations between the two countries developed have the most significant relevance. In 1972, President Nixon of the United States re-established relations with the People's Republic of China hoping to use the better relations with China to balance the power of the Soviet Union (Cheng, 2012). According to your interests in the commercial and financial field. While the diplomatic relations between the United States and China were on hold, around 100 other countries, including Japan, Germany, France and the UK had already recognized the People's Republic of China and renewed business with China (Dong, 2013). In 1979 a wide range of development encouraging the complete normalization of trade relations ensued between the United States and China. However, we are currently facing a dispute over hegemony, so it is difficult to maintain that harmony around global power. Also, as China has grown, its interests towards the United States have shifted, putting Americans at odds, sometimes leading to trade and diplomatic conflicts.

1.1. Research question

The U.S. diplomacy has evolved over the years, but it has been undergoing a more drastic change with the former Secretary of State's behavior, Mike Pompeo. Therefore, the analysis of implications his actions in the international area, specifically with China, are objects of study that I consider attractive in international relations.

The general line of research of this work focuses on analyzing the practice of former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in the diplomacy. Specifically, I will focus on how the application of his public diplomatic strategy has changed traditional American diplomacy, more precisely in the international relations between China and the United States. So, the question is “*What are the influences of Pompeo's diplomacy on U.S. diplomacy with implications on the relationship on SINO-U.S. bilateral relations?*”

1.2. Theoretical Framework

1.2.1. Diplomacy and its historical evolution

In order to carry out an analysis of the change in traditional diplomacy concerning strategic diplomacy that the former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, was developing, we must first have a clear definition of what we mean by diplomacy and diplomatic relations in general and later analyze it for the American cause. To do this, after describing this concept, I will make a historical summary of the evolution of diplomatic relations since its inception, as well as an analysis of the characteristics of this type of relations in the international sphere in order to be able to compare them with those executed by the former Secretary of State, in the specific case of his relationship with the country of the Asian continent in question, China.

The meaning of diplomacy is somewhat complex, as it can have two general meanings. On the one hand, in the political sense, the diplomacy of a government or on the other hand, in the operational sense. It is understood "as the conduct of business between agents and between governments, through institutions and bureaucratic processes" (Montobbio, 2016). The former refers vaguely to a country's foreign policy, hence the confusion, while the latter is the country's foreign policy bureaucracy's activity. It should be noted that these terms and what they represent on many occasions can

overlap. The distinction between means and objectives between the two cannot be wholly separated, and in fact, they complement each other.

By the concept of diplomacy according to Nicholas J. Cull, we understand that it is the set of those mechanisms that are not war, deployed by an international actor to manage the international environment (Cull, 2009). It implies a relationship between two subjects in the international sphere, which has a connection with the statement established by Nicholson, in which he establishes that: Diplomacy is neither the invention nor the pastime of any particular political system, but rather it is an essential element in any good relationship between man and man and between nation and nation (Nicholson, 1977).

Vincent sees diplomacy as the skill or direction in which international relations are managed (Vincent, 1984). Considering both the objective of diplomacy and its methods, Berridge establishes that the primary purpose of this is to allow States to ensure their foreign policy's objectives without resorting to force, propaganda or law (Berridge, 2005). On the other hand, we can establish two common points in all these definitions: first, diplomacy is a social practice of the states; then, this practice consists of reconciling the state's behaviour before international law.

In this way, and of a general nature, we conclude that diplomacy is a primary discipline to resolve conflicts that may arise in the international scope, encourages cooperation in conflict resolution, and is an activity incorporated into international relationships. We can deduce that diplomacy is linked to various aspects of politics. On the one hand, it is related to the internal policy of a country since it defends the internal interests outside. On the other hand, it is also related to foreign policy since it is worth mentioning that solving problems peacefully is an activity that can be applied to other types of environments such as the business field, or the political one, that is to say in areas where there is a relationship between human beings, and whose purpose is to achieve specific objectives peacefully.

Following the historical evolution of diplomacy, it is necessary to mention that current diplomatic relations present a significant difference compared to the first ones that were developed. There are numerous factors to be taken into account: the evolution of means of communication and transport, the consolidation of the Modern State and the complexity of order in international society create intergovernmental organizations that have led to their transformation. However, even though they have evolved, they are necessary for international society.

At the beginning of recorded history, diplomacy is characterized by being unstable. It was carried out by extraordinarily assigning diplomatic representatives to perform various tasks for limited periods in the countries in which they were assigned. These tasks did not have any norm or organization by which you could be governed. Diplomatic tasks were complex since neither the means of transport nor communication are like the ones we have today; besides, difficulties were added to this, such as the cultural, linguistic, or religious difference. These obstacles complicated the establishment of permanent diplomatic relations.

Later, in the Middle Ages, the Vatican began to carry out temporary diplomatic missions to solve other countries' problems in religious matters. This type of missions will later be consolidated stably until today since they continue to be carried out through the Apostolic Nunciatures (Calduch, 1993).

When diplomatic relations become more stable, we can consider a new stage in the history of diplomacy. These missions become permanent due to the emergence of modern states on the international scene, the consolidation of the Far East and the American continent, and new economic relations. All this implies a necessity in the international sphere that makes relations between countries more regular until they are permanently established through institutions that regulate actions with the outside world (Calduch, 1993).

Diplomatic relations, as they were being established, their characteristics vary. As I mentioned earlier, the two major blocks in the history of diplomacy could be divided into three sub-periods:

- i. Firstly, in the first period, diplomatic relations' attributes were very imprecise since they were characterized that way: There were no rules by which they were governed; there were no immunities and privileges that diplomats possess today and there was no professional career to dedicate in a specific way to carry out these missions. The monarch directly appointed the people who carried out diplomatic tasks at that time, and their functions were limited to negotiating with other countries and informing the monarch (Calduch, 1993).

- ii. From the Congress of Vienna until the end of the First World War, diplomatic relations continue to develop. In this period, a diplomatic law is established, through which a series of norms and obligations are established, that will govern the relationships established between the States so far. The peculiarities of this period's diplomatic relations are becoming more and more structured and resembling those we have today. Development of the diplomatic career begins so that diplomats can become independent and become the States' representatives on behalf of the monarchs. Likewise, diplomatic law established a hierarchical order in diplomatic relations, diplomatic missions began to be better regulated, and diplomats were granted privileges and immunities. Finally, diplomacy at this time

had limited access to people who were exclusively dedicated to the foreign affairs of the country (Calduch, 1993).

- iii. Subsequently, thanks to new means of transport and new communication technologies, diplomacy has undergone a significant change from the First World War until nowadays. Woodrow Wilson, in his fourteen points, established that diplomacy should be open and public. With the complexity of the international system, the functions of diplomats and their missions have been transforming. Special diplomatic missions have emerged for specific issues that do not fall within what we know as traditional diplomacy either because the actors in the international scope have increased considerably or because there are issues that go beyond the simple relationship of foreign policy between States. For the negotiation of these, experts are needed for each topic (Calduch, 1993).

As we can see, diplomatic relations have been taking shape throughout history, and are essential in international relations. Throughout history, diplomacy has been a primary component for human beings and resolves both global and everyday issues. These types of relationships have indeed evolved, as the international arena is more interdependent and complex. Therefore, it is essential to also analyze the transition that this traditional activity has recently undergone.

1.2.2. International Relations Theory

Diplomacy is an activity that we can place within the framework of international relations, and it can be studied from many points of view: historical, psychological, legal-political etc. In this section, we are going to focus on its theoretical study.

Modern diplomatic representation in the public sphere can often be confused with the foreign policy of a country, so we are going to delimit both concepts.

The concrete actions characterize current foreign policy carried out by a country in the international system to achieve the development of its interests and the development of society under the security and influence of the country in question, in the international scope, therefore that we can determine diplomacy as a tool used in the exercise of foreign policy.

Therefore diplomacy, is, in a general way, a practice of political cooperation between states to resolve their interests. Negotiations and decision-making in diplomatic relations are driven by the control capacity that one country has over another. This control can be exercised in terms of political and economic power. Neither of the other two characteristics applies, the decisions of the negotiations will be made based on the cultural or social ties between the two countries. Consequently, a diplomatic relationship has three aspects, cooperation, the capacity for influence and cultural interaction

(Nicholson, 1967), for which I am going to establish three theories and thus later be able to explain what theoretical dimension the former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo was following at the United States diplomacy practice.

Contemporary diplomacy is characterized mainly by the following functions:

- a. Manage matters in which all subjects of International Law are involved;
- b. Handle these matters through peaceful procedures;
- c. Use negotiation as an essential means for resolving disputes between States, who may present opposing interests and may generate a plurality of competing interests.

Therefore, diplomacy's essential task is a peaceful solution to the differences that may arise between states for coexistence in a globalized and interdependent international system.

Diplomacy can be analyzed from various theoretical points below:

1.2.2.1. Constructivism

Constructivism is a theory of international relations that can be studied from the point of view of diplomacy. This theory is based on a hypothesis by which humans live in a world that they build themselves, with their ideas and decisions. The constructive think that the world is in continuous construction and those who carry out this "agents" function dominate because they are capable of building with ideas the relationships

between people and the way to expose their interests, which forms the relations between states in the end. These agents are opposed to the "actors" which are those who carry out much more concrete and limited tasks (Sánchez, 2012).

These agents are the ones who, through laws, communication, institutions and values, among other elements, are building reality (Vázquez Lozano and González Ojeda, 2018). From this constructive point of view, we can include public diplomacy since it depends mainly on discourse and communication between states to form an image and thus be able to exert influence in the global order. However, we will thoroughly explore this type of diplomacy as we delve into the former Secretary of State's diplomatic characteristics, Mike Pompeo.

1.2.2.2. Liberalism

Diplomacy from the theoretical perspective of liberalism follows an idealistic basis whereby war is seen as a struggle between states that can be prevented. To prevent it, the diplomatic activity must be lucidly exercised and applied in all kinds of activities so that disputes, confrontations or violent acts do not occur between any actors in the international arena. Likewise, the liberal theory of diplomacy includes cooperation as an essential element for the proper development of individual states, which will result in the prevention of war and international harmony.

Diplomacy is traditionally understood to be an activity that includes negotiation and peacemaking. The liberal theory considers that communication and dialogue are necessary to resolve disputes, rather than the use of violence, as the same will be achieved in both ways. However, diplomatic activity must always avoid force. Liberalism considers as a fundamental pillar the interaction between the states for the preservation of the law, in general, the International Law and the various organisms that have been created for the execution of this. Thus, liberalism takes into account that the function of diplomacy is the peaceful resolution of conflicts, giving particular importance to dialogue and negotiation, based on International Law, as well as on institutions, and considering cooperation between countries relevant in order to build a unified international system (Vásquez Lozano and González Ojeda, 2018).

1.2.2.3. Realism

Realism is a theory by which it is understood that countries coexist in the international environment, and their relationships are based on a power struggle, exercised by each country following their interests. As for the exercise of power, (ability to affect other people to obtain desired results), it can be carried out through three different behaviours: threats of coercion, incentives or exerting an influence on third parties so that they want to imitate your behaviour. Therefore, in this realistic theory, we include coercive diplomacy. From a defensive strategy point of view, coercion consists of exerting persuasion on the opponent to stop or undo what he is doing or physically prevent him from continuing. “*Sticks and Carrots*” is the strategic execution of

diplomacy according to the realistic theory based on coercive threats (Sticks) and incentives (Carrots) and consists of the induction of the weakest to execute a threat proposed by the most potent state (Vázquez Lozano and González Ojeda, 2018).

This type of threat is considered a type of indirect violence that resides in the states' foreign policy since what they want is to change a "status quo" in their favour and consists of using a reasonable force. For example, an economic blockade or a sanction to demonstrate and defend the interests of the party, applying this diplomacy, and sufficient credibility to exercise force majeure if necessary. It differs from a military strategy because it should be noted that this type of diplomacy seeks to exert force more flexibly, applying a psychological element than if it were exerted using military power. It leads to a faster and more conclusive practice (George, 1994).

1.2.2.4. In the case of the United States:

The types of theory that have been applied to diplomacy have varied between liberals and realists. However, today we can say that, after analyzing these theories, the former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, apparently follows diplomacy realistic in nature. It should be noted that it is difficult to attribute a coherent strategy to Mike Pompeo. Since he began his mandate, he has carried out recurring contradictions between what he does and what he says.

We can draw several distinctive features from the former Secretary of State's actions, which we will analyze later as we go deeper into the specific case of the United States-China dispute.

- i. *Characteristics of Pompeo:* He is characterized by exercising a state-centric practice, placing the state as the nucleus of international politics, always seeking its interest and destabilizing the enemy. This coercive instinct of the former Secretary of State, head of American diplomacy concerning foreign policy is another characteristic that we can attribute to the former Secretary of State coercive policy.

His provocative action is reflected in his threats through social networks and speeches, the constant persuasion he has over competing states, such as attacking China's national security and questioning the China's treatment of COVID-19. He uses all of this to continue a national policy "Make America Great Again", promoting first of all domestic politics so that it affects abroad, that is to say, protectionism. These behaviours all go in the direction of centralization of power, the main feature of realist theory.

We can identify Mike Pompeo's diplomacy with the coercive diplomacy mentioned above. However, it is more characterized as a Gunboat Diplomacy. They differ in that, on the one hand, coercive diplomacy “seeks to erode an opponent's

motivation by exploiting the ability to inflict harm” (Lauren, 1972), while Gun-boat Diplomacy, involves the use or threat of a limited naval force, of gold that is not as an act of war, in order to cause advantage or avoid losses, either in the promotion of an international dispute or against foreign citizens within the territory or jurisdiction of their own State.

1.2.3. Diplomatic Methods for Dispute Resolution

In 1945, International Law became the law established by the international community to govern relations between countries and ensure security and the establishment and preservation of peace between them. Peace and security are two principles that constitute the purpose of International Law, and with this, new world order is established. Furthermore, they were also the purposes for which the 1919 Society of Nations, and later the United Nations, was created. Therefore, as peace and security are essential elements for the international community, it is necessary to resolve conflicts between states. This dispute resolution can be made through various procedures, but all of them must be peaceful to respect the principles established by International Law (Hamza and Todorovic, 2017).

Throughout history, numerous treaties have been signed with the objective of the peaceful solution of the differences generated by conflicts of interest between states. Likewise, there are both bilateral and multilateral agreements that cover the issue of

disputes with provisions or articles intended exclusively for this. Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations, which includes articles 33-38, focuses on the resolution of these controversies. Article 33 establishes the various procedures by which conflicts must be resolved, and they are: "negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, recourse to regional organizations or agreements" (United Nations, 1945). Thus, following this paragraph, should a situation arise in which there is a conflict that may endanger the preservation of international peace and security, the parties will be obliged to put into practice the methods mentioned in the article or other peaceful means of your choice.

