



UNITED STATES' CONTAINMENT POLICY: A STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN US AND CHINA IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF BRI VS B3W

DR. AHTASHAM JAN BUTT¹, DR. ARFAN LATIF², SAJJAD HAIDER³

ABSTRACT

This study examines the historical and contemporary strategies of the United States and China in their pursuit of global influence. It highlights the US's post-World War II offensive policy, focusing on political, economic, and military alliances to counter communism during the Cold War. The US established key alliances like NATO, the Marshall Plan, SEATO, and CENTO, effectively containing the Soviet Union. In contrast, the contemporary era witnesses China's ambitious Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), aimed at connecting numerous countries through infrastructure and trade. China claims it seeks to promote economic development and people-to-people ties. However, concerns arise regarding BRI's loans, interest rates, and potential control of infrastructure in the event of defaults. The United States and its allies view BRI with suspicion, suggesting it serves China's geopolitical ambitions and may lead to economic domination. They respond by forming alliances such as QUAD, Three Seas Initiative, Build Back Better World (B3W), Blue Dot Network, and AUKUS to counter China's expansionism, much like their efforts during the Cold War. B3W, supported by G-7 countries, is the principal initiative aimed at countering BRI. China's commitment to invest nearly US\$1 trillion in BRI by 2050, primarily in underdeveloped nations, contrasts with B3W's reliance on G-7 countries and private sector investments. This discrepancy suggests that China may be more successful in pursuing its goals through BRI. The competition between the US and China intensifies, with the former taking an offensive stance while the latter adopts a more defensive posture. Both countries claim to work for the betterment of developing nations, particularly in the Eurasian region. The text concludes by emphasizing the potential benefits of mutual cooperation between the US and China to address the infrastructure and fiscal challenges facing developing nations. Overall, this discussion sheds light on the contrasting approaches of the US and China in their pursuit of global influence and their implications for the developing world.

KEYWORDS: Belt and Road Initiative, strategic competition, BRI vs B3W

1. BACKGROUND

This great game which started between Russia and Britain is at its same practice but the actors, priorities and regions have been changed. The same tug of war is now shifted from Russia (USSR) and Britain to China and US may be known as "New Great Game" (Edward, 2003). Now in the contemporary times, both China and US have initiated their long term politico-economic projects to win over each other (Edward, 2003). The major difference at this time is the expansion of the eras as it was confined to a particular/specific region (as of Great Game) but now the competitors are encompassing the different regions and continents (as of BRI and B3W). On the other hand, in the past, Russia was alone and Britain had somewhat loyalties of the their allied states; likewise China is running Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) solely by its own but US is leading in the Build Back Better World (B3W) with the help of its allies commonly known as G7 countries. During the period Great Game, the west had reservations regarding Russia (USSR) and in the same way now perhaps terrifies of the politico-economic expansion of China. Simply, now the "Great Game of Asia" is replaced by the "Global Great Game" in the forms of BRI and B3W.

This study tries to root out the history, aim, nature, and comparison between the China-led BRI and the US-led B3W. It also discloses the US's containment policies to counter USSR through different politico-economic and military alliances. This article is also an attempt to explain the contemporary tug of war between two major powers of the world i.e. China and United States. The basic purpose of the article is to root out the west's policies regarding the containment of Chinese politico-economic expansion in Eurasia, Middle East and Africa. This article will explain the changing nature of tactics adopted by west especially US for containment of China.

¹ Assistant Professor, Higher Education Department, Pakistan, ahtishamjanbutt12@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Sociology University of Okara, Pakistan, arfanlatif9292@uo.edu.pk

³ Program specialist policy and research JICA, Pakistan, sajjad92@gmail.com

1.2. Research Objectives

- To explain the historical analysis of US's containment policy
- To find out the US's alliances during Cold War and contemporary period
- To explain the major infrastructure development plans of BRI
- To elaborate the prime objectives of B3W
- To explore the US's containment Policy to control Chinese expansionism

2. METHODOLOGY

The current research is purely qualitative in nature because the researchers explored the nature of different policies of US to contain the expansionism of its counterparts during the different eras in qualitative way. On the other hand, the nature and objectives of the B3W and BRI are widely explained to disclose the recent US developments to counter the Chinese influence especially over the Eurasian and African continents. The nature of the data is secondary as the researchers collected the data from the available resources i.e. research articles, books, journals, research reports, newspapers and forums of discussion.

3. US'S CONTAINMENT POLICY DURING COLD WAR

After the end of the World War II, a Cold War started between Soviet Union and United States. Both of the big powers started plans to communicate their ideologies with maximum number of countries. The administration of Truman transformed the US foreign policy in order to compete its counterpart i.e. Soviet Union in all political, economic and military spheres (Isaacson & Thomas, 1986). The US's plus point was the closeness with Western Europe as ally which supported US against the expansion of communism. With the help of these European allies, US added its leverage to the developing world of East Asia, Latin America and Africa. The European states had influence over this developing and under-developed community which helped US to promote capitalism and tried to ouster communism from those regions (Ikenberry, 2001).

