



# THE BOILING MOAT

***URGENT STEPS TO DEFEND TAIWAN***

EDITED BY  
**MATT POTTINGER**

## CHAPTER 1

# “The Stormy Seas of a Major Test”

MATT POTTINGER

*Deterrence is unlikely to be achieved by accident.*

—ROSS BABBAGE

If just one lesson could be drawn from Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, it must be that deterrence would have been a lot cheaper than war. Yet democracies seem to be getting worse at deterrence. The record of the past two years is marred with failures and signs of trouble:

- Vladimir Putin, unfazed by Washington’s threats of sanctions, assaulted the capital of Ukraine and plunged Europe into its most destructive conflict since World War II.
- Iran equipped Hamas to initiate a war with Israel and, once the war had started, mobilized several of its other terrorist proxy groups, in Lebanon, Yemen, Syria, and Iraq, to rocket Israel, attack commercial shipping in the Red Sea, threaten US warships, and strike US military positions across Iraq and Syria.<sup>1</sup>
- Beijing intensified its long-standing campaign to impose Chinese sovereignty over the South China Sea, home to some of the world’s most important international sea-lanes and fishing grounds. China is using its coast guard to block and ram Philippine vessels tasked with sustaining or regaining Manila’s administrative

control of offshore islets that Beijing claims for itself, in defiance of international norms and court rulings.

- Venezuela's dictator, who may have concluded that Washington's bark is worse than its bite, has threatened to annex much of Venezuela's oil-rich neighbor, Guyana.<sup>2</sup> In a bold reprisal of Soviet mischief in the Americas during the Cold War, Beijing is expressing sympathy for Venezuela's position while also developing Chinese intelligence facilities and a plan for a military base on Cuba.<sup>3</sup>
- North Korea, undaunted by United Nations Security Council resolutions or American sanctions, resumed testing intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) for the first time in more than five years and became a supplier of arms and munitions for Russia's war in Ukraine.<sup>4</sup>

Looming on the horizon is the specter of a conflict more consequential than all these flashpoints combined: Chinese supreme leader Xi Jinping has vowed to "reunify" Taiwan with mainland China through force of arms if necessary. Indeed, Xi's public statements about a coming "great struggle" against China's enemies provide a window into his intentions—one the world would be unwise to ignore.

More than once, Xi has described unification with Taiwan as a prerequisite for achieving his broader objectives for China on the world stage, a vision he calls "the Chinese dream for the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."<sup>5</sup> In a 2017 address to the 19th Party Congress in Beijing, Xi said that "complete national unification is an inevitable requirement for realizing the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."<sup>6</sup> In 2019 in Beijing, at the Meeting Marking the 40th Anniversary of the Issuance of the Message to Compatriots in Taiwan, he said: "The rejuvenation of the Chinese nation and reunification of our country are a surging popular trend. It is where the greater national interest lies, and it is what the people desire."<sup>7</sup> In October 2021, he delivered an address about Taiwan at the Great Hall of the People in Beijing in which he uttered the word "rejuvenation" more than two dozen times.<sup>8</sup> The implication is hard to miss: Xi is equating a failure to subsume Taiwan with a failure to enact his overarching goals as China's leader.

Although Xi has been less concrete—at least in public—about a timeline, he has exhibited an impatience that distinguishes him from his predecessors. “The issue of political disagreements that exist between the two sides must reach a final resolution, step by step, and these issues cannot be passed on from generation to generation,” Xi told an envoy from Taiwan in October 2013.<sup>9</sup> This and similar statements by Xi are a far cry from then paramount leader Deng Xiaoping’s famous line, in 1984, that China could wait “1,000 years” to unify with Taiwan if necessary.

And whereas Xi’s more immediate predecessors, Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao, framed war as something Beijing would wage in response to a declaration of independence by Taiwan, official propaganda under Xi has gone further by suggesting that force may be used to *compel* unification, not just to respond to a Taiwanese bid for formal independence.

