

## VENEZUELA, THE ACID TEST FOR THE USA'S LATEST NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY.

*November's US's [National Security Strategy](#) was recently released. It was a combination of hyperbole directed towards saviour Trump, blame gaming, the need to restore the US to grandeur, and a restatement of policy diluted by a growing realisation of the limits of US global ambitions. Notably, history will remember this document as the first admission by the US that it can no longer exercise global domination.*

Below is the foreword from the document probably penned by Trump.

**Over the past nine months, we have brought our nation—and the world—back from the brink of catastrophe and disaster. After four years of weakness, extremism, and deadly failures, my administration has moved with urgency and historic speed to restore American strength at home and abroad, and bring peace and stability to our world.**

This is the opening paragraph to the foreword which is not so much immortal as immoral. The next two paragraphs praise his efforts to rebuild the US military, strong arm allies into supporting the US drive to rearm and how Trump has smitten his and Israel's enemies. It concludes with Trump's intention to preserve the US as the greatest nation in history and the home of freedom on earth. Ah, the fraudulent imperialist, every word soaked in deceit, rotating the world on its axis to East West.

However, the foreword is the least important piece of the document. The document proper proposes a coherent theory to advance US strategy, but as we shall see later, it violates this theory within the body of the document. "A 'strategy' is a concrete, realistic plan that explains the essential connection between ends and means: it begins from an accurate assessment of what is desired and what tools are available, or can realistically be created, to achieve the desired outcomes." It then goes on to explain that this strategy is inward looking, the protection of the USA itself, not of other countries. That the total global domination as practised by US *global foreign policy elites* had failed. Here the blame rests on elites and not the relative economic decline of the USA.

Here is found the true kernel of the document, namely, that the US is now too weak to exercise global domination but needs to become selective as to where it operates and focuses its attention. The document goes on to blame the decline of US imperialism on the fact that the US global elites acted contrary to US national interests. It's as though Trump and his retinue refuse to acknowledge that the pursuit of profit waves no patriotic flag, that it seeks the highest return regardless of the collateral damage to the nation. Instead, the document proposes reversing 40 years of drift by regenerating the nation amnesiac to profit and by portraying the elite as being un-American.

Part 2.1 is interesting. Here the document is laced with wants. A true father Xmas list of wishes. Why the word wants and not the word, need. Had the document used the word need, it would reveal an admission, that the US had failed over these issues. Take the following want. "*We want the world's most robust industrial base.*" If the word need replaces want so that the sentence reads, we need to ensure that the US industrial base is robust..., it no longer implies aspiration but admits that the US no longer has this capacity. China has.

And it concludes in typical far-right fashion, with a cultural want. *“Finally, we want the restoration and reinvigoration of American spiritual and cultural health, without which long-term security is impossible. We want an America that cherishes its past glories and its heroes, and that looks forward to a new golden age. We want a people who are proud, happy, and optimistic that they will leave their country to the next generation better than they found it.”* No doubt it was this vision which inspired Trump to go on his walking-talking tour this week to convince US voters that there was no cost-of-living crisis, that fear of job losses was unfounded, and that their experience where each successive generation becomes progressively poorer, was being over-dramatic. Trump and his coterie will soon find that capitalism crushes – wants – underfoot. And as for ‘Past glories and heroes’, here is a definite recommitment to the cultural war against Woke, and a return to the John Wayne version of history.

Part 2.2 is the more important. Predictably it begins with the Western Hemisphere and the reassertion of the Monroe Doctrine. This is the essence of its strategic foreign approach: *“we want a Hemisphere that remains free of hostile foreign incursion or ownership of key assets,”* Again this is directed to the two hostiles, China and Russia. The use of incursion covers both the economic and military. In reality, what the US opposes is Chinese investment in its backyard hemisphere. And as for *“continued access to key strategic locations”* this stands for the monopolisation of key natural assets. In short what the US is aiming for, is a client based hemisphere, where China is excluded and which can be turned into its cheap backyard production sector helping the US to decouple from China.

In the order of foreign priorities, the Indo-Pacific is next, which the US intends to; *“keeping the Indo-Pacific free and open,”* It also uses the phrase preserving reliable supply chains in the region, clearly referring to non-Chinese sources but including Tiawan.

It then provides nods towards Europe and the Middle East but given how cursory this is it clearly does not have the strategic importance of the Western Hemisphere and Asia.

Part 2.3 is an assessment of the balance of power. It catalogues US strengths or tries to. The first two elements - politics and economics - misses the mark. It describes the US political system as nimble and the economy as the largest and most innovative. Both are dubious claims. As are its claim about its military. Its financial strength on the other hand is accurate, as is its global connections built up over decades of dominance. Less so is its claim about its technology where its lead is narrowed to only chips and aerospace. It then goes to describe how the Trump effect will boost the USA’s dominance through tax cuts, reducing regulations, re-industrialisation and selective investments.