Consequently, there are three levels of dispute resolution. The first is through diplomatic methods; the second is judicial methods: transferring the problem in the courts and finally, the institutional procedure—resorting to the different institutions among which the United Nations or other regional organizations are included to resolve these differences.

Diplomatic procedures for the resolution of disputes are the ones that we are going to analyze in this theoretical framework since they are the ones that interest us in our line of research. The diplomatic forms for conflict resolution are: negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation and good offices. These methods can be carried out by each of the parties individually or by ultimately resorting to the help of other entities.

From the end of the Second World War, when International Law was introduced, more rational and acceptable conflict management methods began to be developed than those used previously (Román, 1995).

The first method of dispute settlement mentioned in Article 33 of the United Nations Charter is negotiation, which consists of a process of dialogue in which the objective pursued is a compromise or an agreement while avoiding discussions. Negotiation is a method that is usually applied to a situation of disagreement where the parties aim to achieve the best for both, even though the results are not always beneficial for all parties. The pre-established purpose of the negotiation is to resolve the disputes that may arise, obtaining advantages for a single party, a group, or peacefully satisfying all interests. It is worth mentioning that it is essential that all parties cooperate in the negotiation and the parties, both those who have benefited and those who have not had such good results, trust that what has been decided will prevail because otherwise, the negotiations will fail.

Negotiation and the linguistic and communication skills of human beings have been evolving and adapting to the changes we find in the social, political, cultural and economic environment. These negotiation skills can be learned through many activities, since they have numerous applications from the day-to-day application, such as for business, or legal matters. In the negotiation, the relevant parties in the controversy intervene, that is, the international law subjects who have to resolve differences (Stein,

1988). This method is often used as it is flexible and States can keep track of all phases of the negotiation, and it is often quite effective in resolving contentious issues and controversies peacefully.

Consultation is the second method mentioned in the dispute resolution chapter of the United Nations Charter. This method is developed when there is an obstacle in the difference that has been generated between the states after a negotiation phase. As it is difficult to establish the points that have given rise to the dispute, what is done is to resort to an investigation procedure to resolve the difference. To carry out this task, a commission of inquiry is created to develop agreements and subsequently inform the parties about the dispute's facts. For example, the first and second Hague Conventions 1899 and 1907 have established these investigative procedures as formal institutions for the peaceful resolution of disputes. However, it is not a method in itself. It is instead used as a mean of resolving differences. It has been used to establish the path that the parties must follow to resolve conflicts peacefully. Therefore, this method does not oblige the parties to accept what has been established.

Mediation by a third person is the third method for the peaceful resolution of differences, instead of resorting to arbitration. The role of a mediator is not legal, and you cannot force them to accept your decision, but what you can do is persuade the parties to reach an agreement. All of this can be developed thanks to the communication capacities that States have. Unlike negotiation, this method is more interested in the

parties' rights and interests, for the constructive resolution of the difference and that both parties reach the best solution. Likewise, by not being directly involved in the conflict, the mediator acts as an impartial and neutral party, without providing his judgment (Shaw, 1988). Measurement is a method used for disputes of any size and one of the most widely used internationally for conflict resolution.

Another diplomatic method for dispute resolution is conciliation. This procedure consists of resolving the difference through an institution and body specially created to clarify the facts of the controversy and establish a proposal for the solution of the problem between the states. However, like mediation, the proposals made through this procedure are not binding, so the parties are not obligated and can reject what is proposed to them to resolve the difference. This procedure can be understood as a combination of the two previously mentioned, investigation and mediation since it is a third party that investigates what happened, although the goal is different, which is the explanation of the facts and proposes a series of clauses to reach an agreement that this is the primary purpose of the conciliation. On the other hand, this method is more formal and has a more structured hierarchy than mediation.

Finally, the excellent method encompasses various activities whose purpose is to promote negotiation between the parties that have to resolve the dispute. It differs from other methods of peaceful dispute resolution.

On the one hand, in the practice of good offices, the litigating parties do not meet together, but rather that the various meetings are held separately from each other. In the good offices' process, the parties can invite different states to participate in the negotiations, which can be refused by one part or by all of the parties (Shaw, 1988). On the other hand, this procedure ends when negotiations begin since the function is simply limited to achieving a peaceful meeting between the litigants.

Although these methods have been used for bilateral and multilateral treaties, they are considered quite flexible, especially conciliation, mediation and good offices. With the creation of the United Nations, more effective and severe methods have been created, such as, for example, the establishment of permanent bodies whose purpose is the management of conflicts through arbitration or judicial procedures. Likewise, to carry out conciliation, mediation and reasonable offices procedures, cooperation between the parties is necessary, and this is not always achieved; therefore, more disciplined methods must be used (Hamza and Todorovic, 2017).

1.2.4. American Diplomacy's historical Characteristics

The history of American diplomacy is not mainly characterized by being unique, but it does present certain differential features concerning other countries globally, which is essential to mention since they make a difference in the framework of international relations. The United States, throughout history, is a country that has

"world domination" in terms of power, so we must analyze how its diplomacy has evolved. It is difficult to make a difference in their diplomacy since it is difficult to find countries with which American diplomacy can be significantly similar.

In times of the Cold War, it could have been compared to the Soviet Union. However, it was a totalitarian superpower while the USA is characterized as a great liberal democratic power. Another comparison could be with hegemonic countries in history or with the five permanent member countries of the United Nations Security Council. Likewise, it is difficult to compare the American power with that of France and the United Kingdom, of liberal countries of the East, but the power they have in terms of strategic, economic or socio-cultural aspects, and comparison with the United States the differences are representative (Newsom, 1988). In conclusion, it is very complex to find a country to compare with the United States because it is a considerably different country and therefore the diplomatic practice of this country has characteristics that diverge from other countries in the international system.

American diplomacy has to grapple with the kinds of problems common to any kind of diplomacy: peace, war, commercial, economic, cultural, human rights, and the environment. The US gives great responsibility in its foreign policy strategy to the diplomatic practice, and for this, it uses its military, economic and political forces.

The United States is a significant global power: Whether on land, at sea or in the air, its military reach extends to all parts of the planet. Its economic capacity fuels world trade and industry. Its political and cultural appeal is so broad that most international institutions reflect American interests.

However, how do you manage relations with other countries? To analyze this question, I will explain three differential features of US diplomatic relations that will later serve us to study the dispute between the United States and China.

- i. As the first fundamental characteristic of modern American diplomacy is that American administrations as a whole tend to privilege hard power policies over soft power policies. This is due to the history of the use of military and economic force (hard power) instead of diplomatic persuasion ability (soft power). In a way, this is understandable. In 1945, what would later be known as soft power was considered ineffective or non-existent, given the lesson of the 1930s that military force was the only way to stop the aggressive dictators. In the Second World War, they undoubtedly used military power to achieve victory (Newsom, 1988).*

Later in the Cold War, they were often criticized for the perception of their willingness to go to war - for example, in Vietnam. Later, after 9/11 and during the George W. Bush administration, the use of military force was also resorted to in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. This situation can be said to have

changed with President Barack Obama who, for example, ordered the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan, and demonstrates the search for balance between force and diplomacy, although he was also criticized for resistance to intervention in some conflicts such as Libya in 2011 (Zhimin, 2011). But with the arrival of Trump to power, and since the appointment of Mike Pompeo as secretary of state, the use of soft power has also been significantly weakened with the use of his particular public diplomacy, something that we will analyze later.

The militarized quality of much of the American diplomacy - hard power - has a significant impact not only on how American diplomats represent the United States but also on who represents the United States abroad. In other words, the most important representatives of the United States abroad are not its ambassadors, but its regional military commanders and possibly, in certain countries, its Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) station chiefs.

In summary, while the United States has a relatively strong commitment to public diplomacy, possibly a form of soft power, the balance of evidence suggests that - at least since the start of the Cold War in the late 1940s - the United States have an entrenched and dominant national security culture and a comparatively weak diplomatic culture, and that this national security culture tends to prefer hard power to soft power policy instruments.

- ii. *Another differentiating feature of the U.S. diplomacy* is the preference of bilateral to multilateral diplomacy. In this case, multilateral diplomacy refers to the involvement in the variety of international organizations such as the United Nations as opposed to military alliances like NATO. From the realist point of view, it is thought that the great powers are prone to participate in the formation of alliances, as an intrinsic part of the global balance of power, and to engage with international organizations, and only under very favourable conditions, such as having a permanent contract, in the Security Council of the U.N. Also, realistically, small and medium powers tend to prefer multilateral diplomacy because it offers a seat at the table rather than because they have an inherent interest in fostering international cooperation (Muldoon, 2011).
- iii. *The third distinguishing characteristic of American diplomatic relations* is a cultural disposition toward a direct, low-context negotiating style. This characteristic has been aggravated by the United States' hegemonic status during much of the 20th century. A low-context negotiation style focuses on outcomes rather than relationships, is direct and explicit in communicating preferences, and is typically practiced in newer societies where the individual is valued more than the community in his or her life. This is the case of the United States. This idea is related to a country's negotiating capacity and how the country is represented, in which these denials are included.

The role of negotiation in diplomacy is grossly exaggerated on the literary side. In practice, diplomats spend a relatively small amount of negotiating time, in the sense of sitting around a table discussing the details of a treaty or agreement. The Obama administration, led by the president himself, introduced a moderate style characterized by "tactful" diplomacy. However, that has been modified with Trump's arrival, whose diplomacy is more direct, following a low-level negotiation style and imposing his own ideas (Wiseman, 2011), and Mike Pompeo follows Trump's style, with more aggression in the diplomatic relationship with China.

These characteristics mark a distinctive character of American diplomacy and establish a framework with which many countries' diplomatic relationship with the U.S. administration can be evaluated. Also, with these characteristics, it can also be studied as the interests and the American identity have been evolving. Therefore, having established these characteristics, they will serve as a theoretical framework in evaluating relations between China-U.S. As the United States' interests have evolved, so has its diplomacy, especially the characteristics that we have previously highlighted.

1.3. Literature Review

For the world, China and the United States' international relations are important because it will be determined by the relationship between the world's most significant power, the United States, and the largest emerging market, the People's Republic of China. And it is projected that if China maintains the pace of economic growth that it has been registering in recent years, sometime between 2025 and 2030, it will become the world's largest economy, according to projections by Goldman Sachs & Co., an investment bank of Wall Street.

Also, even though China and the U.S. are ideological rivals, they need each other so severely economically because that relationship is marked by deep asymmetry, said Stephen S. Roach, an economist and head of investment bank Morgan Stanley.

On the other hand, the military might of the U.S., which retains its undisputed supremacy, but its enormous warlike force is not effective in solving contemporary challenges such as global epidemics, climate change, terrorism, and organized crime at the international level. As specialists repeatedly point out, the ability of countries to face these challenges is based on the ability to make efforts and cooperate with other countries through diplomatic relations, that is, to combine hard power and soft power, to have; as a result, an intelligent power.

Therefore, almost all academics have constantly been developing numerous studies that focus on the international relationship between the U.S.-China, such as the evolution of that relationship and its implications for the world, considering that the current geopolitical situation in an evolving world Towards multipolar power-sharing cannot be understood without looking at the relationship between the two countries. Likewise, the vast majority of studies focus on the economic relationship they have and their projection and global economic consequences. However, there are still many spaces to continue investigating or developing as diplomatic channels that lead to strengthening, invigorating, or harassing international relations through national strategies according to each state's interests.

Therefore, in this research, I intend to deepen the understanding of the implications of the public diplomacy of the former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, in traditional diplomacy and the possible effects on the international relationship between China-U.S. Therefore, when reviewing the literature, I try to evaluate the characteristics of international relations, its development through diplomacy, analyzing its evaluation, the theories of international relations such as constructivism, realism, and liberalism. Furthermore, the ideology evolution of American diplomacy and its foreign policy to later compare it with the mandate of former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, as head of U.S. diplomacy.

In this regard, historically international diplomacy is a concept that emerged in ancient Greece through the practice of sending special messages to carry out missions from city to city. This practice would also have been carried out in China, India, and Egypt.

Much of the literature on diplomacy was written by diplomatic professionals or historians. No category of authors has been interested in the construction of theories, inclined to describe a good diplomat or what is the best way to conduct diplomacy. In this regard, we find the ancient Indian treatise "Arthashastra", written by Kautilya in the IV century BC, which contains advice on the conduct of diplomacy. Later, in 1436 Bernard de Rosier published the first book of European diplomatic practice, "short treatise on ambassadors", on the ambassadors' diplomatic system residing in Italy.

In 1716 Francois de Callieres wrote "De la maniere de m.' gocier avec les souverains", which, together with the book "Wicquefort", became important books on diplomatic practice throughout the 18th century. Also, in 1939 *Diplomacy and The evolution of the diplomatic method of 1954* written by Harold Nicholson, which is an encyclopedic work of Satow as modern classics.

Researchers have tried to understand the dynamics and evolution of international relations through diplomacy, understood as the art, science, or practice of conducting negotiations between States (Moreno, 2006) and/or the foreign affairs of a subject of

international law, using peaceful means and mainly negotiation, as the most suitable mechanism before the war as pointed out by Phipile Cahier.

This may partly explain why, for a long time, the nature of traditional diplomacy is non-coercive and that since the Congress of Vienna in 1815, countless treaties and agreements between states and international organizations have been agreed upon in the multilateral sphere through diplomatic relations.

Regarding The U.S. diplomacy, many researchers determined that American diplomacy was outlined in more open diplomacy since former president Woodrow Wilson named his fourteen points for the formulation of the so-called Pact of the League of Nations and that later it would assume the form of what we know today as the United Nations (UN). Wilson's open diplomacy was fixed by considering that the United States would have a role of an actor with the overtones of global power and, on the other hand, generating a new diplomatic exercise from the rise of the technological revolution is currently known. Like the digital age (particularly because of the use of social networks).

Therefore, it is not surprising that there is not much academic research on the implications of public diplomacy in traditional American diplomacy because that communication strategy in international relations is part of the former government of the United States and when the head of American diplomacy was Mike Pompeo, developing his mandate from April 2018 to last January.

In this sense, studying the diplomatic practice of Mike Pompeo as the central study of this research leads us to analyze his political strategy, compare him with Rex Tillerson and study his personal and ideological characteristics and his future projection, as well as the changes and precedent that he leaves. in American diplomacy as the new type of communication in international relations.