Xi seemed to confirm this in his face-to-face meeting with US president Joe Biden in San Francisco in November 2023. According to a senior US official who briefed reporters after the summit, Xi said his “preference was for peaceful reunification but then moved immediately to conditions that the potential use of force could be utilized.”<sup>10</sup> When Biden responded by “assuring Xi that Washington was determined to maintain peace in the region,” Xi’s response was blunt. Per the US official:

President Xi responded: “Look, peace is . . . all well and good, but at some point we need to move toward resolution more generally.”<sup>11</sup>

In other words, Xi appeared to elevate the goal of unification above the goal of peace. His tough signaling extended to China’s official read-out of the meeting, which quoted Xi as follows:

The United States should embody its stance of not supporting “Taiwan independence” in concrete actions, stop arming Taiwan, and support China’s peaceful reunification. China will eventually be reunified and will inevitably be reunified.<sup>12</sup>

That may have been the first time Xi publicly called for US “support” for unifying China and Taiwan. Such language marks a fundamental revision of Beijing’s long-standing demand that Washington refrain from supporting Taiwan independence. Simply put, and contrary to the assumptions of many Western analysts, Xi’s moves aren’t aimed at maintaining the decades-old status quo in the Taiwan Strait but at ending it.

Xi knows this may require war. In key speeches over the past few years, he has admonished his party and its armed wing, the People’s Liberation Army, to prepare for a major conflict.

“In the face of major risks and strong opponents, to always want to live in peace and never want struggle is unrealistic,” Xi said in his November 2021 speech to the Sixth Plenum of the 19th Party Congress in Beijing.<sup>13</sup> “All kinds of hostile forces will absolutely never let us smoothly achieve the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation. Based on this, I have repeatedly stressed to the entire Party that we must carry out a great struggle.”<sup>14</sup>

In this seminal address, kept secret for two months before being published in a Chinese-language journal (where it was missed by Western journalists and many scholars), Xi praised then paramount leader Mao Zedong’s decision to enter the Korean War in 1950. “Facing the threat and provocation of the United States,” Mao and his comrades made the brave decision to go to war, Xi said. As he put it:

The Party Central Committee and Comrade Mao Zedong, with the strategic foresight of “by starting with one punch, one hundred punches will be avoided,” and the determination and bravery of “do not hesitate to ruin the country internally in order to build it anew,” made the historical policy decision to “resist America and aid Korea” and protect the nation.<sup>15</sup>

The language shows Xi framing Mao’s move as a preemptive attack to avoid what Xi called “the dangerous situation of ‘invaders camping at the gates.’” Xi’s choice of words was surely meant to signal his own preparedness to wage war under analogous circumstances



Xi Jinping gestures to his audience in Tiananmen Square during a July 2021 speech celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party. Xi vowed in his speech that any foreign forces trying to bully China would have their heads bashed bloody against a Great Wall of steel. *Ju Peng/Xinhua via Getty Images*

and, chillingly, his tolerance for risking national “ruin” as the price of victory over China’s enemies. “No matter how strong the enemy is, how difficult the road, or how severe the challenge, the Party is always completely without fear, never retreats, does not fear sacrifice, and is undeterrable,” he said.<sup>16</sup>

While the speech’s description of the United States as an enemy was made in a historical context, Xi has more recently cast Washington as China’s explicit, present-day adversary. “Western countries headed by the United States have implemented containment from all directions, encirclement and suppression against us, which has brought unprecedented severe challenges to our country’s development,” Xi said in a March 2023 address.<sup>17</sup> That address was one of four made by Xi that month in which he underscored the need to prepare for war.<sup>18</sup>

In the first of the addresses, to delegates of the National People’s Congress on March 5, Xi said China must end its reliance on imports of grain and manufactured goods. “In case we’re short of either, the international market will not protect us,” Xi declared. In a speech the following day, he urged his listeners to “dare to fight, and be good

at fighting.”<sup>19</sup> On March 8, he unveiled to an audience of generals a National Defense Education campaign to unite society behind the military, invoking as inspiration the Double Support Movement, a 1943 campaign for society-wide militarization.<sup>20</sup> In the fourth speech, on March 13, Xi announced that the “unification of the motherland” was the “essence” of his great rejuvenation campaign—a formulation that exceeded even his previous statements calling unification a “requirement” for China’s rejuvenation.<sup>21</sup>

In light of all this, the world should regard gravely Xi’s exhortation, contained in his “work report” to the 20th Party Congress in October 2022, that the Chinese Communist Party must prepare to undergo “the stormy seas of a major test.”