The continent of Europe was also divided into both sides as the western part was allied with US but the eastern European states were under the influence of communism. The Second World War had destroyed almost whole of Europe where US provided aid to strengthen their economies. Thus both sides had reciprocal benefits. The US also helped the European states to settle their bilateral issues. In forties and fifties both Soviet Union and China were the major targets of US. That time China was not as much important concern for US as Soviet Union but the emergence of China was also critical because it had pro-communist ideology. But over the passage of time as Soviet Union was broken after the withdrawal from Afghanistan, China gradually rose as a future economic power which is now a major threat to US supremacy.

The US also got advantage of the Bretton Woods reforms and Marshall Plan to gain sympathies of more and more countries in Europe and across the globe. Soon the US dollar became the world currency and the millions of dollars were given as aid to the developing and poor countries which opted US. This aid fostered the economic growth of the allied countries. Hence, the Soviet Union was restricted to a few eastern European countries and some of the scattered allies across the globe.

Marshall Plan was constituted by the US Secretary of State George Marshall with aim to facilitate the western European countries economically. This US investment resulted in the formation of Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC). This organization estimated the total cost of Europe's recovery of \$33 billion. The US Congress allocated \$13 billion for the European recovery plan which was spent during 1948-1951. This plan helped US to integrate itself in the European continent (Sorel & Padoan, 2008).

After economic initiative, US established military alliance with its allies in the Western Europe known as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This was again the US initiative to contain the communism expansion in Europe. On the other hand, Soviet Union also initiated a military collaboration with its allies in the Eastern Europe named as Warsaw Treaty Organization. This organization could not flourish like NATO due to little interest of the member states.

In accordance, the US containment policy was successful in Europe where it integrated with its allies militarily and economically. The US fiscal aid helped the European allies to strengthen their economies and by the same token also assured their security matters through NATO. This halted the Communism infiltration in the Western Europe which confined only to the minor states in the Eastern Europe.

Another important event between capitalist US and communist Soviet Union occurred in Korea (Ernest, 1993). The North Korea was supported by Soviet Union while the South Korea was backed by US. Eventually, the Soviet policy proved successful and perhaps it was the only successful mission of the Soviet Union during the long Cold War (Curt, 2011).

After the Truman period, the US “New Look” foreign policy was introduced under the Eisenhower presidential tenure. He too prolonged the existing US containment policy and made some necessary modifications regarding the situation. Eisenhower supported his allies with conventional and nuclear forces. This period of containment is remarkable regarding the new military alliances under which different military alliances were established in the different regions especially in the Indo-Pacific region. The Eisenhower tenure is also remarkable regarding covert operations by CIA and spent a huge budget for the same purpose (Herspring, 2005). The spread of nuclear weapons was witnessed during this period as more nuclear aids and facilitations were given to the allies. Although these nuclear weapons were not used against each other but it created a strong deterrence in the global arena (Jablonsky, 2020).

The policy of “Balance of Terror” was adopted to create a mutual terror between US and Soviet Union. It shows that balance of terror policy also played a role to avoid the conventional war between the two global powers of that time (Freedman, 2004). It saved the thousands of the lives but it was only opted where it was possible otherwise US adopted every possible measure to halt the spreading of communism. In between, it may also be perceived in the meanings that both of US and Soviet Union avoided indulging in direct conventional war (Richard, 1990). After the establishment of NATO, US established many other alliances in the region. In order to defend the western region from communism the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance was formed. After the formation of different organizations in American and European continents, further US formally allied with Australia and New Zealand through ANZUS alliance in the Pacific region. Later on, the collaboration was also made with Japan, Philippines, South Korea and Taiwan. All of those countries were primarily chosen that had reservations regarding Soviet Union and China (Freedman, 2003).

The whole of the above discussion shows that US adopted all possible measures to culminate the influence of the communism over the world. US started the Soviet Union’s containment policy from the North and South American region and moved gradually to Europe, Asia, and Indo-Pacific region. US mainly chose economic, military and nuclear tools to contain the communist expansionism. US was very successful in the containment of communism as it established many successful alliances for example NATO. US continued to follow its containment policies and finally got success in 1991 when the power of communist Soviet Union was broken. After the debacle of Soviet Union, US enjoyed full fledged power over the globe as a super power. But later, China rose as another global power with its giant economic expansion. It challenged the US supremacy that once again US has to reshape its policies to control the Chinese expansionism. This competition between China and US mainly started soon after China initiated BRI (formally known as OBOR) in the middle of the previous decade.

4. BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE (BRI)

Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is a Chinese strategy to establish connectivity among the six planned corridors. According to Asian Development Bank (2017) there is need of approximately US\$ 26 trillion in Asian infrastructure development and China is the major country to help in Asian infrastructure development. On one side, BRI will help China to expand its economic and trade market with so many countries and on other side, it will boost up the political influence of China over these regions (ADB, 2017). The BRI is one of the prominent projects of China through which China is going to open the gates to new world. This is a global project which is inclined to encompass the globe through different road and maritime connections. BRI is basically an infrastructure development project which is going to help in social, economic, and political spheres (Mengzi, 2019).

The BRI was initially launched in 2013 whose key intention was to connect 50-60 (now almost 140) countries of Asia, Europe and Africa. There are two basic terms adopted in BRI i.e. “Belt” and “Road”. The Belt refers to the land routes by which the member countries will be connected and on the other side, the Road means the Maritime Silk Road including the sea and water routes. The major roads of BRI include the South China Sea and the Indian Ocean (United Nations, 2017). Belt and Road Initiative was initiated by President Xi Jinping in 2013. It reflects the progressive ambition of Xi to develop a larger infrastructure network in order to facilitate trade and economic activities. BRI is composed of land-based “Silk Road Economic Belt” and sea-based “21st Century Maritime Silk Road”. BRI includes projects related to energy, transport, information technology, and special economic zones (Joshi, 2018).

5. BRI CORRIDORS

The BRI is composed of different economic corridors in order to complete the respective aims efficiently. Following are major six economic corridors of BRI.

- China-Mongolia-Russia Corridor
- New Eurasian Land Bridge Corridor
- China-Central Asia-West Asia Corridor
- China-Pakistan Economic Corridor
- Bangladesh-China-India-Myanmar Corridor

- China-Indo-China Peninsula Corridor

5.1. BRI OBJECTIVES

According to United Nations (2017) following are some of the main objectives of BRI. It requires the collaboration of China and other participating countries to meet the objectives.

- Firstly, to boost the policy coordination
- Secondly, to advance infrastructure connectivity
- Thirdly, to strengthen trade and investment cooperation
- Fourthly, to develop financial integration
- Fifthly, to help in people-to-people collaboration

In accordance to above, BRI includes five major areas i.e. coordination, infrastructure development, trade and economic cooperation, and people to people interactions. There are more than 100 countries across the world have signed China's led BRI which is proposed to invest over US\$1 trillion by 2027 (Brookings Center, 2019). BRI is also perceived as a challenge for west especially US. US and its allies are not in the favor of increasing Chinese political and economic influence over the different regions. This is changing the world order scenario and setting new parameters for upcoming powers. The main rivalry between China and US is rising mainly in the Southeast Asia and Asia-Pacific region (Brookings Center, 2019). This also led the containment of China by the west especially US as it was carried out during the post-cold war period to contain the powers and expansion of USSR.

Today, China is the largest consumer of the energy which requires China to import almost half of her consumed oil from the regions i.e. the Middle East. This is the reason that China's 80% of the investments are related in the energy sector. In this regard, BRI is also helpful to meet the country's energy needs and will be helpful in establishing bilateral ties with Gulf region despite the enmity of US (Brookings Center, 2019). BRI is helpful in promoting Xi in the list of the most powerful leaders across the globe. BRI is the Chinese strategy to affix China in the top list of the futuristic economic and trade engagements. It is also helpful to introduce Chinese products not only in the Asia and Pacific region but in the Europe as well. It also depicts China's determination of becoming strong and influential society by 2049 (Joshi, 2018). This again articulates Chinese aspiration to become future global power. Although, in the future the world is going to be multi-polar once again yet US and many other western and European countries have qualms regarding China. They want to replace the Chinese influence prevailing in the Eurasia, Africa and Southeast Asia through substitutive projects.

BRI is a win-win game for China because it depicts the soft image of China across the globe on one side and promotion of Chinese ideas, economy and technology on the other. It is also promoting peace and cooperation among the different nations which is also one of the major aims of Chinese led BRI. With the passage of time new ideas and spheres of development are being included in BRI to overcome the other areas of development (NDRC, 2015). Port infrastructure development also has special focus in it. Ports development is significant for China because China is surrounded by seas especially the South China Sea which covers the ASEAN countries. Similarly, it is also important to develop ports because the whole Asia Pacific region is mainly linked by sea routes. Through the port development, China to going to connect the far flung countries like Indonesia and its surrounding to be economically tied (Nakano, 2019).

5.2. FINANCING OF BRI

The uniqueness of the BRI is that whole of the financing of this project is indigenous. Unlike the other such mega projects where different stakeholders participate in the financing, BRI is solely based on Chinese investors. According to Cheung et al (2016) following are some of the major financiers of BRI.