Likewise, many contemporary International Relations experts agree that, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the deconstruction of the bipolar arrangement of the global scene, the current international system based on the preponderant domination of the United States in almost all spheres of politics International is essentially a unipolar one problem. However, due to this research's focus, I will not go into detail about the behaviour of the U.S. in the international sphere and its global implications. However, it seems relevant to mention it.

Besides, I will focus the study and analysis on the diplomatic relations of the U.S.-China and the changes that Pompeo's coercive diplomacy has generated in the relationship, the future implications, and its profound ways to mitigate them.

For many researchers, this relationship began with very cautious steps since both countries were going through difficult times: The U.S. was involved in the Vietnam War and China it emerged from the Cultural Revolution. Likewise, most studies determine that both countries knew of their mutual need. On the one hand, Washington needed to

have good relations with China, as it was a key player in its containment strategy. On the other hand, China needed the United States to deter the threat of Soviet attack and open up to the Western world.

For his part, Henry M. Paulson, former United States Secretary of the Treasury, knows China very closely and analyzed the behaviour of both countries within the framework of international relations and to maintain a dynamic relationship, he led the wing of the "reformists" who do not favour open pressure against China to take measures that favour the United States, but persuasion to turn it into a "responsible partner", an opinion that goes along with the axes of traditional American diplomacy.

Likewise, in 2005, Fred Bergsten, Director of the Petersen Institute for International Economics in Washington, launched the idea of creating a G-2 between the United States and China, considering them the two essential powers to govern globalization (Bergsten 2009a). The proposal was based on the fact that they are the largest economies globally, which generate half of world growth, are the basis of global macroeconomic imbalances, and are the leaders, respectively, of industrialized countries and emerging powers. Although this last statement is debatable and that Bergsten was deliberately leaving the countries of the European Union in the background, the idea of the G-2 was intended to put the U.S and China on an equal footing that would force China to take a more active attitude in international economic affairs, especially concerning its exchange rate and energy-climate policy.

However, other studies determine that this claim hides that, beyond the fact that the U.S. and Chinese economies are increasingly interdependent, their relations are asymmetrical because they have structural differences in their development levels and the political room for maneuvering their governments and internal problems. Moreover, although the United States is the great military superpower and the most influential country on the international stage, it is a hegemonic power in decline and currently with greater distrust generated by the coercive public diplomacy of Mike Pompeo.

Traditional American diplomacy had slight changes but nothing significant in the past. For example, it is worth mentioning that the Bush Administration has squandered much of its soft power, something that former President Obama has not been able to remedy. Besides, its energy dependence and its growing debtor position pose important vulnerabilities in the medium and long term (Cline 2005).

On the other hand, during the Obama administration against the Asian region had a multilateralist tendency under the traditional characteristics of U.S. diplomacy. However, it is public knowledge that the relationship has become a geopolitical competition that has reached its most significant tensions during the Trump administration and the conduct of foreign policy through the head of American diplomacy, Mike Pompeo and that he would have opted for a more assertive policy towards China, which can be evidenced in the decision to leave the TPP. the agreement, tensions over the South Sea, the commercial conditions that American companies

receive on Chinese soil, support for Taiwan expressing its position against a single China, 5G technological competition, the issue of the COVID-19 virus and the questioning of the ideology of the Communist Party of China, which could be considered harassment of China's national security and the discrediting of the image of the Asian country.

Therefore, it is interesting to analyze Mike Pompeo's behaviour using social networks as part of public diplomacy to ensure that American interests, policies, and ideologies prevail in his relationship with China.

1.4. Methodology

In this dissertation, use qualitative data, the type of thesis is exploratory, with historical, analytical, and interpretative characteristics. I will focus on data collection in which I will include information from both primary and secondary sources.

The method used is descriptive to be able to explain traditional diplomacy compared to the diplomacy of Mike Pompeo and the transition that has taken place between the two, for this, I will take as a reference the evolution of the history of diplomatic relations in phases and how they have influenced until arriving at the exercise of diplomacy in the current international system.

Likewise, studying this change in diplomacy focused on the American country and the figure of its former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, I will be able to study its public diplomacy and draw conclusions from the influence of its decision-making in the international arena. Later, the method will be analytical, because after we have the study of the evolution of diplomacy, we can use it to explain the causes and effects that the change in U.S. diplomacy has been having on relations with China.

I will focus in data collection and the analysis of the American diplomacy, as well the public diplomacy of the Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo. Additionally, I will base the research of the Impact of Pompeo public diplomacy into the traditional American diplomacy specifically in the international relations between SINO-U.S.

Qualitative data were extracted from primary and secondary sources. For primary sources will be carried out through of a literature review using mainly the databases provided by the university. Likewise, foreign policy queries, books, official publications of both governments, for example, by the Council on Foreign Affairs, the U.S. State Department and China's foreign policies, and other academic studies done that has relations with this thesis. For secondary sources, will be carried out through mainly opinion articles to obtain more truthful results.

CHAPTER 2: U.S. FOREIGN POLICY UNDER POMPEO

2.1. American Foreign Policy

In this part, I will develop the United States' foreign policy, its ideology, the evolution, and the participation of important political actors.

For the first 130 years, American foreign policy was characterized by political isolation and strict neutrality from the rest of the world. These principles were established by George Washington, the first president, and formalized in the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. Summarized in the phrase "America for the Americans."

At the end of the 19th century and has become a regional power in America, it was also one of the most significant economic powers in the world. However, after the Spanish-American War, the U.S. established a more aggressive foreign policy. Concerning Asia, it acquired the Philippines and precipitated a new "open door policy" stance, which sought to guarantee the US access to the vast Chinese market.

In the 20th century, the U.S. developed a diplomatic-strategic policy of commitment to the "liberal international order" based on representative liberal democracy in the free market economy to avoid the emergence of another hegemonic

country in Western Europe or Asia. . This policy was based on the bipartisan consensus among the political agents in Washington that gave greater importance to Western Europe.

Just two decades after the end of the Cold War, U.S. hegemony, whose leadership was already in question after the invasion of Iraq, received a severe setback in the 2008 economic crisis. As Western economies plunged and U.S. leadership broke down, other powers such as China emerged. As a result, President Obama tried to move away from the Bush heritage by taking a more multilateral stance, relying on NATO to intervene in the 2011 Libyan war.

So, it can be summarized that from the end of the Cold War until the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it was defined by a constant search for a coherent foreign policy doctrine. Many elites feared that in the absence of the Soviet threat, it would be more challenging to invite the Americans to the call for world leadership. Yet American foreign policy oscillates between underinvestment and hyperextension, from isolating America from the world to a quest to transform that.

The search for meaning also caught the attention of the presidencies of Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama. For advocates of the "Pax Americana," the 1998 description of United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright as the "indispensable nation" seemed adequate in defining the United States' global role.

The United States also tried to improve diplomatic relations with historical enemies such as Cuba and Iran, with whom it negotiated an agreement to limit its nuclear program in 2015. However, the U.S. cannot prevent the loss of leadership, which was revealed in the Syrian civil war. As if that were not enough, the growing importance of Asia led the U.S. to make a strategic turn towards that region.

2.1.1. The U.S. Foreign Policy in Asia.

After the end of the Cold War, the United States did not carry out a massive military operation sending troops abroad comparable to the Korean or Vietnam War, except for sending its troops as the nucleus of multinational forces in the United States. Gulf War in 1991. However, on the occasion of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the administration of George W. Bush (2001-2009) carried out military intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq for a long time.

The previous George W. Bush administration decided and carried out the most significant U.S. military-strategic intervention in Asia. Obama, for his part, in addition to maintaining the mainline of the previous administration, developed it under the new name to include multiple aspects and have a broader regional scope. He particularly attached great value to intervention in Southeast Asian countries.

In addition, Obama took the post amid widespread anti-war sentiments in American society and decided to change foreign policy to end said military occupation. Unlike his predecessors, Obama did not keep Europe a "priority," but instead shifted it to the Asia Pacific region and even defined it as the most important for the U.S. This implied a change in the geopolitical and economic assessment of the superpower.

Obama emphasized that peace and prosperity in the Asia Pacific were of vital importance for the future of his country. Accordingly, he proposed long-time strategic U.S. intervention in the region so that the economic dynamics of the same continue to get on track. Announced in November 2011, this new U.S. foreign policy toward Asia was first called a pivot (turn) and then rebalanced (rebalance).

By taking a turn in U.S. foreign policy concerning Asia, Obama made the decision not to face a major conflict that could occur in subsequent years: the confrontation with emerging China. The central objective of U.S. foreign policy in Asia had been to prevent the emergence of a hegemonic country. Indeed, before the Obama administration, China did not have enough power to threaten the region as a hegemonic country, and the U.S. did not see the need to take action against it.

Nevertheless, the growth of China forced Obama to take a position on the matter, choosing the president to give more importance to harmony and conciliation with China than to competition and confrontation.

This "tolerant" attitude of Obama towards China was due to factors. Like that, the Obama administration found itself dominated by an optimistic or idealistic view that China would ultimately accept and share its ideal of the "liberal international order" and act as a "responsible stakeholder" of that order. Thus, the factors of Obama's foreign policy allowed China to take a series of actions that caused the change of the territorial status quo in Asia.

The "grand strategy" was primarily to restore global confidence in the United States, both for its allies and adversaries. All this was reflected in the reports of the National Security Strategy, issued within the framework of his administration and which provided a change of approach in terms of foreign policy diplomacy.

Ultimately, Obama's new diplomatic-strategic line did not take hold in the United States, and with Trump's coming to power, U.S. policy in Asia has become more confused and contradictory and it has become clear that Trump is not interested in maintaining and promoting the "liberal international order."

2.1.2. Trump's Foreign Policy

In this part, will focus on the United States' foreign policy during the administration of Donald Trump, the documents on the National Security and National Defense strategy. Trump changed foreign policy towards unilateralism and protectionism, away from the Wilsonian ideals that characterized the U.S. since 1917. For Trump, the government must first protect its citizens, promote their prosperity, rebuild its economy, and project military force.

Trump's foreign policy has been confused and apparently without a compass or clear north. This is mainly due to his "populist" character, to the fact of being an outsider with no previous experience in any public office, an "accidental" president elected as a result of a series of internal circumstances in the United States, and whose style is to take decisions according to the situation, thinking that this way of doing politics is appropriate for their country, to which they give priority number one: "American first" (Levitsky and Ziblatt, 2018).

To analyze Trump's foreign policy in Asia, one must understand his political style and consider to what degree or to what extent the Trump administration (which symbolizes the return of the U.S. to isolationism) backs down or reduces its scope or space for action strategic-diplomatic.

Due to the bitter experiences of the two world wars developed during the first half of the 20th century, the United States abandoned the isolationist policy of the 19th century and assumed the role of protecting and promoting on a world scale the so-called "liberal international order," based on both representative liberal democracy as in the open free market economy. True to its ideal of the previous order, the U.S. tried to prevent in Asia the appearance of a hegemonic country alien to the principle of freedom in the second half of the last century, maintaining its presence in the world and in particular in that region based on a series of political-military alliances.

Apparently, Trump has directed his interest in internal affairs, as he did not have a firm position to treat the agendas systematically and coherently. Instead, he addresses each foreign policy agenda on the fly, by issue, or by country. As he made public in his election campaign, he treats diplomatic-strategic agendas as if they were "business" or "transaction" matters. According to Trump, diplomacy and international politics can be managed by going to the deal (negotiation) to achieve his goal of "American first."

In the first year of his mandate, Trump did not put into practice almost any of the nonsense launched during his electoral campaigns, such as dispensing with defense commitments with allied countries and strategic treaties such as NATO, or the need to dictate protectionist measures against foreign products. However, he has made it clear that he has no interest in maintaining and promoting the "liberal international order" that the United States championed until Obama's predecessor administration.

In his first State of the Union Address, Trump mentioned China and Russia as "rivals" of the U.S. However, the first year has been instead a process of returning to normal relations between the two powers.

It should be remembered that, after the electoral triumph, Trump questioned in an interview with a media outlet why the United States should tie itself to the principle of "one China." This question increased the tension with the Asian nation. It could lead to the revocation of the so-called "Shanghai Communiqué," released after the lightning visit of then U.S. President Richard Nixon to China in 1972 and which was a crucial part of normalization in the relations between SINO-U.S.

In February 2017, Xi Jinping agreed to the first telephone conversation with Trump, after which the White House released a statement stating that "President Trump agreed to respect our one-China policy, at the request of President Xi Jinping." In this way, both countries settled the first disagreement and made way for the first summit between Trump and Xi in April 2017 in the United States; and the second in November of the same year in China.

Meanwhile, the Trump administration continued Obama's "free sailing" operation and resumed it in May 2017. As of January 2018, he ran the operation five times. Although the U.S., taking the innocent step enshrined in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, is careful not to anchor its vessels in the territorial

waters proclaimed by China, the Beijing government has been increasingly irritated against the act of show of force by his American rival.

In April 2018, Trump ordered limited, precision airstrikes against Syria and then reversed his original intention to withdraw from Afghanistan, sending more American troops there. NATO, regularly derided by Trump, not only survives, it grows. Trump threatened to "destroy North Korea" and unleash "fire and fury" in Pyongyang now; they have been credited with helping bring Kim Jong-un to the negotiating table at a historic summit in Singapore on 12 December. June 2018.

2.2. Comparison between Tillerson and Pompeo into Trump's Administration

It is necessary to make an analysis of these two people as the U.S. secretaries of State and their relations with former President Trump, in order to analyze the change that Pompeo made in diplomacy.

Topic	Rex Tillerson	Mike Pompeo
Recommendation	Tillerson had been recommended to Trump by former Secretary of State Condelezza Rice (former Secretary of State in the George W. Bush Administration) and by former CIA Director and Defense Secretary Robert Gates.	Trump received the recommendation of his closest associates in the Republican party, in addition, that Pompeo had shown political positions of questioning the Obama administration on various issues of American foreign policy with Iran, Cuba, and the investigation against Hillary Clinton.