These statements, it is important to understand, weren’t propaganda meant for Western ears. They were authoritative instructions delivered by Xi to the Chinese Communist Party. They are taken seriously by the country’s governing apparatus. We should give them at least the same weight that analysts ascribe to leaked Oval Office conversations about war and peace.<sup>22</sup>



This book offers practical and feasible steps that democracies should pursue urgently to deter Xi from triggering a catastrophic war over Taiwan.

The book focuses mainly on the military dimension. This isn’t because economic, financial, informational, and diplomatic tools are unimportant when trying to dissuade adversaries; it’s because they have little chance of succeeding in the absence of credible hard power—the sine qua non for effective deterrence.<sup>23</sup>

The book singles out Xi Jinping personally as the object of deterrence and for good reason: After more than a decade of consolidation and centralization of power, no other decision maker counts nearly so much as Xi when it comes to questions of war and peace. His personal assumptions about China’s chances in a conflict, and about the intentions and capabilities of Taiwan and the United States and its allies,

are key variables informing his calculus on whether to wage war. As the Australian strategist Ross Babbage reminds us in chapter 12, “deterrence involves using one’s actions to deliver the strongest possible psychological impact on the opposing decision-making elite so as to persuade them to desist, delay, or otherwise alter their operations to one’s advantage.” In today’s China, the “decision-making elite” more or less boils down to one man.

The steps called for in this book are meant to be adopted *now*. The coauthors call for marshaling technologies and weapons systems that, for the most part, already exist in the arsenals of the United States and its partners or have been developed and tested and are eligible for production and procurement. The biggest challenges are

1. insufficient stockpiles of munitions, such as antiship missiles, and the means to produce more of them rapidly; and
2. insufficient planning, training, rehearsals, and coordination within and between the United States, Taiwan, and other threatened democracies.

The coauthors believe that if democracies rush to implement the recommendations in this book over the next twenty-four months, we will have a better shot at deterring a Taiwan war through the end of this decade, after which newer weapons systems may enter democratic arsenals that can, if we play our cards wisely, deepen the allied “offset” of China’s growing military juggernaut.

If we do succeed at deterring Xi for the remainder of the 2020s, it will be thanks largely to “legacy” military systems—not futuristic programs that have yet to bear fruit. General Christopher G. Cavoli, America’s senior military officer in Europe, said one of the lessons of the Ukraine war is that “kinetic effects are what determine results . . . and the majority of kinetic effects are from legacy systems. So don’t ‘sunset’ legacy systems prematurely while awaiting the ‘sunrise’ of next-generation capabilities. Otherwise, we’ll be left stranded at midnight.”<sup>24</sup>

This means democracies must increase their defense spending sharply to keep key legacy systems working and to scale up the



production of munitions while we research and develop new systems. The US military has a smaller active-duty force today than at any time since the early stages of World War II.<sup>25</sup> The US defense budget, adjusted for inflation, is shrinking at a time when wars are proliferating. As a percentage of GDP, US annual defense spending today (at 3.1 percent) is less than half what it was at the peak of the Reagan administration (6.8 percent), which presided over the most decisive decade of the Cold War without the need for a direct conflict with the Soviet Union.<sup>26</sup> These statistics suggest Washington is forgetting the hardest lessons of the twentieth century—the ones that were written in blood.

Bolstering deterrence in the face of China's *Wehrmacht* can appear daunting. Yet China's vulnerabilities are many. It may now have the world's largest navy, but its surface vessels (without which it cannot secure military control of Taiwan) would be ripe targets in a war—not only for American attack submarines, but for US heavy bombers that can reach the Western Pacific in hours and launch fusillades of anti-ship missiles from a relatively safe distance. (This is why, in chapter 7, we argue for the US Air Force to prepare for a more central role in a Taiwan contingency than its current priorities suggest.)