- The China Development Bank is financing in different 400 projects of worth about US\$ 110 billion.
- The Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (ICBC) is involved in almost 212 projects with worth about US\$ 67 billion.
- The Bank of China has also supported in BRI of about US\$ 100 billion during the period of 2016-18
- China Exim Bank is also another important financier of BRI and has participated in almost of 1000 different projects with worth about US\$ 80 billion.
- The Silk Road Fund also pledged for the capital of US\$ 40 billion.
- The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) also participated in the BRI project. Although its share of US\$ 2.3 billion is tinny as compared to the rest of investors, but it also financed in BRI.

5.3. WESTERN RESERVATIONS OVER BRI

China claims that BRI is a peaceful initiative which aims at bringing closer the countries of different regions and continents. According to China, BRI is committed to provide new ways to connect nations through economic and trade integration. But at the same time US National Security Strategy (2017) claims that China is portraying military capabilities in the wake of BRI. US claims that BRI provides the ways to inflict Chinese defense strategy through

these infrastructure developments. Similarly, some of other US agencies explain that China wants to displace US from the Indo-Pacific region (U.S. Office of the Secretary of Defense, 2019).

The Southeast Asian countries have also expressed their reservations regarding the expanding political influence of China. They have also prompted their concern about China's control in the South China Sea. China is the major regional power which is perceived to be dominant in nature. The Philippines ex-president Benigno Aquino III has also linked the policies of China as that of Nazi Germany's (U.S. Office of the Secretary of Defense, 2019). Being the regional power, there are a few nations of the South China Sea that challenge the supremacy of China. There is limited pressure from this region regarding the growing Chinese influence over this region. India also expresses her reservations regarding the increasing political and diplomatic control of China in South Asia (Sibal, 2014).

China has been denying the development of overseas bases. To China, the aim of BRI is to foster infrastructure and economic development. The Chinese Defense White Papers also rejected the claim of her military expansion in the wake of BRI and also has not occupied a single inch of foreign country (Christopher et al, 2014).

5.4. US PERSPECTIVE OVER BRI

It has been a long history of US to compete the global powers in the international arena. Earlier this competition was between US and Soviet Union but now the same has been initiated between China and US. China emerged as a global and economic power since the advancement of the current century but the actual competition started in the post OBOR (currently BRI) period which intended to connect the different regions of the world through land and sea routes (Blumenthal, 2018). The current US president Biden has also paid attention to Chinese containment policy as both of the countries are engaged in the long term strategic competition. BRI is Chinese led infrastructure development plan which is going to be leveled through US-led B3W initiative. BRI is the grand strategy of China to control the maximum countries through different economic and trade initiatives. At the same time, this project is of great concern for US because US is not ready to share the same powerful position with any other country. But China is perceived as a "Growing Threat" by US which is the reason that US with its allies want to contain the Chinese influence over the other regions (Rolland, 2017).

It is not surprising that the current US president is countering the Chinese policies rather the pervious president also led the similar motives against China. Donald Trump initiated the plans of Chinese containment are being followed by the Biden administration too. This war is not slowing down rather it will infiltrate more rivalries in the current decade too as the BRI is estimated to complete by 2030 and onwards (Wu 2020). The National Security Strategy (NSS) developed under the Trump reign estimated that in US is facing a great power competition in the form of China. This reported that China is/will be major strategic competitor of US in the era ahead (The White House 2017). The same picture is going on in the current scenario as China rose as the biggest counterpart of US in the terms of international relations dimensions i.e. diplomacy, war, trade and regionalism. China is going to increase its influence not only over the East Asia but encompassing the different regions of Asia, Middle East, Africa and even Europe. On the other side, US with the help of its allies wants to control the Chinese policies of controlling the different regions. If it is analyzed critically, China was not any concern for US even in the recent past. The last decade of the pervious century was a golden period for US because it was the sole superpower after the debacle of Soviets but China rose gradually as an economic bull which became a major challenge for US in the present time (Fingar 2019).

US and its allied countries showed some reservations regarding BRI and raised questions of the validity and loan schemes of BRI. On the other hand, the Chinese officials do not have such uncertainties regarding west-led B3W. According to many studies, China even wants to collaborate with its anti-group so that the developing and under-developed world may get more advantages in development sectors (Irgengioro, 2021).

The most of the critique on BRI is made in accordance to the efficiency of the projects and it is explained the debt under the BRI program is not beneficial in Africa but the concrete study shows that BRI is going in the smooth functioning. The example of Nairobi-Mombasa railway in Kenya explains the success of BRI whose 80% funding is granted by China (Barclay, 2018). Some of the other port and highway related projects are also about to complete. It again shows that China is committed to work for the physical infrastructure development which is not in favorable condition for the western countries because China is gaining superior position in African continent as well (Zhong, 2021; Muller, 2019).