<p>Profile</p>	<p>President and CEO of ExxonMobil, he was not very knowledgeable about political affairs when he took office, as he was a man who had led a life in the oil business.</p> <p>I should mention that Americanism also has as its fundamental support part of the big American oil companies, for whom the fight for natural resources is inseparable from the unilateral political-military power and the control of the Middle East, whose flagship ExxonMobil. These sectors, together with the coal industry, were the basis of the United States' unilateral rejection of the Paris Agreement against climate change.</p>	<p>It is considerably more linked to the political sphere. He is one of the hard-line representatives of the Republican Party with extensive experience in intelligence, national security, and military matters.</p> <p>Since 2011 he was a member of the House of Representatives for the state of Kansas (Stephens, 2018), where he was one of the state leaders of the republican ultraconservative faction known as the Tea Party, which is a conservative political movement within the Republican Party and hammer of Democratic heretics. He was director of the central Intelligence Agency (CIA).</p>
<p>Projection in the Secretary of State</p>	<p>Tillerson was projected to have the weight and global experience as head of EXXON to be the right fit to represent America's interests in the world, to be Trump's messenger to the world of "<i>America First</i>".</p>	<p>Pompeo projected to be the hawk that Trump needed to guide foreign policy under bold diplomatic behavior, putting the United States as a priority.</p>
<p>Relationship with Trump</p>	<p>It can be determined by a strange couple of politicians who had been together for too long and a man of different temperaments, behaviors, and styles.</p> <p>The bad relationship was in evidence when in July 2017 an audio was leaked where Tillerson desperate, had told his team that Trump was "stupid". A statement that he never completely denied, and that led the president to publicly humiliate himself with the following comment: "<i>I think it is false information; But if he said so, then I guess we'll have to compare our IQs. And I can assure you who will win</i>"</p>	<p>His expository clarity and his division of the world into friend and foe are highly appreciated by Trump, with whom he shares ruthless manners.</p> <p>Trump was guided by his instincts and adopted by the most faithful and close to replace Tillerson. Trump said, "<i>With Tillerson disagreeing on some things, like the Iran deal, Pompeo and I have similar thought processes.</i>"</p>
<p>Trump's support for management</p>	<p>We could tell Tillerson was in office, but he didn't have the power, he traveled the world with the distinguished title, but he seemed to have little influence to change Trump's mind. The head of American diplomacy, he had become an empty vessel. Uncomfortable versions were heard within the State Department and there was a feeling of instability.</p>	<p>Although sometimes the decisions and reactions did not coincide, and under the freedom they could do what they want. Trump was not confrontational in overcoming his position or making a decision made by Pompeo.</p>
<p>Disagreements with Trump</p>	<p>Tillerson clashed with Trump from the first weeks. He is a thoughtful man and used to long-term deals, his management was continually shaken by Trump's style and untimely tweets from him.</p> <p>It was precisely on the subject of North Korea, Trump wrote on Twitter that Tillerson was wasting his time. Trump</p>	<p>Since January 2017 he was director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) upon receiving confirmation from the Senate, he maintained a delicate balance in relations between the intelligence services and Trump, who came to compare the management of the CIA with "<i>Germany Nazi</i>"</p>

	<p>preferred to send members of his family to negotiate with foreign government officials to discuss other matters as well.</p>	<p>He always maintained a firm position even when it comes to the statements of former President Trump, who affirmed that he believed Russian President Vladimir Putin when he denied any interference in the elections, Pompeo remained firm in the United States' assessments of the alleged interference by Moscow.</p>
<p>Trump's strategy look at them</p>	<p>There is a foreign agenda that Trump treats as a matter of domestic politics. The tariff war that had started, the North American Free Trade Agreement was on the tightrope. The pact with Iran was to be renewed in a matter of weeks, Trump considered that Rex would work according to his ambitions.</p> <p>The fall of Tillerson had a strategic significance since it was that, after a year in office, the president was facing at that time key elections for a third of the Senate, the entire House of Representatives, and 39 governorships. Faced with the foreseeable ups and downs, Trump wanted to reinforce the Republican hard wing and get rid of anyone who, like Tillerson, stops his ultra-nationalist narrative.</p>	<p>He served on the intelligence committee. This is something that, although Trump has not mentioned, he has considered in his decision, since it allows him to have "privileged information"</p> <p>In March 2018, Trump praised Pompeo in a statement: <i>"I have gotten to know Mike very well in the last 14 months and I am sure he is the right person for this critical juncture. He will continue our program of restoring America (...) and seeking the denuclearization of North Korea "</i>.</p>
<p>Firing of Rex and appointment of Mike</p>	<p>The dismissal of Tillerson was through Twitter, and he found out by arriving at the Andrews military base, in Maryland, where a member of his team informed him and showed him the message because he does not have Twitter.</p> <p>It should be noted that the impeachment announcement was made within days of agreeing to meet face-to-face with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un.</p> <p>For many he had been humiliated as few secretaries of state have been before. Trump only called him three hours after announcing to the world that he was firing him with a tweet and replacing him with the hawk Mike Pompeo.</p>	<p>Trump nominated then-CIA director Mike Pompeo as the new Secretary of State through his Twitter account. In the tweet, Trump thanked the current head of US diplomacy for his service. <i>"Mike, Director of the CIA, will be our new Secretary of State. He will do a fantastic job! Thanks to Rex Tillerson for his service! Gina Haspel will be the new Director of the CIA and the first woman elected to the position. Congratulations to all!</i> (tweet from March 13, 2018)</p>
<p>Period</p>	<p>From Texas from February 1, 2017 to March 31, 2018.</p>	<p>From Kansas April 26, 2018 - January 20, 2021</p>

Source: Own elaboration (elaborated of the data collection, through the reading of articles, newspapers, indicated in the reference).

The table contains information that helps to compare Tillerson and Pompeo under the Trump administration and describes the profile that each secretary of state has and the personal and professional relationship with former President Trump. The recommendation that Trump received for the appointment and the projection of political strategy, personal that Trump had for the appointment in the office. It also shows the support that Trump gave them during his tenure, at the forefront of American diplomacy and the freedom to make unilateral decisions by making them the country's official foreign policy. The table also shows the disagreements between Tillerson and Pompeo with Trump, from when they began and which ends with the firing of Tillerson and the appointment of Pompeo as secretary of state.

From the comparison, we can determine that Mike Pompeo had an approach and greater power to decide and impose his own ideological line in American foreign policy. The practice of diplomacy was different because while Tillerson was thoughtful, without political experience and with uncoercive diplomacy, in addition to that, he did not have an account on Twitter or social networks; we consider it as null public diplomacy. On the other hand, Pompeo imposed coercive public diplomacy under the support of strengthening and importing the great American strategy called "America first."

2.3. The U.S. Foreign Policy under Pompeo toward China

In this part, we analyze Pompeo's foreign policy towards China, analyzing the National Security Strategy (NSS) and the Summary of the National Defense Strategy (NDS), respectively. Furthermore, Pompeo's behavior, so we will examine his personality.

First, In December 2017 and January 2018, the executive branch of the United States Government published two essential documents that purport to describe the main characteristics and fundamentals of the United States' overall security posture towards the world. Both documents call for a fundamental change in the U.S. approach to security, emphasizing competition against Russia and China. Therefore, consider it relevant to analyze the position established in these documents towards China.

In both documents, Beijing seems to be seen as an almost existential threat to the United States and the West in general. China is considered to be a "repressive vision of world order," overthrowing the traditional "free" vision of world order led by Washington (Neuman, 2017). Unlike the previous strategies, these two documents reject the idea of presenting China as a potential contributor to regional or global stability and prosperity or as a possible collaborator in common global and regional security problems. Instead, they want to seek to pit the U.S. and other democracies against China in zero competition for global dominance.

Thus, these documents represent a significant shift in America's defense and national security priorities, as they move away from the post-9/11 focus on terrorism and other transnational threats that require cooperation with China - such as climate change or the proliferation of mass destruction weapons - and is geared towards a traditional emphasis on great-power rivalry and the threat of a rising China.

From the Chinese authority's point of view on the NSS and the NDS, the opinions are very critical since the documents present a mentality reflecting the Cold War. In this type of relations of great power, a somewhat traditional vision continues, in which the great powers behave simply as power maximizers to possess hegemony in an anarchic world, typical of an offensive realist theory. This, as we have described previously, seems to be the line of action of the former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, or at least all the movements lead to think that it is this way.

Second, we compared Pompeo's personality and foreign policy as a critical examination of his personality from the information collected.

In the hope of unraveling this complex and ambiguous coercive foreign policy against China, the synthesis is twofold. Firstly, Trump's paradoxical and ambiguous foreign policy in his first year presents a new Pompeo Doctrine of assertive, chaotic but pragmatic, impulsive but functional, unpredictable but realistic. Secondly, the implications of such an atypical doctrine may lead to the decline of the Pax-Americana

due to Pompeo's diplomatic strategy toward international affairs. This view is supported by various researchers, who predict a relative decline in US global dominance shortly with the possibility of a shift in the global power hierarchy and a possible shift in the current world order.

- i. *The cross-comparison of Pompeo's personality with his foreign policy* toward China also highlights a close correlation between the two. The arrogance, narcissism, populism, belligerence, unpredictability, and transactional thinking of the former secretary of state are reflected in his conduct of foreign affairs.
- ii. *A critical examination of Pompeo's personality* consolidates that US foreign policy varied and shows a replica of Pompeo's personality traits in many cases. The stark symmetry between Pompeo's traits and his foreign policy agenda, along with the absence of a subjacent school of thought and the incoherence of his decisions, make it impossible to identify policy patterns during his tenure.

After this analysis, it could arrive at the determination of Ms. Marie Adela Carrai, associate professor at the Weatherhead East Asian Institute at Columbia University, considering that the former Secretary of State's strategy was to create a new "Cold War" we look back. However, both countries had enormous differences, and they were able to establish a communication that not normalized the relationship but move on in the same way.

CHAPTER 3: POMPEO'S INFLUENCE UPON THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

3.1. Pompeo's Position as Secretary of State

In the structure of the American State, the State Department was established, which is directed by the Secretary of State, who leads the diplomacy. Therefore, one of the study objectives is the analysis of Mike Pompeo, like secretary of State (head of American diplomacy), and the changes it generates.

In this sense, it is appropriate to mention that foreign policy, although it may exist without diplomacy, is presented as "anomalous, atypical and with a reduced radius." The Foreign Policy draws up the guidelines for the international action of the State, what the Anglo-Saxons call "decision making," while the diplomacy deals with their execution. The former has a substantive character, compared to the latter, which has an adjective character.

Considering this concept, we determined that Pompeo, through his cargo like secretary of State, is a particular way of making Foreign Policy decisions that can be carried out by means that is different from negotiation, such as ideological or economic pressure and even non-peaceful means.

Pompeo had moved away from the ideology that the U.S. developed and that which is to "shape and sustain a peaceful, prosperous, just and democratic world and promote the conditions for stability and progress for the benefit of the American people and the people of the world" (USAID, 2013).

3.1.1. The importance of the secretary of State in Foreign Policy

The Secretary of State is responsible for creating the country's foreign policy for the world. Through the history of the secretaries of the state of the United States, we can affirm the continuous evolution of the similar ideology that is part of traditional American diplomacy.

Therefore, I will mention some secretaries of state and some decisions they made in different governments to analyze their decisions or influence the United States' foreign policy unusually.

In Pompeo's case, American foreign policy underwent several constant negative changes because they were directed with coercive diplomacy and political interests.

Among modern secretaries, I will mention Colin Powell, mistreated by George W. Bush, who defrauded the country by tragically selling the lousy decision to invade Iraq. On the other hand, Madeleine Albright made the right decisions to participate in wars

for others to fight. One can also mention Alexander Haig, who managed little else to assert that he was in charge after the attempted assassination of Ronald Reagan. Also, one can mention Williams Rogers, whom the national security adviser Henry Kissinger replaced after not having a good performance. Finally, backtracking, we find Robert Lansing, who helped maneuver the United States into World War I, one of the most counterproductive movements in American history.

3.2. Pompeo's Personal Ideological Line in U.S. Foreign Policy

Mike Pompeo forgot many times that his job as Secretary of State is not to advance his personal ideological line, so many researchers agree that he has consistently failed by not promoting the United States' interests and making his own decisions outside of Trump. Therefore, I will mention how the handling of foreign policy is evident from his position as Secretary of State. This would lead us to catalog it, as Pompeo's foreign policy:

The issue with North Korea. Pompeo assumed command in March 2018, with the first meeting of heads of state already planned. The following year it was Pompeo's responsibility to hold the second meeting in Hanoi. Unfortunately, Pompeo lost points by doing nothing to disabuse Trump of the belief that Pyongyang was prepared to hand

over its entire arsenal in the hope that Washington would look favorably on his aspirations.

Absent from Pompeo's agenda was a concern for human rights violations unless it functions as a weapon against his adversary like China. Nevertheless, he maintains support for allied dictators as they imprison, torture, and murder like the case of Prime Minister Narendra Modi. Pompeo cried while criticizing Iran but bows to the Saudi realization. He is horrified by the Maduro regime in Venezuela but conveys love to Abdel Fattah al SiSi of Egypt and Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Pompeo introduced a new initiative supporting inalienable rights with the support of countries like Saudi Arabia and other tyrannies.

On Arab-Israeli relations, it is valid, although strengthening two authoritarian regimes is not. The Sunni monarchy of Bahrain sits on the Shiite population with the backing of the Saudi army, while the Emirates by the Pentagon, using the military to commit assassinations and mayhem against Yemen in a war of economic exploitation and political aggression, turning the United States an accessory to war crimes.

On the subject of Sudan, the negotiations have been worse, using an unjust terrorist state designation to force recognition of Israel, which will weaken the democracy that has not yet been fully born after the popular revolution.

On the other hand, Pompeo worked to thwart Trump's apparent desire to escape "endless wars." As in the case of Afghanistan, which has been nationally built for more than 19 years. The United States does not belong to the Syrian civil war. Likewise, Iraq and its neighbors have the ability to deal with what remains of the Islamic State.

So too, Pompeo played an equally evil role in Europe, weakening Trump and working to spend more and place more troops on the continent, even as Trump pressured Europeans to do more in his own defense. Furthermore, the same policy developed with the United States' relationship with South Korea.

Pompeo used sanctions to starve the people of Syria and Venezuela to force their governments to yield to the United States. In the case of Syria, Pompeo did not support Trump's effort to bring US troops back.

Pompeo's obsession with Iran, the result of the abandonment of the nuclear deal, has been catastrophic. The Iranians have refused to negotiate and stepped up nuclear reprocessing, interfered with the Gulf oil trade, attacked US bases and the embassy in Iraq. Given this, Pompeo could only threaten to close the US embassy in Baghdad.

On the issue with Russia, Pompeo treated Russia as a threat to American security. He constantly accumulated sanctions without providing a way out, increasing Russian

hostility and its inclination towards China. Regarding China, we will analyze it in greater detail in the chapter on the relationship between the U.S.-China.

After all of the above, we can determine that the best that can be said about Pompeo is that he has not led the U.S. to participate in new wars. For the most part, he has played the role of anti-diplomat, determined to insult, intimidate, demand, insist, dictate, threaten, harangue, and impose through new public diplomacy. As a result, the results of the administration lack notable successes to benefit the U.S. regarding an "American First" foreign policy.