China may have a large arsenal of antiship ballistic missiles to keep US aircraft carriers at bay, but Washington has formidable allies in the region that could help thwart Beijing's war aims if they joined an effort to defend Taiwan. This is why we argue, in chapter 10, for Tokyo to publicly embrace the near inevitability that it would be compelled to fight in the event China attacks Taiwan. A clear statement of intentions by Japan now, in peacetime, would reduce the odds of a war by helping to dispel wishful thinking in Beijing that Tokyo would remain passive.

China may be physically close to Taiwan, but geography offers asymmetric advantages for the defender too. Taiwan's mountainous coastline, poor landing beaches, and urban sprawl present foreboding challenges for an invader. A favored metaphor in Taiwan is that it should adopt the strategy of a porcupine, making itself unappetizing or, if that fails, fatal to a hungry predator.

But the real blessing for Taiwan is the strait that separates it from China. The Han dynasty statesman Kuai Tong advised that even a

powerful army should refrain from attacking well-defended border cities protected by "metal ramparts and boiling moats." Taiwan, the United States, and key US allies should embrace a "boiling moat strategy." The Chinese military's center of gravity in a Taiwan war would be its naval forces. The Taiwan Strait would be its graveyard. This book encapsulates that approach.

Some related themes run throughout this book.

*1. The future of democracy, sovereignty, and prosperity in Taiwan matters for the future of democracy, sovereignty, and prosperity in Asia and beyond.*

It is tempting to imagine that the ripple effects from Beijing subjugating Taiwan could be contained, especially if the island were coercively annexed without a wider and highly destructive war. After all, there were dire predictions in the 1960s and 1970s about what a US loss in Vietnam would spell for the future of Asia and for American power in the region—predictions that never came to pass. "Domino theory" didn't play out and communism didn't spread from Indochina. In the decades after Saigon fell in the spring of 1975, US economic and political influence actually *grew* in Asia, even as Washington's military footprint decreased in the region.

But this is the wrong analogy. A more apt precedent would be Imperial Japan's aggression and brief domination of the Asia-Pacific in the first half of the 1940s as Tokyo foisted its Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere upon hundreds of millions of unwilling subjects. Xi Jinping, in a landmark speech in Shanghai in 2014, even declared, "It is for the people of Asia to run the affairs of Asia, solve the problems of Asia, and uphold the security of Asia"—a formulation eerily similar to the "Asia for Asians" slogan Tokyo adopted in 1940 when it set out to impose its concept of a self-contained, regional economic and security bloc controlled by Japan.<sup>27</sup>

As Gabriel B. Collins, Andrew S. Erickson, and I argue in chapter 2, "Taiwan: The Stakes," the subjugation of the island nation by Beijing would have profound ramifications for geopolitics, trade, nuclear proliferation, and technology. Taipei's fall would represent much more

than a mere Vietnam-style unification; it would herald the dawn of a new empire—one that would suit Beijing’s brand of muscular authoritarianism and strongly disfavor the interests of the United States and its fellow democracies. The coercive annexation of Taiwan, even in the absence of an American intervention, would not alleviate Sino-American tensions but would supercharge them.

*2. Long-term deterrence won’t be achieved haphazardly as a by-product of other defense objectives; it will be achieved when it is the primary goal.*

A long and sorry tradition of underestimating Beijing’s capabilities and intentions is giving way to sober new analyses in Taipei, Tokyo, Canberra, and Honolulu, home to the US Indo-Pacific Command. In Washington, the bromide that “war isn’t in Beijing’s interest” is also finally, if slowly, beginning to subside.

Even so, the coauthors of this book—who hail from seven democracies and include former elected leaders, policymakers, flag officers, combat veterans, strategists, and scholars—are alarmed by what we see as deficient planning, training, equipping, and coordinating for a crisis over Taiwan. The often parochial and ill-coordinated defense budgets requested by allied military services and voted on by our legislatures leave the impression that deterrence is at best a secondary objective, something leaders evidently hope to achieve by accident or on the cheap. This thinking must change, and fast.

So must the absence of top civilian leaders from tabletop exercises and other rehearsals for war. The decisions that the president of the United States makes in the first few hours of a Taiwan war could be decisive, as Robert Haddick, Mark Montgomery, and Isaac “Ike” Harris argue in chapter 7. As commander in chief, the president, along with his top aides, should participate in exercises covering a wide range of scenarios to test the consequences of various decisions so the president can be confident and swift in wartime. The elected leaders of Taiwan, Japan, Australia, and other democracies should follow suit.