All of the above mentioned studies explain that BRI is questionable regarding its loan scheme and validity of the project. But at the same time, there is community of the researchers who favors BRI because this is the hope of development in developing and poor African countries. BRI is an ongoing project that has completed many of its projects in African continent. On the other hand, B3W is just a communiqué of the G-7 countries that may take a vivid time in implementation. There is also uncertainty of B3W's funding and clarity but currently the west just presented the idea of development in the low and middle-range countries to just counter the expansion of Chinese influence over these areas.

6. BUILD BACK BETTER WORLD (B3W)

China rose as an emerging superpower especially after launching BRI (earlier OBOR). This posed some serious concerns for the rest of the global powers particularly US who tried to overcome the growing influence of China in different regions (Dissanayake, 2021). Thus, the G-7 countries put forward the idea of B3W with intention to compete Chinese BRI plan. The ultimate target of the B3W is to counter China in the international system (Dissanayake, 2021). Since the B3W has been initiated, a new wave of strategic competition has started between the west and China. With the advent of 21st century as China started to emerge as global power and US started to establish policies to tackle the Chinese expansion and B3W is also a part of the same policy.

B3W is a developmental program which was announced in the middle of 2021. It is an amalgamation of Build Back Better World (B3W), EU Global Gateway and UK Clean Green Initiative (CGI). The EU Global Gateway is committed to mobilize round about US\$ 350 billion between the years of 2021-27 whose larger share will be contributed by the private sector (Scull & Healy, 2022). Secondly, the CGI is also committed to spend about US\$ 4 billion in the field of climate change. Hence, all of the aforementioned programs collectively embrace the umbrella of B3W and dedicated to work for the development in the climate, health, infrastructure, gender equality and human infrastructure etc in the low and middle-range economies of the world (Scull & Healy, 2022). Blue Dot Network is another alliance incorporated in B3W. Under Blue Dot Network, US with alliance of Australia and Japan endeavored to motivate the private sector for the development purpose. B3W is the recent launched effort which may also include other member countries too i.e. South Korea, India and South Africa. These countries are also considered to be regional powers and can help in implementation of B3W worldwide (Wheeler, 2021).

B3W is mainly perceived as a substitute by the West to tackle the Chinese infrastructure development project BRI. B3W is chiefly supervised by the United States which intends to strive for development in the middle and low range income countries across the globe including Latin America, Southeast Asia, and Africa (Pradumna, 2021). B3W was launched in June, 2021 at the G-7 Summit. On this occasion, all of the member states of G-7 collectively announced to provide billions of the dollars for the infrastructure development where both public and private sectors will contribute for the same purpose.

B3W is going to provide a way of opportunities for the G7 nations to coordinate with one another primarily in four areas including climate, digital economy, health security and the gender equity and equality. B3W is relatively a new program hence the exact figures and data are unknown. It is also yet not so clear that what parameters ought to be adopted in articulating the program (Pradumna, 2021). The US backed B3W is aimed to provide an alternate option of China for infrastructure development in the Southeast Asia. Southeast Asia is situated in the southeast side of China where the Chinese influence is increasing day by day. B3W will help this region in providing the assistance for infrastructure development as an alternate to China.

The tactics of competition have changed in the current era. The practice of the conventional wars of competition is no more affordable. So, the big powers now enrich themselves through their ideas and developmental plans. This is the straight way to induce the adoption of soft power than hard one. B3W is also the depiction of same plan under which the US is going to influence the middle and low-range countries through their developmental ideas. Blue Dot Network has special importance in B3W by which the G-7 countries are intended to trigger the private capital for infrastructure development. At the same time, B3W also targets those regions that are under the direct influence of China i.e. Southeast Asia.

On one side, US and her allies committed to alienate Southeast Asian region from China but at the same time, the B3W member states especially US will have to think that it is not an easy task to withdraw China from this region. The basic reason is that there is not a single country of this region that can stand against China. In such circumstances, this region will remain under the Chinese pressure despite the direct investment of G-7 countries.

According to the International Energy Agency, World Economic Forum and World Bank, the ratio of investments in the clean energy in the middle and low-income economies is increasing day by day. It was about US\$ 150 billion in 2020 and estimated more than US\$ 1 trillion annually by the end of 2050. This target can be achieved through the collective efforts as are being initiated in the wake of G-7 B3W plan if it works accordingly (Scull & Healy, 2022). At the same time, the Chinese led BRI is also helpful to overcome the situation mentioned above. But on concrete basis, B3W is full of illusions because there is not any clearly mentioned framework to provide funds (TJMA 2021). It is also right that private funding will be helpful to achieve the target as mentioned in EU Global Gateway. But if the sole responsibility is laid on the shoulders of the private sector, B3W's efficiency looks void (Scull & Healy, 2022).

7. MAJOR AREAS OF B3W

Following are the broader areas of the B3W plan. All of the member countries agree to work for these areas.