Part IV takes the cake or at least a peace of cake. There is a central contradiction in this section. The US says it stands for non-intervention and respect for the sovereignty of other countries. But it also focuses on putting the USA first. *“The United States will put our own interests first...”* In other words, the US intends to remain the first amongst nations, the strongest nation. However, strength implies weakness elsewhere, which makes nonsense of its claim to: *“seek good relations and peaceful commercial relations with the nations of the world without imposing on them democratic or other social change”*.

If the US allows other nations to build themselves up, to not interfere in their rise, then it would become impossible to maintain the US as first amongst nations. It would respect China’s rise and rise. This strategy is written tongue in cheek against a background of the US levying reciprocal (read extortionate) tariffs against virtually every nation on earth. This comes against a background where

Trump has strongarmed countries to invest hundreds of billions in the US economy. This comes against the background of [dozens of countries being sanctioned](#) by the US. (Here is the full list issued by the [Office of the General Council](#).) This comes against the background of the weaponizing of the dollar. This is what the first amongst nations means in action, not empty platitudes.

The question is asked, why does Trump, using this document as a soapbox, pose as a peace-dove and the settler of wars. Its subterfuge. Trump knows how to read his base. The North American people, especially the youth are war weary, tired of the forever wars, knowing that funding them has come at a cost to their own standards of living. The document admits as much: *"Our elites badly miscalculated America's willingness to shoulder forever global burdens to which the American people saw no connection to the national interest. They overestimated America's ability to fund, simultaneously, a massive welfare regulatory-administrative state alongside a massive military, diplomatic, intelligence, and foreign aid complex."* Of course, that statement is a double-edged sword. Trump and his party have shown that they do not intend to cut down on military spending to fund welfarism, but on the contrary by their actions and votes in Congress they intend to boost military spending while cutting down on welfarism as demonstrated in their culling of Obamacare.

This sums up its strategy: *"As the United States rejects the ill-fated concept of global domination for itself,"* but not at the expense of its antithesis: *"The United States cannot allow any nation to become so dominant that it could threaten our interests."* In other words, the US finally recognises it can no longer dominate the world, and all it can do is to prevent any other country, read China, from dominating the world. Everything else in this section about respect for nations, equity between nations, for balanced trading relations is mere background noise.

The section on 'Priorities' predictably opens with the issue of mass migration embroidered with inflammatory far-right language. *"Border security is the primary element of national security. We must protect our country from invasion..."* It then moves onto the second far-right trope, the far right's version of freedom of speech. We have seen what this version means, cracking down on the freedom to speak to history, or any criticism of Israel where even mild criticism has been criminalised.

It then discusses burden sharing, or what is the same thing propping up the declining US empire under the guise of the partnership of nations. It then calls for peaceful co-existence amongst nations, truly the Bald White Eagle the symbol of US prowess, should be replaced by the domestic Pigeon. Clearly this is a stop gap measure because further on the strategy emphasises the necessity for the US to re-industrialise and decouple from adversaries while rebuilding its military capacity. Thus, all this fluff about peaceful co-existence is merely an admission of weakness until such time it *'quickly'* overcomes this weakness. Except of course, this quickly will not be in time as China streaks ahead.

Next is the Regions and here it becomes interesting because the document recognises that the US must become selective, which means selecting its backyard so to speak: *"After years of neglect, the United States will reassert and enforce the Monroe Doctrine to restore American preeminence in the Western Hemisphere, and to protect our homeland and our access to key geographies throughout the region. We will deny non-Hemispheric competitors the ability to position forces or other threatening capabilities, or to own or control strategically vital assets,"* *"Non-Hemispheric competitors have made major inroads into our Hemisphere, both to disadvantage us economically in the present, and in ways that may harm us strategically in the future. Allowing these incursions without serious pushback is another great American strategic mistake of recent decades."* The way the document describes

previous administrations, one is forgiven for believing they were asleep at the wheel. Nothing could be further from the truth, all administration acting through the State Department and the CIA have been active in central and Latin America subverting governments there.

What is different is that the Trump Administration is prepared to establish a visible military muscle in the region, a combination of air, sea and ground assets, designed to intimidate and enforce its will. So much for respect for the equality of nations, equality provided they align with the USA, especially in the Western Hemisphere. This of course requires a readjustment, the withdrawal of US military assets from the regions of the world which the US has deprioritised such as Europe. For example, the biggest aircraft carrier in the world the USS Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78) traditionally patrolled in and around Europe, no longer. The US devotes 21 paragraphs to detailing its strategy towards the Western Hemisphere.

Since militarily muscling in and around the Caribbean, the Venezuelan government recognising the threat of regime change, has been willing to negotiate with the US. Madura went as far as offering to virtually denationalise the oil industry by inviting US corporates to take over swathes of the industry. But this was not enough. Instead, the US demanded that all links to China be severed something Madura was unprepared to do. This was highlighted by the arrival of the first Billion Dollar offshore Chinese refining vessel able to boost regional oil output five-fold. It started sailing at the same time as the US began its military build-up, but whether this was the real cause for the heightened tensions in the region, rather than the excuse of drugs, is unknown.