We believe that Xi Jinping, contrary to his declaration that the Chinese Communist Party is “undeterrable,” can be persuaded that

a decision to wage war over Taiwan would be a grave miscalculation. Xi has demonstrated an appetite for risk, but his record isn't that of a reckless gambler. Even so, we believe time is running short to halt—and hopefully reverse—the erosion of deterrence.

***3. The United States and its allies must urgently expand their capacity for making munitions.***

Taiwan and its partners must have enough munitions not only to deny Beijing a speedy victory but also to continue fighting in case Xi chooses to wage a protracted war. At present, democracies may lack sufficient munitions for *either* scenario. The preexistence of industrial capacity for making these weapons will be a crucial element of effective deterrence.

One silver lining is that in war, time tends to be a better friend to the defender than to the aggressor. “An offensive war requires above all a quick, irresistible decision,” the Prussian strategist Carl von Clausewitz wrote in his classic *On War*. “Any kind of interruption, pause, or suspension of activity is inconsistent with the nature of offensive war.” If Beijing stumbles in its initial onslaught, Taiwan will have a much better chance at winning a conflict. It would be a shame for Taiwan to make it that far only to fail in a follow-on, protracted phase of war because democracies didn't have the foresight to invest enough in military manufacturing.

Admiral Yoji Koda, author of chapter 11 and a former commander of the Japanese fleet, told me that Americans often consider the June 1942 Battle of Midway to be the decisive naval engagement of World War II. Japanese military historians don't all see it that way, he said. Rather, it was the months of sea battles that followed, many of them without names, during which the US armed forces decisively wore down the Imperial Japanese Navy thanks to superior production of ships, munitions, aircraft, and incremental technologies, such as those that gave the Americans an edge in nighttime combat. This “War of the Destroyers,” as Koda calls it, was more costly to Japan than the Battle of Midway. The United States and Japan—now great allies—should be aiming together for a capacity to win wars, not just battles. The deterrence of Beijing depends on it.

*4. A Nation's will to fight is the great "X factor" in war, and it can be strengthened by courageous leaders.*

Ukrainians have demonstrated what a people can accomplish when they and their leaders embrace the will to fight. They repelled Russian armored columns in early 2022 that friends and enemies alike assumed would overrun Kyiv in a matter of days, and they have persevered in holding off their much larger foe for more than two years since then. But the will to fight is less tangible than bombers and antiship missiles, submarines and torpedoes, sea mines and combat drones. In advance of war, national will is hard to measure.

This book argues that Taiwan must adopt a new military culture. Although the United States can and should play a leading role assisting Taiwan with this cultural transition, the US military shouldn't be the model Taiwan aspires to. Taiwan would do better transplanting cultural elements from other nations that, like itself, face steep odds. Think Estonia, Finland, Ukraine, and Israel.

In June 2023, I accompanied Israeli retired military officers and national security officials to Taiwan for exchanges with senior military officers and civilian leaders. The Israelis described how young men and women in Israel participate in multiyear compulsory military service. They described a reserve force that is much smaller than Taiwan's but that serves as the mainstay of Israel's defense, with more frequent and realistic training than takes place in Taiwan's reserves. They described how military service is held in high esteem across Israeli society. Israel has, without any formal alliances, won every war it has fought since the 1940s, despite facing numerically superior and technologically sophisticated enemies.

Since the Hamas attacks of October 7, 2023, the benefits of Israel's warrior ethos have been on display again as Israelis have unified, despite bitter domestic political differences, to wage a war to destroy Hamas. The authors of chapter 4, including an Israeli combat veteran whose children are fighting today against Hamas and Hezbollah, argue for Taiwan to compensate for its lack of geographic depth by cultivating greater *social* depth—that is, a more strategic culture.

Taiwan’s partners need to be clear-eyed, too, about what would be required of them to break a Chinese blockade or repel an invasion. What the American people must sacrifice to win a Taiwan war will be far greater than the indirect support they have, to date, provided to Ukraine. There is simply no realistic hope that Taiwan can hold out for long against China without America committing directly to the fight. If America’s support for Ukraine today is analogous to its indirect support for the United Kingdom and other allies through its Lend-Lease program in 1941, US support for Taiwan amid a Chinese attack would be more akin to its direct participation in the 1950–53 Korean War.