- Climate
- Health & health security

- Digital technology
- Infrastructure
- Gender equality and equity
- Human infrastructure (vaccine and girls' education)

8. CHINESE CONTAINMENT BY US

There is vivid difference between the US and Chinese perspectives about BRI and B3W. According to US, China is going to control the Eurasian region through their BRI initiatives which is challenging for the developing and under-developed countries. US and its allies are against the Chinese expansionism which is being offered in the developmental projects but according to them actually China is undermining the sovereignty of the poor and developing nations through huge debt plan. But on the other hand, China portrays a clearly different point of view. According to China, BRI is helpful for the regional connectivity through the belt and route initiatives as it will help to integrate the different nations through trade and economic activities. By the same way, BRI is also helpful in promoting the regional connectivity and people-to-people interaction through land and route connectivity and promotion of tourism. In Beijing's point of view, US has initiated different global and regional plans to contain the China. US along with its allies is trying to encircle the economic, technological and ideological steps of China so that it may prevail its own plans.

The Indo-Pacific region is one of the important regions for both China and US. In the line of China, this region has much importance because it allies with the South China Sea which is directly linked with China. This region also has importance for China regarding the shipment of the raw material and oil that China imports from the Middle East and African countries. On the other side, the Indo-Pacific region is also important as the most of the countries have troubled relations with China and they are against the Chinese dominance. India, Japan and Australia are three major US allies and have dominance in somewhat context in the region. US also offers loans to the developing countries of this region for development so that Chinese plan may be substituted. The US-Japan-and India have launched Indo-Pacific Trilateral Infrastructure Forum. The basic motive of this forum is to just counter the Chinese plans through the mobilization of the private sector.

At the same time, US established another Indo-Pacific collaboration i.e. Quadrilateral Security Dialogue which is commonly known as "Quad". Quad includes US, India, Japan and Australia with major objectives to coordinate in the maritime security, anti-terrorism, cyber-security, and the inter-connectivity among the member states. The prime objective is forum is to exert pressure on their common rival China as all of the above mentioned states are against the Chinese growing influence over this region. US is far away from this region hence it is going to handle China through its allies where India is playing the significant role (Madan, 2020).

The US is not targeting China in the Asian and Indo-Pacific region only rather the European region is also underlined. In the Europe, US also supported the "Three Seas Initiative" (3SI) and promised to help the Central and Eastern Europe in energy, infrastructure and digitalization (Wemer, 2019). This project is basically launched by the EU member states including Croatia and Poland whose aim is also to counter the BRI and 17+1 cooperation of China. The 3SI including Baltic, Black and Adriatic Sea was launched in 2015 soon after China launched OBOR. The European member states endeavor to promote economic prosperity and infrastructure development in the northern-Southern sides from Baltic to Adriatic and Black Seas through this initiative. The 3SI includes twelve countries of Eastern and Central Europe (Garding & Derek, 2021).

The importance of the 3SI partnership for US is seen as President Trump himself participated in its summit in 2017 which was held in Poland. Later, in 2020 US pledged to grant US\$ 1 billion support to 3SI under the International Development Finance Corporation (DFC) (Wemer, 2019). This again shows the US containment policy which directly targets the Chinese expansionism. The international community develops the economic and diplomatic association according to their benefits the same is the case with European region too. The middle range economies of the European region prefer to gain aid and support from US than China.

9. CONCLUSION

The whole of the above discussion shows that US has adopted an offensive policy to control the expansion of its counterparts since the post-World War II. During Cold War, US made political, economic and military alliances with its allies to counter the communist policies. During this period, US started to make alliances from North America and later encompassed the South American, European and Asian regions. US primarily targeted the European continent where it established the most powerful military and economic alliances i.e. NATO and Marshall Plan but later it focused on the Muslim states in the South Asia and Middle East. SEATO and CENTO were two pacts that targeted the Soviet Union's expansionism in these areas. Although these pacts did not prove successful like NATO but both of these played a role for the containment of communism in the concerned areas. Later on, US covered the Asia-Pacific

region and allied itself with Australia and New Zealand through ANZUS. US also established relations with Japan, South Korea and Taiwan during the Cold War for the same purpose. US proved successful in the containment of Soviet Union through its above mentioned coalitions and dissolved the power of communism.

In the contemporary era, Chinese-led BRI is the world-wide project through which China is going to connect round about 140 countries through land and sea routes. According to China, BRI's primary objective is to connect more and more countries for the trade and economic activities through infrastructural development. To China, BRI is also helpful in enhancing the people-to-people contacts which is based on soft image of China. The Chinese point of view is clear and concise that China wants to help in the economic and infrastructure development of the developing countries facing the economic and technical resources (Ghiretti, 2021). But BRI is criticized regarding its loans and loan schemes as it is perceived that China is not in position to grant loans to her BRI participating countries in Africa. At the same time, the other African countries are also being scrutinized regarding loan agreements (Noah, 2021). The terms of loans under BRI are also being questionable about the interest rate. The misconceptions are also being prevailed that China will control the infrastructure in the case of default (Mitchell, 2019). In most of the cases, this is just a propaganda prevailed among the BRI participating countries so that the Chinese politico-economic expansionism can be controlled.