Next the strategy turns on China. This strategy is detailed in 25 paragraphs. It opens with deep regret, why o' why did we help China industrialise over thirty years? Answer without investing in China, reaping profits in its expanding market and receiving cheap imports in return, US capitalism would have been flat on its back decades ago rather than more recently. After this, the strategy goes on to talk with a forked tongue. It describes the possibility of mutually beneficial economic relations but immediately follows that up with this: *"Importantly, this must be accompanied by a robust and ongoing focus on deterrence to prevent war in the Indo-Pacific."* *"This combined approach can become a virtuous cycle as strong American deterrence opens up space for more disciplined economic action, while more disciplined economic action leads to greater American resources to sustain deterrence in the long term."* In other words, there are no mutually advantageous economic relations, instead its all about coercive relations which can fund further coercion. All under the goal of ensuring: *"A favorable conventional military balance remains an essential component of strategic competition."* It invites its allies in the region to join this dance. It's pathetic and certainly won't be welcomed by the Chinese.

When it turns on Europe it only provides 14 paragraphs, such is the relegation of the EU. The strategy describes the decline of the EU in terms of Dollar based GDP [but measured in PPP](#) the decline is not as evident. The strategy attributes this decline to issues internal to Europe and not to the machinations of the US. *"But this economic decline is eclipsed by the real and more stark prospect of civilizational erasure. The larger issues facing Europe include activities of the European Union and other transnational bodies that undermine political liberty and sovereignty, migration policies that are transforming the continent and creating strife, censorship of free speech and suppression of political opposition, cratering birthrates, and loss of national identities and self-confidence."* And far from the US respecting the sovereignty of nations as pledged at the head of the document it proposes an active political intervention into the affairs of the EU. *"America encourages its political allies in Europe to*

*promote this revival of spirit, and the growing influence of patriotic European parties indeed gives cause for great optimism. Our goal should be to help Europe correct its current trajectory."*

And then the tongue in chief stuff. The Ukraine war was a mistake which the US needs to end to stabilise Europe. This is an abuse of history, one where the US provoked a war with Ukraine to destabilise and weaken the EU to encourage external dependencies such as US shale gas, only to now announce the US seeks to end the war to help stabilise the EU and end its dependency on expensive US energy which will now presumably be replaced by cheaper piped Russian gas. You can't make it up.

In reality of course, the defeat of the West in Ukraine, was just as much a defeat for the USA as it was for Europe and Britain. The only difference is that the US seeks to mask this defeat by posing as the peacemaker, distancing itself from the war and dumping the consequences on Europe while deriding the EU for accepting this poisoned chalice. The only major success the US has had recently is to disrupt the EU and neutralise it as a competitor. This offer of help is the scurrilous Trump at his most devious.

As for the Middle East or West Asia as it is now being described, the emphasis is shifting. It will have less importance to Washington as it focuses on the western Hemisphere. The Middle East is destined to become the touchy-feely region instead of the region of agony: *"It is rather emerging as a place of partnership, friendship, and investment..."* as if.

## **Conclusion.**

Forget what the strategy says. US imperialism when faced with the rise of China and the presence of the EU had two priorities. Firstly, to neutralise the EU as a competitor and secondly to arrest the rise of China by all means. Russia figured prominently in both strategies. The dominant faction on the Beltway in Washington headed by Clinton, Obama and Biden set out to destroy Russia first, clearing the way to taking on China. The smaller faction headed by Trump sought to prise Russia away from China. The problem with this strategy was that the only way to induce Russia to break away from China was to offer it closer alignment with the EU together with a regional mutual security agreement.

But Russia with its cheap energy and other resources would have energised the EU so to speak potentially turning it into a formidable competitor to the USA. On the other hand, waging a war against Russia raised the spectre of a win-win scenario. Possible regime change in Russia, and if not regime change, then certainly a disrupted and economically weakened Europe as it lost the benefit of Russia as a supplier of energy and materials. Accordingly, while the US was defeated in the Ukraine it won the consolation prize of seeing the EU on its knees.

Finally, Venezuela. Matters seem to be quite for now except for US piracy on the high seas when they arrested a tanker with Venezuelan crude. But no doubt behind the scenes the CIA is working overtime to overthrow the Madura government. Trump cannot step back, especially if the CIA fails. Firstly, he needs a win after the failures in Ukraine and Iran. And secondly his whole Western hemisphere expeditionary effort depends on success in Venezuela. If he fails in Venezuela, other Latin American and even Central American countries will be more emboldened to resist US advances. That is why the entirety of the US strategy short of attacking China hinges on Venezuela. If he fails, the parlous state of US imperialism will be revealed for all to see and his last-ditch strategy will lie in ruins.

Brian Green 17<sup>th</sup> December 2025.