3.3. Characteristics of Tillerson and Pompeo on American diplomacy

It is important to make an analysis of the two secretaries of State of the United States, to be able to analyze the change that Mike Pompeo made in diplomacy during the execution of American foreign policy:

On the one hand, Rex Tillerson, during his first year as head of American diplomacy, was characterized by being thoughtful and used to extended agreements. His first joint press conference with his Russian peer Sergei Lavrov was a classic. The Russian was expansive and talkative, perhaps even verbose. Furthermore, Rex Tillerson said the bare minimum. He looked tense and fearful. Moreover, he had reason to be

because he committed the State Department to significant spending cuts without a clear plan for how he would implement them.

In addition, in his position, he made a series of non-voluntary errors due to his governmental inexperience, and we could even add that the advice given to him by his small circle of confidants was not the best. As a result, Tillerson, despite serving as secretary of state for a year, failed to win Trump's trust. (Parker and Rucker, 2018).

Thus, **Tillerson's diplomacy was characterized** by an instinct to conduct diplomacy in a pragmatic, not coercive manner. He did not have a grand strategy for conducting American foreign policy, such as maintaining global confidence in the United States, both for its allies and its adversaries.

Therefore, the first year does not show significant progress in fulfilling the campaign commitments of the former U.S. president regarding American foreign policy. Many researchers agree that in the first 13 months in office, Trump, through Tillerson as secretary of State, few political decisions have shown isolationism or willingness to tolerate the U.S. withdrawal from the world. Both (Trump and Tillerson) are not internationalists and have not expressed support for the institutions of global governance that emerged after 1945.

On the other hand, Mike Pompeo is closer personally than Tillerson was to carrying out what was planned in American foreign policy and perhaps because he blends in with Trump's interests, ideas, and actions.

Both (Trump and Pompeo) have the perception that they can do "what they want, how they want and when" In other words, they rarely consider anything beyond the immediate impact that statements, actions, or tweets can have. (Days, 2018)

A clear example to compare between Pompeo and Tillerson, in apparent opposite positions, is that Tillerson explicitness ruled out regime change in North Korea and Pompeo had been much more aggressive in his public comments, insinuating that he prefers to remove Kim from control about its nuclear arsenal. "Although he did not go so far as to advocate for regime change, his comments go in that direction," Isaac Stoine Fish, from the NGO "Asia Society."

In addition, Pompeo made hostile statements against Kim Jong-un, who during Mike Pompeo's first secret visit between March 31 and April 1, 2018, in Pyongyang, reminded the former secretary of state that he had said that the North Koreans "would love for him to leave (office)." Pompeo responded to the joke, saying that he "was still trying to kill him," later "they both laughed," according to information provided by a former CIA employee.

So, while Tillerson was a person who fell into the position of Secretary of State lacking the skills and political relationships necessary for the direction of American diplomacy, Mike Pompeo is a person who has a character between assertive, dominant, and arrogant, similar to that of former President Trump, with whom he wants American diplomacy to move across the global sphere. After several months with Pompeo as secretary of State, Trump tweeted:

"Mike Pompeo is doing a great job. I am very proud of him. His predecessor, Rex Tillerson, did not have the mental capacity needed. He was dumb as a rock, and I could not get rid of him fast enough. He was lazy as hell. Now it is a whole new ballgame, great spirit at state!" By @realDonaldTrump

Therefore, a general concern has developed that this research work has been analyzing the form of communication of Mike Pompeo that was seen and valued as diplomatic actions because Pompeo was the head of American diplomacy, and also that many times they were more aggressive and very coercive against China.

Many researchers agree that during the roughly three years Pompeo was in office as secretary of state, "American First" impulses hardened as he gained more confidence on the world stage, yet he was fueling the politics of grievance and resentment. that it developed through public diplomacy will continue to erode domestic support for a more

ambitious US foreign policy, and in the future allies will have to think about the nature of US power differently.

Therefore, the type of diplomacy applied by Pompeo is characterized by being coercive, while that of Tillerson is based mainly on reflection.

Some of America's leading foreign policy thinkers lament the loss of credibility and prestige of "the great global history of our age," writes foreign affairs columnist Fared Zakaria; it is the "decline of American influence ... a decline of his desire and ability to use his power to shape the world."

CHAPTER 4: POMPEO'S PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

4.1. American Diplomacy and Public Diplomacy

Throughout the history of the United States, the men leading the secretary of State as heads of American diplomacy have been characterized by people who reserved their thoughts, private lives, personal reflections on specific issues, etc.

However, since the arrival of former President Trump, we have seen no distinction regarding what the world thinks and what it communicates to the rest of the world. Along these lines, we can also see the former Secretary of State communicating his actions through his social network, interviews, newspapers, speeches, and Twitter. This social network has become a means to make "his own show of American diplomacy." Through body gestures, short phrases, aggressive insinuations, direct threats, and the 140 characters that the application allows to write per publication, Pompeo could retransmit any idea or think about what he was going to do in American foreign policy.

Over the years, we can see how diplomacy has undergone a considerable transformation since the Second World War. States are adopting new ways of relating and interacting globally to achieve their goals and defend their interests.

However, Diplomatic tasks continue to have five fundamental principles: i) represent, ii) negotiate, iii) inform, iv) protect and v) promote the interests of States against third parties (Roncati, 1990). However, all these functions have varied from their traditional form, and today there are other forms of diplomacy, such as "public diplomacy."

Communication in diplomatic relations has historically been based on government-government and diplomat-to-diplomatic interactions. However, given its transformation, it has expanded to include "from the government to people" (Manheim, 1994). This change has been made thanks to the use of social networks as a communication method, a resource that many political leaders have recognized as favorable for maintaining order and staying in power (Barberá and Zeitoff, 2015).

Other secretaries of States had previously used these means of communication to announce diplomatic events relevant to international relations. However, the importance of these social media can be minimized, arguing that they are simply propaganda tools and do not provide meaningful information on leaders' behavior. However, it is essential that we analyze these media's use by the former Secretary of State of the U.S. to see their influence on American diplomacy.

In general terms, diplomacy, already defined above, can be conceptualized as a policy instrument or as a means of communication (Sharp, 2001). Therefore, starting from the basis that diplomacy is a means of communication, the language used is important since this will be the dominant channel of diplomacy (Rana, 2001), which, combined with the words used, will often be seen as their actions (Pascual, 2001). Consequently, currently, diplomats are viewed not only as those who have been formally delegated the duties of diplomacy (e.g., foreign ministers, ambassadors) but also political leaders who are increasingly important as representatives and negotiators in decision-making processes at the international arena.

Social media often requires diplomats to engage in a more personalized and interactive way with their audiences. However, there is a debate about the extent and degree of influence that the media can have on diplomatic communication and practice. World leaders use social networks for various purposes, including fostering relationships with other foreign world leaders. According to many indicators, Twitter is the most popular social network used by world leaders (Lüfkens, 2017). Donald Trump had 89 million followers, until January 2021, in this social network. For his part, Mike Pompeo, in February 2021, has 3 million followers when he leaves the government.

4.1.1. Public Diplomacy

Public diplomacy is a social practice. It is a form of interaction between social actors structured by rules, norms, and habits, producing social resources. These rules define and limit the practice of diplomacy and, in turn, are reproduced and modified in the course of their use. Besides, one of the advantages that this public diplomacy offers is focusing on specific audiences.

Never a government, in this case, a secretary of States, had been as active on social media as the American one, it was challenging to know what the most significant political leaders thought about the world, and you had to trust what they announced in the press or said in their speeches (Karlsen, 2016). However, with Mike Pompeo, these thoughts were released within seconds for all to see. In other words, the social networks for Mike Pompeo were a constant communication channel.

4.1.2. Coercive Diplomacy

Coercive diplomacy is a defense strategy used to deal with "an adversary" to change a status quo situation favoring whoever uses this type of diplomacy. Therefore, we restrict the definition of coercive diplomacy to defensive uses of strategy, that is to say, efforts to persuade an opponent to stop or reverse action.

This type of diplomacy is an attractive strategy because it offers the defender the opportunity to achieve reasonable objectives in a crisis with less political and psychological cost and often with less risk of inadvertent escalation in opposition to traditional military strategy. However, leaders of states with military power may sometimes be tempted to believe that they can, with little risk, intimidate weaker opponents into giving up their move to a status quo (George, 1994).

4.2. Pompeo's Public Diplomacy

When it comes to Mike Pompeo's public diplomatic communication, several permissive and restrictive factors could influence the extent to which you follow diplomatic rules. **On the permissive side**, it is known that U.S. diplomats tend to be too direct and harsh in diplomatic exchanges (Sharp, 2001). Likewise, in a certain way, it privileges that the speech is impulsive and straightforward, something contradictory with the language that has traditionally been used in diplomatic relations (Ott, 2017). **Regarding the restrictive factor**, this use of the social networks affects the necessity of cooperation of other countries since it creates pressure to follow the diplomatic codes of conduct universally expected in international relations (Strauss, Kruike-meier, Meulen, and Noort., 2015).

Differentiating characteristics between Mike Pompeo and diplomatic relations: After analyzing his speeches, interviews, messages, tweets, we can extract some differentiating characteristics of the speech used by Mike Pompeo in diplomatic relations.

4.2.1. Characteristics of the Speech used by Mike Pompeo

- i. Provocation to opponents:** Mike Pompeo wanted to occupy all the media with aggressive and provocative speech and exert a strong influence on traditional and social media systems.
- ii. Simple, direct, and repetitive style:** Perhaps other politicians have used more elaborate language, but their style is simple and direct according to the analysis of their communications. In addition, he often uses exact words or phrases and conveys opinions clearly.

Many of the conversations currently having through social networks previously took place behind closed doors, and the people had no idea what was happening. However, Mike Pompeo used the media as a megaphone to output all kinds of information: from personal reflections, such as opinions, attacks, propaganda, etc. So, a question arises: To what extent does Pompeo use social media for diplomatic purposes? Definitions of diplomacy are commonly accepted, including the art of treating people

with sensitivity and tact, the practice of conducting negotiations between nations, the ability to handle international affairs without arousing hostility.

If we analyze the communications of the former Secretary of State, they are not characterized by the words "sensitivity, sympathy and tact" but by their antonyms, indiscretion, confrontation, and cruelty. Therefore, we can determine that Mike Pompeo is characterized by being selfish, authoritarian, and aggressive. All these characteristics are not peculiar to the head of American diplomacy. With this type of behavior characterized by rebellious actions, they are often adverse decisions for the country. The U.S. is currently suffering from the lags and inheritance of the actions of former President Trump and former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo since it affected the security of the country and the international order.

Therefore, after analyzing the language and some of the actions carried out by the former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, we can conclude the following. If Pompeo's diplomatic communications through communication and social media are indeed an alternative to the formal communications that have been throughout the history of traditional diplomatic language, there are two possibilities. First, the diplomacy style of social media could destabilize and even replace traditional diplomatic practices and potentially provoke conflicts in international relations. Second, it can lead to the development of new rules or conventions in digital diplomacy. All this could lead to adopting a form of gradual change and adaptation within the existing frameworks and

principles concerning traditional diplomacy, or it could represent a break with the accepted patterns of behavior, norms, and rules so that diplomacy begins to be different.

4.2.2. What was Pompeo's Diplomatic strategy using Public Diplomacy?

The U.S., since Trump's arrival to the presidency, has suffered turbulent political and economic moments, which created an inconsistent and unpredictable American foreign policy, and we relate it to the type of public diplomacy that Mike Pompeo carried out during his term, which is why it arises the question did Pompeo abandon traditional American diplomacy? We have been able to analyze Pompeo's actions because he was focused on strengthening the image of a strong economy and, on the other, giving a strong "aggressive" approach towards foreign affairs. With that, he has achieved that the United States has more negotiating power.

It is clear that since Pompeo assumed the Secretary of State, he has made a change in strategy, or at least what is evident during the three years in charge of American diplomacy, and after the publication of the National Security and National Defense Strategy that we have previously analyzed.

4.2.2.1. Characteristics of Pompeo's Strategy:

First, Pompeo followed as a strategy a line that requires construction and required strengthening a military force; therefore, in the previous government, he increased the United States' defense spending. It is a defense extended to all areas as in the image of power for the world, in addition to preventing all possible strategic attacks (considering terrorist threats up to the attacks of "gray areas" by rival powers that blur the line between war and the peace).

Second, Pompeo is focused on strengthening the U.S. economy. He carried out the motto "Economic security is national security," under the concept of increasing, preserving, and protecting the competitive advantages of the United States in science, technology, and innovation that served as the basis for extending the military power of the United States. According to the NSS, revitalizing the manufacturing sector in the United States is a priority, as it is the industrial base that has grown dangerously dependent on global supply chains (The White House, 2018). For example, in the case between China-the U.S.

Third, Pompeo was trying to renegotiate U.S. foreign relations. This part is also related to the renewal of trade relations to lower trade deficits in the United States. They sought an approach to industrialized democracies as allies and considered states with similar ideas to the country as aspiring partners. In order to do so, create a defense

network for powerful states that threaten their sovereignty and independence. Focusing on China, a country that they considered as "a strategic rival" because it not only challenges the power and influence of American interests but also considered that "they try to erode the security and prosperity of the United States" (Almond, 2018).

As a result, it can be determined that he had a decentralized strategy, sometimes promoting international discord; during Pompeo's tenure, the U.S. made effective its withdrawal from two essential agreements: The Paris agreement on climate change and the nuclear agreement with Iran. On the other hand, Pompeo's strategy generated a negative result with his private diplomacy because it diminished the confidence of the American power.

These changes, according to the Pew Research Center, have concluded that since the arrival of Pompeo, there has been a decrease in the trust that the United States receives on the world stage, particularly among some of the United States' closest allies and in general the fall in the favorable ratings of the U.S. is generalized.

4.3. Pompeo's Public Diplomacy toward China

Mike Pompeo launched a U.S.-led campaign against China because he believes it would be a severe challenge, not primarily a security problem. It is difficult or impossible to believe that China plans to launch a weapon across the Pacific. The bottom line is the dominance of the waters of Asia and the Pacific.

Pompeo has referred to China on several occasions as "the enemy" of the United States, according to the National Security Document of that country, and criticized for carrying out certain practices that from his point of view are incorrect and have been to the detriment of the interests of the U.S. and consequently negatively affect the American economy and leadership.

Along these lines, Pompeo led some measures that would be focused on questioning many issues of China as a currency manipulator and identify all foreign commercial abuses that unfairly impact U.S. employment.