This makes preventing war all the more desirable and important. Yet the 1930s-style isolationism that has infected pockets of the political discourse in America and Europe bodes ill for deterrence. The only antidote for isolationism—other than war—is morally courageous leadership. In this sense, it isn’t only Taiwan that has some soul-searching to do. Fortunately, America can look to its own history to find inspirational episodes and archetypal leaders: the America of the early 1940s under Roosevelt; the America of the late 1940s under Truman; the America of the 1950s under Eisenhower; the America of the early 1960s under Kennedy; and the America of the 1980s under Reagan.



A closing word about deterrence in the context of multiple, simultaneous conflicts.

On October 19, 2023—at a moment when Israel was fighting on multiple fronts, US forces and Iranian proxies were exchanging fire in Syria and Iraq, Ukraine was approaching the two-year mark of its war for national survival, and North Korea was funneling arms and munitions into Putin’s war machine—President Biden summarized the stakes in a sobering Oval Office address. “We’re facing an inflection point in history—one of those moments where the decisions we make today are going to determine the future for decades to come,” he said in his opening line.<sup>28</sup>

Biden made no mention of China in the speech. Yet Beijing serves as a propaganda engine for, and the primary economic and diplomatic sponsor of, the revanchist autocracies that Biden did single out in his address: Russia, Iran, and North Korea.

While Beijing often hides the extent of its support for Moscow, Tehran, and Pyongyang, the fig leaf is wearing thin. The aims and actions of these four regimes are increasingly interrelated, as exemplified by Xi's "no-limits" pact with Putin on the eve of Russia's 2022 re-invasion of Ukraine, and by Moscow's "trilateral" meeting with senior leaders from Iran and the terrorist group Hamas less than three weeks after the massacre of more than 1,200 Israelis on October 7, 2023.

Whether Xi is acting opportunistically or according to a grand design (or, more likely, both), it is clear he sees advantage in the compounding crises on multiple continents—crises that run the risk of exhausting the United States and its allies and setting the table for a possible move on Taiwan.

Indeed, Xi has made statements over the past few years that suggest he would agree with Biden that the world has reached a historic inflection point. The difference is that, from Xi's perspective, this is good news.

"Since the most recent period, the most important characteristic of the world is, in a word, 'chaos,' and this trend appears likely to continue," Xi told a seminar of high-level officials in January 2021.<sup>29</sup> Xi made clear that this was a useful development. "The times and trends are on our side," Xi continued. "Overall the opportunities outweigh the challenges."

Official texts make clear that this is a moment Xi has been long preparing for. A 2018 military textbook on Xi Jinping Thought, stamped "internal use only," states the following:

The world is now undergoing a transition so massive that nothing like it has ever been seen before. At its core, this transition is being driven by the following changes: The United States is becoming weak. China is becoming strong. Russia is becoming aggressive. And Europe is becoming chaotic. . . . The Chinese

nation-state is rising and the Chinese ethnos is resurgent. This is an historic turning point.<sup>30</sup>

Xi has since cast himself not just as a beneficiary of the current situation but as an *architect*. In March 2023, more than a year into Russia's full-scale assault on Ukraine, Xi visited Moscow to strengthen his cooperation with Vladimir Putin. As he bade farewell to Putin at the Kremlin, Xi was captured on video telling his host: "Right now there are changes, the likes of which we haven't seen for 100 years, and we are the ones driving these changes together."<sup>31</sup>

Any realistic and effective strategy for deterring Beijing cannot be crafted in a silo, isolated from the conflicts in Europe and the Middle East. Because the crises are interrelated, so must be the responses to them. That deterrence failed in Ukraine and Israel means it stands a greater chance of failing in Taiwan. Some will argue that effective deterrence of Beijing must entail de-prioritizing US support for Ukraine or Israel or other partners. No doubt, prioritization (and de-prioritization) are the essence of strategy.<sup>32</sup> Given the stakes involved, along with the fact that US forces would have to intervene directly and fight to prevent Taiwan's defeat in a war, there should be little question that the preponderance of American military focus should be on acquiring the means to deter and, if necessary, defeat China in war.