But contrary to Chinese perspective, US and its allies termed BRI in different way. According to them, BRI has more negative than the positive attributes as China is going to dominate the developing and low range economies through geo-political ambitions. China is granting loans on very tough conditions which are harmful for these countries. By the same way, US and its allies explain that China is expanding its military expansions through BRI. This is the reason that US is establishing alliances i.e. QUAD, Three Seas Initiative, Build Back Better World, Blue Dot Network, and AUKUS etc. to tackle the Chinese expansionism as it targeted the spread of communism during the Cold War. B3W is the major initiative which is the amalgamation of different projects established to counter the Chinese-led BRI with the assistance of G-7 countries.

But this time, US looks not as much successful as it was during the cold-war era. No doubt this time too US is forming so many military and economic alliances to counter the Chinese expansionism but BRI is working on the same speed. China is aimed to invest almost US\$1 trillion by 2050 in this project by targeting the under-developed countries mainly that need developmental assistance. Hence, this time US's counterpart China looks more successful as it alone is investing such a huge amount which is based on indigenous sources. On the other hand, the B3W is based on the investments of all G-7 countries and the private sector is also included for the investment purpose. This is the reason that China is more successful than the US and allies.

The competition between US and China is growing day by day where US has adopted the offensive point of view and employs every possible measure to control the Chinese plans i.e. BRI and 17+1. But on the other hand, the role of China is more defensive than offensive because unlike US, China desires to build a friendly fiscal and developmental program for the developing world of Eurasian region. The both of these global powers portray that they want to work for the betterment of the developing nations (Friedhoff, 2018). If both of the countries actually prefer to strive for the infrastructural, economic and technological development of the developing world, their mutual consensus will be much beneficial. The accumulative efforts of US and China will sort out the basic infrastructure and fiscal problems of the poor and developing nations.

References

- ADB. (2017). Meeting Asia's Infrastructure Needs, Asian Development Bank, www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/227496/special-report-infrastructure.pdf.
- Barclay, B. (2018). Bridging Africa's infrastructure gap. <https://www.worldfinance.com/infrastructureinvestment/project-finance/bridging-africas-infrastructure-gap>
- Blumenthal, D. (2018). Testimony before US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the China challenge, part I: economic coercion as statecraft. July 24, 2018. https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/072418_Blumenthal_Testimony.pdf
- Brookings Center. (2019). Belt and Road Initiative: China-Middle East Cooperation in an Age of Geopolitical Turbulence. Doha, Qatar December 16–17
- Cheung, T. M., T. Mahnken, D. Seligsohn, K. Pollpeter, E. Anderson, F. Yang (2016), Planning for Innovation: Understanding China's Plans for Technological, Energy, Industrial and Defence Development. University of California, Institute on Global Conflict and Co-operation. Report prepared for the *US-China Economic and Security Review Commission*.
- Christopher D. Y., Ross, R., Scott, D., & Jenny, L., (2014). Not an Idea We Have to Shun?: Chinese Overseas Basing Requirements in the 21st Century, National Defense University, Institute for National Strategic Studies, Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs, *China Strategic Perspectives* No. 7, October 2014,