In what would promise to be a long and complicated relationship, genuine and severe diplomacy is required, which is obviously beyond Pompeo's limited capabilities. However, as we mentioned, it is characterized by its hostility and the use of public and coercive diplomacy. So, in this part, I will mention some examples of Mike Pompeo's public diplomacy, which I have also mentioned in previous chapters.

As well as his interviews with the media or speeches, Pompeo pointed out about international relations with China: "We have to admit a harsh truth. If we want to have a free 21st century and not the kind of century that the Chinese president Xi Jinping dreams of, the old paradigm of interaction with China does not work". Furthermore, "We must not continue with (that model), and we must not return to it," he added, referring to the American diplomacy deployed by Nixon. In his speech at the Nixon Library, he noted that China is increasingly authoritarian at home and more aggressive in its hostility toward freedom abroad, questioning a dictatorship and encouraging that it is time for free nations to act.

On a personal level, as we have been mentioning, he seems to have abused his position to obtain both personal and ideological advantages. For example, so committed to showing his loyalty to Riyadh, he declared an "emergency" to thwart congressional opposition and send ammunition to the Saudi army so he could kill more Yemeni civilians. He then sought to prevent a departmental investigation, pressuring and firing the inspector general. What prompted his determination to so eagerly aid a ruler who is vile, overbold, and criminal is one of the mysteries of his tenure.

Unfortunately, Pompeo turned out to be one of the biggest obstacles to the United States' international agenda, especially in China's relationship. Pompeo's speech delivered last year in which he claimed to be implementing the Founders' foreign policy

vision, Pompeo denigrated diplomacy and its successful fruits, such as opening both Iran and Cuba to potentially corrosive outside influences, which is the likely strategy to induce long-term change.

Left to his appliance, Pompeo would like to have the U.S. at war with Iran and perhaps beyond: China, Venezuela, and Russia. His belligerence served the American people badly. The actions taken by Pompeo were also part of the discrediting and questioning of China. For example, the closure of the Chinese consulate in Houston accusing it of being a spy center for medical investigations. Pompeo said, "We opened our arms to Chinese citizens, only to see the CCP exploit our free and open society. It sent propagandists into our press conferences, our research centers, our high-school, and college campuses," the nation's top diplomat said Thursday, adding that the Chinese government had also "ripped off our prized intellectual property" and "sucked supply chains away from America." (Leigh Hartman, Jul 2020)

The Secretary of State conveyed to the Americans and the world the terms of his confrontation with China, which he left as a diplomatic legacy. Pompeo's speech pointed out that China is an existential threat to the economy, freedom, and democracy globally and called on Western countries to stand up to Beijing. Also, he mentioned that "The free world must triumph over this tyranny" (BBD news, Jul 2020)

He also compared the Cold War by insisting that China is not the same type of enemy, assuring that "It is not about containment. It is a complex challenge that we have never faced before. Then, the USSR was closed to the free world. Communist China is here, within our borders. Therefore, we cannot face this challenge alone. The combination of our economic, diplomatic and military power is enough to rise to this challenge."

On other issues, Pompeo went to great lengths to scare off potential partners:

For example, the G-7 rejected his demand to call the COVID-19 Wuhan virus, and even allies such as South Korea remained much more measured on the issue. Likewise, its relations with China were determined not to turn its great neighbor into an enemy.

Mike Pompeo repeatedly referred to SARS-CoV-19 as the "Chinese virus" or the "Wuhan virus," a strategy that stigmatized a group of racism and xenophobia in March 2020. "This geopolitical blame game is a race to the bottom," said Bonnie Glaser, director of the Chinese Power project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), where the United States is playing to its detriment, rather than join forces to defeat a common enemy that knows no political borders or geographies. The pandemic has 168 million cases and a total of 3 million deaths around the world (Google, May 2021).

The United States' rhetoric against the threat posed by China's unstoppable economic rise has been escalating rapidly. However, the background is much more complex, related to the race for the future of technological development, the consolidation of Chinese leadership in the Asia-Pacific, and ideological factors, which led Mike Pompeo to attack China's National Security.

We will mention some statements by Mike Pompeo as a strategy of his public diplomacy on internal issues of China: After learning about the Chinese government's initiative to pass a National security law for Hong Kong, Pompeo threatened to take action if Hong Kong's limited autonomy is violated, explicitly referring to the possibility of revoking the special commercial status it confers on Hong Kong and that China also benefits from, a measure that was taken and announced by the U.S. government.

In 2019, Pompeo criticized Twitter China's practices against Uighurs in Xinjiang (Mackerras, 2004), accusing the Asian country of serious human rights violations against Muslim Uighurs. Pompeo emphasized the need for protection and respect for religious freedoms and wrote: "The policy of repression implemented by the Chinese Communist Party is trying to destroy the culture and beliefs of its citizens" Also, Pompeo in 2020 ruled on the possible kidnapping of the heir of Tibetan Buddhism, Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, who is identified as the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama.

CHAPTER 5: ANALISYS ON SINO-U.S. BILATERAL RELATIONS

5.1. Relationship between both Countries

In this section, I am going to focus my research on the relationship that has existed between China and the United States. The relationship has changed completely during the Trump government, since it has transformed and eliminated agreements that the previous former president Barack Obama, had reached. During his legislature, Obama achieved a stable relationship in relations with Asia, signing the Trans-Pacific Agreement after a stage of negotiations, and Trump, upon his arrival in power, broke this agreement through which both countries obtained new opportunities in the commercial field and economic benefits.

The relationship between these two great powers is, without any doubt, highly relevant in the international arena. These two countries have the two largest economies globally and have established positive economic ties between them. However, these links have, in turn, created a rivalry between the two, which has had adverse consequences for the international order.

I will analyze the true complexity of the relationship between China-U.S., relying on analytical frameworks and empirical facts that allow us to explain what was happening in the bilateral relationship under the Trump administration, from different points of view and focusing on the diplomacy of Pompeo as Secretary of State, because it is the object of study of this thesis.

Presidents before Trump has considered for many years that China could be a country with which to establish good relations and that these forms positive synergies for both, however, this is no longer the case. With Trump's arrival to power, different events have emerged that have led to a change in the dynamics of both countries' relations.

China is a country that has achieved rapid military expansion, as well as accelerated industrial growth, and strong economic development, which has made it more substantial in terms of its foreign policy. All this has led to a competitive relationship with the U.S. Instead of considering the Asian country as a strategically, Trump considered that it is a possible adversary and a military threat.

The U.S.-China relationship has evolved since the end of World War II from a tense confrontation to a complex mix of intensifying diplomacy, growing international rivalry, and increasingly intertwined economies. This relationship has been deteriorating due to numerous open conflicts regarding trade, transfer of technological products, military tensions that currently exist in Taiwan or the South China Sea, health field with

the global pandemic (COVID- 19) and China's national security issues with Taiwan, Hong Kong, Tibet, Xinjiang and Macau.

5.1.1. The Bilateral Relationship in Various Areas

Many researchers agree that it seems to be the time for China. The economy continues to grow apace, the new Chinese leadership is emerging, and the country is filling part of the strategic space that the United States is leaving empty, as it is increasingly disinterested in multilateral trade pacts, considerably reducing its global leadership, as it seeks more bilateral agreements. Nevertheless, faced with this situation, we also find that both countries seek to raise the profile of their countries, on the one hand, President Xi with his "Chinese Dream" and Trump wanting to fulfill the problem of "Making America great again," and this is giving rise to all the military and commercial tensions previously analyzed.

In this part, we will analyze the issues that we are producing more tensions and the constant factors on the competitiveness between the two countries:

- i. The economic relationship:** Economic and trade relations have developed steadily since the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the United States in 1979, with profitable trade and investment results. China benefits notably from the strong synergy, while the U.S. also receives

considerable economic benefits from the opportunities and results generated by China's growth. Thus, a solid economic and trade relationship between China-the U.S. is significant to both countries. Likewise, cooperation serves the interests of both parties, and conflict can only harm both parties.

Since 2009, the Chinese economy has tripled in size. By 2012, it had surpassed Japan and ranked as the second-largest economy in the world, behind the United States. Subsequently, the Chinese economy has been growing at a rate of 10% until 2011, and since then, almost 7%, which is a high growth rate. The growth of the world economy is around 3.8%. In recent years, China has begun to develop low-cost growth, driven by exports and gradually increasing domestic consumption and high-tech enterprises' development.

The Trump period: During the election campaign period, Trump already accused China of promoting unfair trade through currency manipulation or intellectual theft of property rights from U.S. companies.

At the beginning of 2017, Trump ordered an investigation into a series of subsidies that he believed China was receiving illegally and that tax or restrict U.S. trade. (Office of the United States Trade Representative, 2017). He assumed that Chinese companies were engaged in illegal practices such as Intellectual Property theft as part of the "Made in China 2025" policy. It is then that Trump considered that fair trade should

be applied with the United States and that no country has the right to carry out this type of illegal activity against the country represented, and began with his tariff battle (Larry, 2018).

China's trade with the United States has increased considerably in the past 20 years, mainly thanks to its accession to the World Trade Organization WTO in 2001 (Hsieh, 2009). From an economic point of view, China benefited more from its commercial relationship with the U.S. Therefore, from an economic point of view, China is the one that suffers the most after the new tariffs are imposed. In previous years, there had been negotiations on a free trade agreement between the U.S. and China (Havránková, 2019).

Then, it is essential to be conceptually clear about what a tariff battle entails. Theoretically, a trade war occurs at the confluence of high and broad tariff impositions (Mandel and Anderson, 2018). This type of trade barrier applies to imported products manufactured abroad. Imposing a product tariff means that people are less likely to buy it because they have become more expensive. Thus, domestic trade is favored. Trade wars can damage the economies of other nations and lead to increased political tensions between them.

Therefore, Trump line announced in December 2017, *"After my tour of Asia, all the countries that deal with us in TRADE know that the rules have changed. The United*

States must be treated fairly and reciprocally. Massive trade deficits must decline rapidly" (@realDonaldTrump, 2017). Later, in 2018 he imposed the first restrictions on imports of steel and aluminum of Chinese products that were imported into the United States.

However, after Trump imposes new tariffs, it will be increasingly difficult to reestablish negotiations on a free trade agreement between China and the U.S. Thus, the relationship between China-the U.S. has an irrefutable competition element (Freeman III, 2015). According to the Chinese Embassy in the United States, ever since the financial crisis China has been trying to help the U.S. recover by increasing export from U.S. to China and exporting good value for money consumer goods to the United States (Zhong, n.d.)

A study carried out by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology - MIT, "The China Shock: Learning from Labor Market Adjustment to Large Changes in Trade," shows that indeed the commercial relationship dramatically affected a large number of companies that used much labor in the United States. because the job positions were moved end masse to China "So several studies agree that talking about specific measures on China would have adverse effects and imply high risks."

Then, from the analyzed information, we can conclude that despite having defined the trade war as greater trade protectionism through tariff and non-tariff

mechanisms, such as increased taxes on imports, as China and the United States have done mutually, it can also be carried out through subsidies on exports. As mentioned in the second chapter, the United States' foreign policy was aimed at strengthening its economy. Therefore, the question arises as to whether U.S. protectionism could be justified.

The agreement signed by both countries in January 2020, which Trump described as the best trade agreement reached by the U.S. in the recent era, has been very decaffeinated by the effects of the pandemic. It already suggested a reasonably aggressive growth in purchases from China to the United States. Although it is evident that it is not being met at the moment, the deadline for its achievement is still in force. We could speak of non-compliance.

ii. South China sea: The American battle not only applies to the commercial sphere but has also reached the military. Trump's defense and national security strategy did not leave a very optimistic future for the two powers' relationship. Military tensions between these two countries are currently unfolding in the South China Sea. It is necessary to situate us a bit in the current context in order to analyze later the reason for the confrontation between the U.S. and China regarding this geographical area.

The South China Sea is one of the most prominent and most representative seas surrounding Asia, which awakens different controlling interests in China, in several of its neighbors, and the United States. This sea, which covers three and a half million km² of water, is one of the most attractive maritime routes in the world in commercial terms, in addition to hosting vast oil and gas reserves. It is a crucial trade route connecting Asia with Europe and Africa, and its sea is rich in natural resources. One-third of the world's shipping, or a total of U.S. \$ 3.37 trillion of international trade, passes through the South China Sea. About 80% of China's oil imports arrive through the Straits of Malacca in Indonesia and then cross the South China Sea to reach China. The dispute, which has been going on for years, is a competition over who controls the thousands of islands, reefs, and banks surrounding China (McDevitt, 2014).

This conflict has been developing for years; the different islands' sovereignty has been claimed on numerous occasions. In 2013, the Philippines requested the Court of Arbitration intervention in The Hague on a specific conflict that broke out in the Spratly Islands (Parra, 2017). For this reason, despite the natural resources and the importance of the sea line, the real reason for the current conflicts is the rise of power in China. The sovereignty competition between China and its neighbors over territorial borders, resources, and security in the South China Sea has been going on for years. However, today, it has attracted the eyes' military and diplomatic intervention leaders who want to promote stability and peace in these vital and globally valuable strategic waters.

Beijing has considerably increased military movements in the region, advocating "active defense" as a military strategy in this geographical area. This Chinese weaponry has generated great neighbors for Trump, and the only thing that is giving rise is that the tensions between Beijing and Washington. Nevertheless, today, considerably (Sarkar, 2018).

The Trump period: As we mentioned in the second chapter, military strengthening as part of the United States' foreign policy, increasing their budget. And like Trump did not want to lose sovereignty in these territories, he also deployed his military device in the area. The Trump administration's Freedom of Navigation Operations (FONOPS) surge in the South China Sea may have consequences other than the stated goals of upholding international law and global lines of communication (Almond, 2018). America's naval dominance and operational readiness could also be seen as a threat to isolate China from foreign markets and energy supplies.

On the other hand, this makes China uncomfortable, as it considers it a limitation in its negotiation strategy with other neighboring countries seeking cooperation. Given this, China continues to militarize the South China Sea areas, occupying and asserts its questionable maritime claims against other claimants (Sarkar, 2018). American rhetoric by Trump has harshly criticized China's behavior and entailed dire consequences if it persists. However, China persists and has made it clear that it will not back down due to the U.S.'s perceived intimidation and coercion.

As a result of these probably predictable events, the South China Sea situation seems to have settled at least temporarily into a "new normal" that neither China nor the United States can disrupt. In this new normal, both will continue their naval and air power deployment in the South China Sea; defend their policies, positions, and actions; they will criticize each other and improve their relations with the region's countries, including military relations. The United States will continue its sporadic and provocative freedom of navigation operations (FONOPS) against China's claims. China will continue to respond, censuring them and using them as an excuse further to militarize its characteristics (Valencia, 2018).

We can determine the development of these two issues (economic and military), Trump presented a strong negative sentiment towards China in the commercial and military sphere, because on the one hand, he has the feeling that the United States is no longer economically irrefutable, and, on the other hand, the military position in the South China Sea can be seen as a military threat, or as a challenge to America's military superiority. This situation, in the economic sphere, led to retaliation by the United States' trading partners. The international environment generated a perspective of greater risk that significantly hinders trade, investment, and possibly the global economy.

5.1.1.1. Conjunctural issues that question China

The challenge of the relationship between China and the United States is not limited only to commercial and security (military) aspects, and there is also a political sphere and issues. Politically, we can mention that the call with the President of Taiwan, Tsai Ing-wen, sets a significant precedent in Sino-U.S. relations. Because of her position, he increased tensions in both countries.

In this part, we will analyze questioned issues, which were part of the United States' foreign policy in its relationship with China during the Trump administration.

- i. The global pandemic COVID-19:* In December 2019, severe pneumonia started in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China. The outbreak spread rapidly in the number of cases and regions of China during January and February and continued to spread to other Asian countries and then to other continents. In March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the pandemic and called on all countries to take measures and join forces to control its expansion.

As the covid-19 crisis stopped looking like a health problem confined to China and turned into a global pandemic, relations between Washington and Beijing began to show new cracks in this regard, evidencing the tense rivalry between the two world superpowers and put aside the apparent commercial rapprochement.

Donald Trump, who had initially praised the efforts made by the government of his counterpart Xi Jinping to contain the pandemic, began to take a more demanding and more critical stance. In July 2020, Trump notified the United Nations that his country would leave the WHO. Last April, he suspended funding to the WHO, accusing this organization of not being transparent about the virus outbreak and being pressured by China to deceive the world, letting "the world now suffer due to the Chinese government's misconduct" (BBC, July 2020).

Faced with this public health emergency, former President Trump had the urgency to find an excuse for his faulty management in prevention and control.

For his part, President Xi delivered a speech during the virtual inauguration of the 73rd World Health Assembly in May 2020, making proposals to fight Covid-19 through solidarity and cooperation and build a global community of health for all, moving technical and supply assistance to many countries.

Although the escalation of hostilities appears to have cooled off for now (in part because of the coronavirus pandemic that has paralyzed the planet), it is clear that the relationship was markedly exacerbated amid the coronavirus pandemic and that some American "political forces" are pushing both countries "to the brink of a new Cold War" (Yi, 2020).

ii. *China internal issues:* Since the triumph of the communist revolution in 1949, the People's Republic of China's leaders have pursued two main goals in their foreign policy: to recover the territories that the country considers theirs and to become a significant international power once again. With different strategies according to the context of their time, Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping, and Xi Jinping have advanced unstoppably and unequivocally towards the achievement of these objectives, which now seems closer than ever.

With Mao, China earned the right to exist for itself. Deng then led the country's economic revolution and, with diplomatic skill, orchestrated China's rise in the international community. Now, Xi is at the forefront of power within reach to become the world's most significant power. Along the way, China has been regaining control of territories such as Tibet and Hong Kong, and only the unification with Taiwan would remain. Those advances were mainly due to Deng's policies and the doctrine of "peaceful development."

As for Taiwan, Xi has made it clear that he intends to regain sovereignty of the island as soon as possible and has warned that any conversation his administration has with the island government will be exclusively about reunification. His success in Taiwan has led Xi to replicate that strategy in Hong Kong, where a wave of protests against the Chinese regime broke out in 2019.

In this case, Trump announced early in his term that he was reconsidering the United States' relationship with Taiwan. In this regard, Geng Shuang, spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry, pointed out that the "one China" policy is the "political foundation" of diplomatic ties between the two nations, and any aggression could cause cooperation between the two countries to be ruled out, he said.

Xi warned countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States, which had signaled to take measures to support the protesters, that "any attempt to endanger the sovereignty and security of China or challenge the power of the central government is absolutely unacceptable," and in May 2020, the Communist Party decided to design a National Security law to combat secessionism and foreign interference in Hong Kong.

5.2. Chinese Diplomatic Position

Under its former leader, Deng Xiaoping, the country's declared diplomatic strategy was to "hide the force and bide the time." However, over the past few years, Chinese diplomacy has become more active and assertive. The New Silk Road initiative, unveiled in 2013, has led Beijing to expand its investments and influence worldwide significantly. Boasting growing power and confidence, China is becoming more forceful

and assertive in defending its national interests, which could harm its already weak "soft power" (Zhu, 2020) and its relations with other countries.

Throughout 2020, the Chinese foreign ministry is adopting an increasingly strident tone against the U.S., Australia, Canada, India, or the Czech Republic. Known as "warrior wolf diplomacy," this new attitude appears to be enjoying some popularity within the country. It points to the presumed transition from traditionally conservative, passive, and low-key Chinese diplomacy to assertiveness, proactivity, and exposure. However, Beijing's diplomacy was so subtle and indirect that it was largely overlooked in Washington (Kissinger, 1994).

Therefore, the diplomacy of the warrior wolf would refer to the work undertaken by Chinese diplomats in favor of China's national interests, which has taken on an essential and often conflictive turn. The spokespersons gave an example of this for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hua Chunying, and Zhao Lijian, when they responded on Twitter to international criticism about China's management of the Covid-19 outbreak and the low quality of exported sanitary materials.

On the other hand, it seems to be China's time. The economy continues to grow apace despite the effects of the global pandemic, and new Chinese leadership is emerging. The country is filling part of the strategic space that the United States is leaving empty. It becomes increasingly disinterested in multilateral trade pacts over

more bilateral agreements, considerably reducing its global leadership. However, faced with this situation, we also find that both countries seek to raise the profile of their countries, on the one hand, President Xi with his "Chinese Dream" and Trump wanting to fulfill the promise of "Making America great again," and this has led to all the military and commercial tensions previously analyzed.

Then, under Xi Jinping's presidency, China is modernizing its armed forces and is becoming more assertive both regionally and globally. However, while Chinese leaders do not shy away from confrontation, they also believe that they have no choice but to get along with the U.S. to maintain stability and prosperity. It should be noted that regarding the critical or hostile phrases and words made by the former Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo about China, spokespersons from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China tend to avoid negative statements, emphasizing the need for a change to continue working on deepening mutual understanding and produce mutually beneficial results (PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016).

On the other hand, in the military field, China has developed a double strategy. First, it wants to continue with the negotiations on the current controversies in the South China Sea. Nevertheless, on the other hand, it wants to continue with its unilateral construction on islands that it controls to establish its power in this geographical area (Swaine, 2018). However, this causes an imbalance of power in the South China Sea, as

American warships' naval presence is no longer dissuading China from presenting its sovereignty claims.

In the health field, the diplomacy of the warrior wolves entered social networks as part of the strategy of Chinese diplomacy to defend the coronavirus pandemic's management and challenge those who question the version of events in Beijing. The German Marshall Fund (GMF) research center in the U.S. determined that there has been a 300% increase in China's official Twitter accounts in 2020, with up to four times more posts.

In the face of the pandemic and during its entire information campaign, China's strategy was focused on what has been called "mask diplomacy," that is to say, the donation and sale of protective medical equipment around the world. That promoted China's soft power, while other countries struggled to adapt. Unfortunately, however, the goodwill generated by this "sanitary silk road" seems to have been dissipated by the aggression of the "wolf warriors."

Therefore, the U.S. faces an acute strategic dilemma: a relationship between the United States and China characterized by a complex mix of competition and cooperation plagued by mutual suspicion and mistrust (Swaine, 2018). Just as Pompeo views the U.S. as distinct from other countries, China sees itself as a country different from the U.S. but close to it. It considers that, for example, the Pacific Ocean is large enough to host both

the United States and China (Carlson, 2018). Therefore, it has proposed a new model of international relations avoiding confrontation and conflict and respecting others' political systems and national interests while pursuing joint win-win cooperation. However, all this will have to be analyzed if China continues to rise and leads to a gradual decline of the United States as a power.

5.3. How will the tensions between SINO-U.S. be mitigated?

America's strategy toward China has intensified with a blatant rivalry driven primarily by Mike Pompeo. As discussed in the paper, the U.S. government adopted a significantly stricter line in its approach to Chinese policy, currently reflecting mistrust on both sides, and ties have deteriorated to a level not seen in decades.

Furthermore, we have to keep in mind that both China and the United States will protect and advance their own interests. So we can determine that Pompeo's departure does not mean a substantial improvement in the relationship but a change. However, neither of them has the sole objective of recovering the relationship.

On the one hand, we have analyzed the commercial relationship, and on the other, the military tensions that exist in the South China Sea. While the relationship between the two countries has seen many ups and downs in recent years, if measures to mitigate tensions are not taken soon, China and the U.S. risk encountering a new and entrenched form of severe strategic rivalry that will determine the stability in the Asia Pacific region.

So, the question, **How could these rivalries be mitigated?**

First, it is necessary to mitigate the commercial tensions between China and the United States, since as we have been able to analyze, they go beyond the commercial sphere and are based on other reasons such as technological supremacy, competition for globalization, the free market and meddling in China's internal affairs. Second, it is essential to soften this situation, as a prolonged trade war can seriously depress the economic growth of both countries during a global pandemic. Furthermore, this will hurt the global economy given the fact that the Chinese economy is currently the biggest driver of global growth today. (Hitoshi, 2018).

Second, it must be taken into account that the military management of the South Asian area requires a concrete administration to avoid more incendiary tensions, which could unleash a war. However, from a more positive perspective, improving relations between the U.S.-China requires a change in the economic and political realms. To date, the American economy that the United States is developing, headed for more robust

growth, makes it less likely that they will continue to see China as a problem of their internal economic problems. In the same way, China has grown economically and achieved specific economic stability, which improves the exchange rate of trade and investment.

Conclusions

This work has followed a line of research mentioned at the beginning: "Analyze the diplomatic practice (public and coercive) of former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in American diplomacy, specifically in the relationship between China and the United States. After having carried out all the research study of this thesis, we can make the following statements:

Mike Pompeo's personal diplomatic strategy reflected his global political strategy. So, in order to interpret both the form and the content of his diplomacy, it is necessary to understand several factors such as: What is the international relations scenario in which he is immersed; what is its position in the face of the different political and economic disputes in which the United States must address in the contemporary era.

Therefore, we can deduce that diplomacy in the Pompeo era is only a symbolic representation of his actual political motivations that weaken his potential enemies and become the next candidate and president of the U.S. with the "American first" strategy.

For this reason, consider that to understand Pompeo's institutional position in the public-diplomatic sphere is to understand latent international conflicts:

- **First**, American foreign policy has undergone a notable change. The foreign policy strategy developed followed an unclear line on several issues, but on the maintenance of a military force, the U.S. increased defense spending. On the other hand, he focused on strengthening the U.S. economy. Likewise, Pompeo tried to renegotiate the international relations of the United States to get allies to face whom he considers his greatest strategic rival, China.
- **Second**, we analyze the American diplomacy has been undergoing an evident change with the arrival of former secretary of State Mike Pompeo. This is due not only to its actions and the characteristics it uses in its rhetoric for negotiating with other countries in the international arena but also to the development of external factors that would obstruct U.S. interests, such as the growth of the Chinese economy, which is something that significantly worries Pompeo.
- **Third**, the situation of the relationship between China and the United States, and having established future expectations about mitigating tensions, I can conclude in a general way that Mike Pompeo could be a threat to peace and prosperity, as well as a threat to order. International release her. After analyzing the theories of international law and determining that Pompeo is a self-determined "realist" in

foreign policy and opted for many positions consistent with an intense form of realism, characterized by coercive diplomacy, which questions all relations of United States foreign policy.

On the other hand, the practice of diplomacy by Mike Pompeo towards public diplomacy has been analyzed, and I can determine the following conclusions:

- **First**, after having analyzed the form of communication, language, corporate expressions, and many actions carried out by Pompeo through the media, if it turns out that communications as Secretary of State are truly consistent and coherent with traditional conventions. From diplomatic language, there are two possibilities: The style of diplomacy of the social media could destabilize and even vary or replace traditional diplomatic practices and potentially provoke conflicts in international relations. Nevertheless, on the other hand, it could also lead to the development of new rules or agreements on public-digital diplomacy.
- **Second**, after analyzing the strategy and diplomacy practiced by Pompeo, it can be determined that a significant precedent was left for the public diplomacy used to develop the National Defense document and under the argument of prioritizing the national interests of the U.S. However, on the other hand, there has been an apparent negative result for Pompeo, the use of his private diplomacy being responsible, that confidence in the United States' power decreased and that a

strategy must be rethought with great caution to regain confidence and space that as world power occupies.

On the other hand, the dispute between China and the United States has been analyzed in the commercial, military, and other internal issues of China, and have reached the conclusions:

- **First**, it has been studied how Pompeo presents an assertive negative behavior towards China in the commercial, military, technological sphere, and other (issues such as the origin of the pandemic, the unification of China and its ideology), because on the one hand, it has the feeling that the U.S. is no longer economically irrefutable and, on the other hand, the military position in the South China Sea can be seen as a military threat, or as a challenge to U.S. military superiority. In the economic sphere, it gave rise to retaliation by the United States' commercial partners. However, China has strong bilateral relations with many countries that have preferred to belong to the fringes of Pompeo's grotesque style of countering China to the world.
- **Second**, it has been analyzed on China's position and it has been determined that said country is in the position of minimizing the dire consequences of a commercial conflict and the tensions in the South China Sea and other issues. In other words, China maintained its traditional diplomacy and avoided taking

actions that could generate a crisis in foreign policy, despite the current consequences that the coercive diplomacy of Mike Pompeo left the relationship between both countries in tension.

Both countries need to be realistic about how close their bilateral relationship may be at any given time and control their disagreements by avoiding any conflict that could threaten their overall peace and prosperity. That is why maintaining the balance between China and the United States will remain the most important bilateral relationship in the world for many years. There are many implications for the whole world. The people of both nations have much more to gain by maintaining a friendly and cooperative relationship.

Final conclusion: The implications of Pompeo's public diplomacy in diplomacy, applied to the case of China vs. the United States, allows us to infer that the changes that it generated in the style and strategy of diplomacy by the U.S. in the last three years, It is a representation or a symbolic replica of the intention of Mike Pompeo to ensure the political, economic and military hegemony of the United States in the field of international relations, regardless of the global costs or consequences that the maintenance of this purpose may generate.