- Curt, C. (2011). *NSC and the Political Economy of the Early Cold War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, R. R., & Blake, H. B. (2020). Weaponizing the Belt and Road Initiative. A Report of the *Asia Society Policy Institute*, September
- Dissanayake, E. V. A. (2021). Build Back Better World vs Belt and Road Initiative: Two Sides of a Political Coin. *Research Gate*
- Eakin, R. (2021). Build Back American Engagement with Southeast Asia: The B3W Partnership and the American Approach to Southeast Asia. *The Bush School, A & M University*, Texas.
- Edward, M. (2003). The New Great Game and the New Great Gamers: Disciples of Kipling and Mackinder. *Central Asian Survey*, 22(1), 83-102
- Ernest R. M. (ed) (1993)., *American Cold War Strategy: Interpreting NSC-68*, New York: Bedford.
- Fingar, T. (2019). Forty years of formal-but not yet normal-relations. *China International Strategy Review*;1(1):11–20.
- Freedman, (2003). *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy*, 3rd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freedman, L. (2004). *Deterrence*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Friedhoff, K. (2018). BET on Southeast Asia: bending BRI to US advantage. PacNet#50. Pacific Forum, Center for Strategic and International Studies. July 24, . <https://pacforum.org/publication/pacnet-50-bet-on-southeast-asia-bending-bri-to-us-advantage>.
- Gertz, B. (2018). US admiral outlines new military buildup to counter China. *Asia Times*. April 24. <https://asiatimes.com/US-admiral-outlines-new-military-buildup-to-counter-China>. *Asia Times*.
- Ghiretti, F. (2021). B3W: Building an Alternative to the BRI or Falling into the Same Trap? *The Diplomat* 22 June, <https://thediplomat.com/2021/06/b3w-building-an-alternative-to-the-bri-orfalling-into-the-same-trap/>
- Herspring, (2005). *The Pentagon and the Presidency: Civil–Military Relations from FDR to George W. Bush*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Hillman, J. (2018). China's Belt and Road is full of holes. CSIS Briefs.Center for Strategic and International Studies. https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/180917_ChinasBelt_final.pdf.
- Irgengioro, J. (2021). Soft Power in Central Asia: The Politics of Influence and Seduction. *Kirill Nou*. <https://oxussociety.org/soft-power-in-central-asia-the-politics-of-influence-and-seduction/>.
- Jablonsky, D. (2020). *War by Land, Sea, and Air: Dwight Eisenhower and the Concept of Unified Command*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Joshi, S. (2018). The Belt and Road Initiative Aka: One Belt One Road Scheme. *Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry*, 24th January.
- Karni, A. (2018). Trump rants behind closed doors with CEOs. *Politico*. August 8,. <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/08/08/trump-executive-dinner-bedminster-china-766609>.
- Madan, T. (2020). China is losing India. *Foreign Affairs*. June 22. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2020-06-22/china-losing-india>.
- Mengzi, F. (2019). The Belt and Road Initiative from Three Theoretical Perspectives. *CIR* March/April
- Mitchell Omoruyi, E.M. (2019). BRI Offers Development and NOT Debt Trap. *Modern Concepts & Developments in Agronomy* 4(4).
- Muller, N. (2019). The Chinese Railways Remolding East Africa. <https://thediplomat.com/2019/01/thechinese-railways-remolding-east-africa/>
- Nakano, J. (2019). Greening or Greenwashing the Belt and Road Initiative? *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, May 1.
- National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), (2015). *Vision and Actions on Jointly Building Silk Road Economic Belt and 21st-Century Maritime Silk Road*. March 28, http://en.ndrc.gov.cn/newsrelease/201503/t20150330_669367.html
- Noah, W.M. (2021). Who Will Win the Strategic Long Game? The G7's Build Back Better World or China's Belt and Road Initiative? *Sochin Research Institute Research N* (June 24th): 1–5.
- Patrick, S. M. (2018). Belt and router: China aims for tighter internet controls with digital Silk Road. Council on Foreign Relations. July 2. <https://www.cfr.org/blog/belt-and-router-china-aims-tighter-internet-controls-digital-silk-road>.
- Pradumna, B. R. (2021). G7's 'Build Back Better World': Rival to China's BRI? S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, *NTU* Singapore.
- Richard, H. (1990). *Immermann, John Foster Dulles and the Diplomacy of the Cold War*. Princeton, N.J.:Princeton University Press.
- Rolland, N. (2017). China's Belt and Road Initiative: underwhelming or game-changer? *The Washington Quarterly*, 40(1), 136–138.

- Scull, D., & Healy, C. (2022). One Vision In Three Plans: Build Back Better World & The G7 Global Infrastructure Initiatives. E3G: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep40227>
- Sibal, K. (2014). "China's Maritime 'Silk Road' Proposals Are Not as Peaceful as They Seem," *Indian Defence Review*, February 26, <http://www.indiandefencereview.com/chinas-maritime-silk-road-proposals-are-not-as-peaceful-as-they-seem/>.
- Thorne, D., & Spevack, B. (2018). Harbored ambitions: how China's port investments are strategically reshaping the Indo-Pacific. Center for Advanced Defense Studies. April 2018. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/566ef8b4d8af107232d5358a/t/5ad5e20ef950b777a94b55c3/1523966489456/Harbored+Ambitions.pdf>
- United Nations, (2017). A Study of ICT Connectivity for the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI): Enhancing the Collaboration in China-Central Asia Corridor. *Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)*.
- Wemer, D. A. (2019). The Three Seas Initiative Explained. Atlantic Council, February, 11
- White House. (2017). *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. December 2017. <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>.
- Wu, X. (2020). On China-US strategic competition. *World Economics Politics* 5:96–130.
- Yapp, M. (2001). The Legend of the Great Game. *The British Academy*.
- Zhao, M. (2021). The Belt and Road Initiative and China–US strategic competition. *China Int Strategy Rev.* 3(2), 248–60.
- Zhong, N. (2021). China Railway Construction to ramp up infrastructure in Africa. <https://global.chinadaily.com.cn/a/>