List of references

Almond, R. G. (01 September 2018). Trade, War, and the South China Sea. The Diplomat: <https://thediplomat.com/2018/09/trade-war-and-the-south-China-sea/>

Almond, R. G. (18 January 2018). Deciphering US Foreign Policy in the Trump Era. The Diplomat: <https://thediplomat.com/2018/01/deciphering-u-s-foreign-policy-in-the-trump-era/>

Amigo Román, C. (1995). The solution to international disputes and their mechanisms. Law School Bulletin (8-9), 511-531.

Arkhipov, I, Kravchenko, (December 2018) “Pompeo blasts Russia for strategic bombers sent to Venezuela. Bloomberg. [https://bloom. bg/2SHCHMc](https://bloom.bg/2SHCHMc)>

Arteaga, F. (2010). The National Security Strategy. Elcano Royal Institute, 1-7.

Barry Buzan y Ole Weaver, (2003). Regions and Powers. The Structure of International Security, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, p. 27-34.

Barberá, P., y Zeitoff, T. (2015). The New Public Address System: Why do world leaders adopt social media? http://pablobarbera.com/static/world_leaders_paper.pdf

Berridge, G. (2005). Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

B. Mukherjee. (1976), *Kautilya's Concept of Diplomacy: A New Interpretation*. Calcutta: Minerva.

Calduch, R. (1993). Dynamics of the International. Madrid: CEURA.

Cheng, D. (2012). The complicated history of US Relations with China. [online]

The Heritage Foundation. Available at: <http://heritage.org/research/report/2012/10/the-complicated-history-of-us-relations-with-china>

Carlson, B. (2018). Why China loves Trump? The Atlantic, 47-50.

Jose Comblin. (1979). The Church and the National Security State, Maryknoll, Orbis Book, pág. 64.

CSR Report. (19 January 2019). China's Actions in South and East China Seas: Implications for US Interests- Background and Issues for Congress. Congressional Research Service: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42784.pdf>

Cull, N. J. (2009). Public diplomacy: theoretical considerations. Mexican Journal of Foreign Policy, 57-92.

Cline, W. (2005): The United States as a Debtor Nation, Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC.

Dias, E. (13 March 2018). Mike Pompeo Has What Rex Tillerson Didn't: 'Killer Graphics' and Trump's Trust. <http://time.com/5197808/mike-pompeo-donald-trump-rex-tillerson/>

Dong, W. (2013). US-China Trade, 1971-2012: Insights into the US-China Relationship. The Asia Pacific Journal. <http://apjif.org/-Dong-Wang/3958/article.pdf>.

Doug Bandow, (November 2020). "Is Mike Pompeo the Worst Secretary of State in History?". Cato Institute. <https://www.cato.org/commentary/mike-pompeo-worst-secretary-state-history>

Friedman, R. (2017). The NSS is not a strategy. Foreign Affairs.

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-12-19/national-security-strategy-not-strategy>

George, A. L. (1994). Coercive Diplomacy: Definition and Characteristics. W. Simons, & A. George, *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*, 9-11. San Francisco: Westview Press.

German Marshall Fund (GMF), <https://www.gmfus.org>

Hamza, A., y Todorovic, M. (2017). Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. (GJCMP, Ed.) *Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective*, 6, 11-17.

Havránková, M. (January 2019). The United States – China Trade War. Institute for Politics and Society: <https://www.politikaspolecnost.cz/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/The-United-States-China-Trade-War-IPPS.pdf>

Henry Kissinger. (1994), *Diplomacy*. Former US Secretary of State, wrote in his influential study diplomacy.

Hsieh, P. L. (2009). China-United States Trade Negotiations and Disputes: The WTO and Beyond. *Asian Journal of WTO and International Health Law and Policy*. p. 368-399.

H. Nicolson. (1939). *Diplomacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press and H. Nicolson. (1954). *The Evolution of Diplomatic Method*. London.

Indyk, M., Lieberthal, K., & O'Hanlon, M. (June 2012). Foreign Affairs. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2012-04-20/scoring-obamas-foreign-policy>

James Curran, (June 2018). “Clash of ideologies Feeds into the Rivalry between the US and China”, *The Weekend Australian*.

[https://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/inquirer/clash-of-ideologies- feeds-into-the-rivalry-between-us-and-china/news-story/ a5b2cb577685c83b2e79538ad4aa2716](https://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/inquirer/clash-of-ideologies-feeds-into-the-rivalry-between-us-and-china/news-story/a5b2cb577685c83b2e79538ad4aa2716).

James Curran (July 2018), “Americanism, not globalism”: President Trump and the American mission”. Lowy Institute.

https://www.lowyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/Curran_President%20Trump%20and%20the%20American%20mission_WEB.pdf

J. D. Spence. (2005). The Once and Future China, Foreign Policy.

Special Report. <http://www.mearsheimer./uchicago.edu/pdfs /A0034.pdf>

Karlsen, R. (2016). Styles of Social Media Campaigning and Influence in a Hybrid Political Communication System. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 3, 338-357.

K. Hamilton and R. Langhorne. (1995). *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*. London and New York: Routledge, p. 89.

Larry, E. (19 September 2018). WTO head offers to mediate between China and US over the trade war. *The Guardian*:

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2018/sep/19/wto-head-offers-to-mediate-between-China-and-us-over-trade-war>.

Lauren, P. (1972). Ultimate and coercive diplomacy. *International Studies Quarterly*, 16, 131-165.

Lawrence, S.V. y Morrison, W. M. (2018). US-China relations. Congressional Research Service. IFI 0119. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/IF10119.pdf>

Leigh Hartman, (July 2020) “Pompeo: The free world must triumph over China’s tyranny” by ShareAmerica <https://share.america.gov/pompeo-free-world-must-triumph-over-chinas-tyranny/>

Lüfkens, M. (31 May 2017). Twiplomacy study. Twiplomacy: <https://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2017/>

Mackerras Colin. (January 2004). Ethnicity in China: The Case of Xinjiang. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/29456744_Ethnicity_in_China_The_Case_of_Xinjiang

Michael Hunt, (1987). Ideology and US Foreign Policy. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Michael Anton, (Spring 2017). “America and the Liberal International Order”, American Affairs 1, N.1, <https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2017/02/america-liberal-international-order/>.

Madeleine Albright, (February, 1998), Interview on NBC-TV The show with Matt Lauer, Columbus, Ohio, <https://1997-2001.state.gov/statements/1998/980219a.html>.

Mandel, B., y Anderson, H. (July 2018). What is a trade war, and are we in one? JP Morgan: https://am.jpmorgan.com/blob-gim/1383557340865/83456/PI-TRADEWAR_r9.pdf

Manheim, J. (1994). Strategic public diplomacy and American foreign policy: The evolution of influence. New York: Oxford University Press.

McDevitt, M., (November 2014). The South China Sea: Assessing US Policy and Options for the Future. Obtenido de CNA: https://www.cna.org/CNA_files/PDF/IOP-2014-U-009109.pdf

Montobbio, M. (2016). Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in the Age of Globalization. The Yearbook of Diplomatic and Consular Law, 245-258.

Moreno Pino, Ismael. (2006). Diplomacy. Theoretical and practical aspects of his professional practice, Mexico, Secretary of Foreign Relations. p.22 and p. 25.

Muldoon, J. P. (2011). The New Dynamics of Multilateralism: Diplomacy, International Organizations and Global Governance.

M. Keens-Soper. (2001). Wicquefort, in G.R. Berridge, M. Keens-Soper and T.G. Otte, *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave, p. 88.

Nathan, A. (2009). U.S.-China Relations Since 1949. Asia for Educators, Columbia University. Foreign Policy.

http://afe.easia.columbia.edu/special/china_1950_us_china.htm

Naciones Unidas. (, 1945). Chapter VI: Pacific Settlement of Disputes. United Nations: <http://www.un.org/es/sections/un-charter/chapter-vi/index.html>

Neuman, S. (2017). Trump's National Security Strategy Angers China. National Public radio: <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwoway/2017/12/19/571873355/trumps-national-security-strategy-angers-China?t=1553618712646>

Newsom, D. D. (1988). Diplomacy and the American Democracy. Indiana University Press, Capítulos 11 y 12.

Nicolson, H. (1967). Harold Nicholson's diplomacy. Chapters I, II and III. 15-55. And
Nicholson, H. (1977). Origins of organized diplomacy. *Diplomacy* (9-34). Oxford University Press.

Nünlist, C. (marzo de 2016). The legacy of Obama's Foreign Policy. (188), <http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/CSSAnalyse-188-EN.pdf>. (M. Bieri, Ed.) CSS ETH Zürich. Obtenido de <http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/CSSAnalyse-188-EN.pdf>

Office of the Secretary of Defense. (, 2018). Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy of the USA: Sharpening the American Military's Competitive Edge. Washington, DC. <https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-Strategy-Summary.pdf>.

Orgaz, Cristina J., China and the United States: What is the "Pompeo Doctrine" that wants to reverse one of the biggest successes of Nixon's foreign policy, September 2020. <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-internacional-53699049Ott>

B.L. (2017) "The Age of Twitter: Donald Trump and the Politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 1, 59-68

Parra, A. (27 March 2017). Changing Alliances in the South China Sea: Challenges of the New "Status Quo". The Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies.

Pascual, E. (2001). Pragmatics in diplomatic exchanges. *Language and diplomacy*, PRC
Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (9 December 2016). "Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Lu Kang's Regular Press Conference". eds., 225-232.

Peter Dombrowski and Simon Reich (2017). By Oxford University Press on behalf of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/ia/INTA93_5_01_DombrowskiReich_0.pdf

Rana, K. (2001). Language, signaling and diplomacy. Language, signalling and diplomacy, eds., 107- 116.

Raskin, 1979. The State is conceived autonomously, threatened even by the very society of which it is in theory delegate. págs. 32, 46 y 84.

Robert Zoellick, (August 2017) “The Conflict at the Heart of Donald Trump’s Foreign Policy” Financial Times, <https://www.ft.com/content/896ff946-868e-11e7-8bb1-5ba57d47eff7>.

Roncati, E. J. (April 1990). The Diplomatic Function:

https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/29597/S3272J37_es.pdf (15-20)

Roach, Stephen S. (2002). This China is Different, Essays on China’s Growing Statute in the World Economy, Nueva York, Morgan Stanley.

Sánchez, E. (2012). What do you talk about when you talk about Constructivism? UNAM International Relations Magazine (No. 114), 107-129.

Sarkar, S. (8 October 2018). Understanding US responses to the South China Sea Dispute. <https://icsdelhiblogs.wordpress.com/2018/10/08/understanding-us-responses-to-the-south-China-sea-dispute/>

K. Nag. (1997). *Theories of Diplomacy in Kautilya's Arthashastra*. Calcutta: Writers Workshop Publications.

Holger Stark, (January 2017). "Megalomania and Small-mindedness: how America Lost its Identity", <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/letter-from-washington-how-america-lost-its-identity-a-1131294.html>

Beville Meaney, (1991), "American Decline and American Nationalism", *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 45, N.1.

Sharp, P. (2001). *Talking to Americans: problems of language and diplomacy*. *Language and diplomacy*, 93-106.

Shaw, M.N. (1988). *International Law*. Cambridge University Press. Siddiqui, K. (2018). *US–China Trade War WFR*.

Stein, J. (1988). *International Negotiation: A multidisciplinary Perspective*. *Negotiation Journal*, 2302-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01005447>

Strauss, N., Kruikemeier, S., Meulen, HV, y Noort., G. (2015). Digital diplomacy in GCC countries: Strategic communication of Western embassies on Twitter. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(4), 369-379. *Government Information Quarterly*.

Swaine, M. D. (2018). *Chinese Views on the Trump Administration's Asia Policy*. <https://carnegieendowment.org/files/CLM53MS.pdf>

The White House, (2017). *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>

Trump Donald, (December 2017) “Remarks on the Administration’s National Security Strategy” <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-administrations-national-security-strategy/>.

Trump Donald, “Remarks by President Trump to the 72nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly”

USAID. (15 May 2013). 3D Diplomacy, Development, Defense. USAID: https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/3D%20Planning%20Guide_Update_FINAL%20%2831%20Jul%2012%29.pdf

Valencia, M. J. (26 de abril de 2018). The South China Sea: The Diplomat. <https://thediplomat.com/2018/04/the-south-China-sea-reality-is-slowly-sinking-in/>

Vázquez Lozano, A., y González Ojeda, M. (2018). Diplomacy and theories of International Relations. Mexico: Editions of Laurel.

Vincent, R. J. (1984). Edmund Burke and the Theory of International Relations. Review of International Studies, 10(3), 205-218.

Wang Yi, Chinese Foreign Minister. May 2020.

<https://www.timesnownews.com/international/article/new-cold-war-some-political-forces-in-us-taking-china-us-relations-hostage-says-chinese-foreign-minister/596305>
<https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-internacional-52815758>

Wassim Dagherir, (June 2020). “Trump’s Foreign Policy Doctrine of Uncertainty”. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/06/29/trumps-foreign-policy-doctrine-of-uncertainty/>

Wiseman, G. (2011). Distinctive Characteristics of American Diplomacy. The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 253-259.

Xulio Ríos. (2006). Director of the Observatory of Chinese Politics. Casa Asia-IGADI.

China and its relations with the United States: competition or interdependence?

Zhimin, C. (2011). US Diplomacy and Diplomats: A Chinese View. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 6(3-4), 277-2.

Zhong, S. (n.d.) US-China Trade Is Win -Win Game. China-embassy.org.

<http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/xw/t675646.htm>

Zhiqun Zhu, November 2020. China and the diplomacy of the warrior wolf.

<https://www.politicaexterior.com/articulo/china-y-la-diplomacia-del-lobo-guerrero/>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I want to thank the International University of Business and Economics, for accepting me to be part of it and for providing me with all the resources and tools that were necessary to carry out the research process. I would not have been able to arrive at these results if it had not been for their unconditional help, as well as the different professors who provided their knowledge and support to move forward.

I also thank my supervisor, Dr. Qiao Liang for allowing me to use his skills and knowledge, and he guided me through each of the stages of this project to achieve the results I was looking for. My gratitude to Ms. Jane Wang for her academic and emotional support during these two years of study.

Finally, I want to thank all my family, my friends and colleagues, for supporting me during this stage. In particular, I want to mention my parents, who are always there to give me words of support, direct me from heaven and feel a comforting hug to renew my energy “Gracias amados mami y papi”.

謝謝, Thank you, Gracias.

个人简历及在学期间科研成果

个人简历

Mary de los Angeles Huaitalla Nuñez女，1982年07月 29生。

2005年 08月 毕业于Alas Peruanas University大学，获 undergraduate degree学士学位。

2019年9月进入对外经济贸易大学攻读国际关系专业硕士研究生。