But any strategy that underplays the conflicts in Europe and the Middle East risks inadvertently deepening those crises and inviting aggression elsewhere. That would leave us with more of the global "chaos" that Xi clearly values and would fuel perceptions of democratic weakness. It would be hard for even the most robust China-centric defense policy to remain credible under such conditions.

There is an opportunity now to thread this strategic needle. To the fortune of democracies everywhere, the people of Ukraine and Israel have demonstrated their will and ability to fight their wars without asking any third country to sacrifice their own troops. Robust support for them by fellow democracies, through financial assistance and the provision of weapons and ammunition, would seem both economical and prudent, particularly when contrasted with the far greater



costs—in lives and treasure—that would be required if either of those nations fell.

By raising defense spending (calculated as a percentage of GDP) to the average levels of the Cold War, the United States, Europe, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and other allies can serve as a new Arsenal of Democracy, counterbalancing the arsenals of autocracy played by Iran, North Korea, and, above all, China. Using government spending to catalyze private industry in unorthodox ways could result in a rapid scaling up of munitions and armaments production, much as Washington's 2020 Operation Warp Speed collaboration with private companies produced hundreds of millions of COVID-19 vaccines in record time.

Such an undertaking would have the benefit of resupplying our partners for their defensive wars in Europe and the Middle East, while simultaneously creating the military stockpiles needed to deter Beijing. There is evidence already that US support for Ukraine has in some respects *improved* US procurement for a war with China, by forcing the Department of Defense to kick-start manufacturing lines and replace old munitions and equipment with new inventory.<sup>33</sup>

The clock is ticking. While diplomacy and public statements have an important place in a well-crafted policy of deterrence, unmistakable strength in the form of military hard power is the key to persuading China to refrain from setting off a geopolitical catastrophe over Taiwan. This is what kept the Cold War cold in the last century. This is what can keep Xi from rolling the iron dice of war in this one.

## NOTES

1. Michael R. Gordon, Nancy A. Youssef, and Gordon Lubold, "Iranian-Backed Militias Mount New Wave of Attacks as U.S. Supports Israel," *Wall Street Journal*, updated October 24, 2023; Lara Seligman, "US Officials Frustrated by Biden Administration's Response to Attacks in the Red Sea," *Politico*, December 4, 2023; Lara Seligman, "Pentagon Chief Heads to Middle East as Attacks on US Forces Spike," *Politico*, December 13, 2023.
2. Alexandra Sharp, "Why Is Venezuela Threatening a Land-Grab War in Latin America?," *Foreign Policy*, December 7, 2023; Kejal Vyas, "Venezuela Ramps Up Threat to Annex Part of Guyana," *Wall Street Journal*, December 5, 2023;

- Kiana Wilburg, Vivian Sequera, and Julia Symmes Cobb, “Guyana, Venezuela Agree to Not Use Force or Escalate Tensions in Esequibo Dispute,” Reuters, December 14, 2023.
3. “凤凰卫视, “#委内瑞拉就与圭亚那领土争端举行公投#, 委方: 争议领土150年前被不当掠夺,” *Weibo*, December 3, 2023, <https://archive.ph/Jw3e5>; “美国介入? 外媒: 美军南方司令部将与圭亚那国防军举行联合空中军演,” *Global Times*, December 8, 2023, <https://archive.ph/Vz02k>; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “2023年12月6日外交部发言人汪文斌主持例行记者会,” December 6, 2023, <https://archive.ph/FLZAr>; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “2023年12月15日外交部发言人毛宁主持例行记者会,” December 15, 2023, <https://archive.ph/kSZTt>; Warren P. Strobel, Gordon Lubold, Vivian Salama, and Michael R. Gordon, “Beijing Plans a New Training Facility in Cuba, Raising Prospect of Chinese Troops on America’s Doorstep,” *Wall Street Journal*, updated June 20, 2023.
  4. Jeff Mason, “White House Accuses North Korea of Providing Russia with Weapons,” Reuters, October 13, 2023.
  5. The Chinese phrase 中华民族 (*zhonghua minzu*), often translated as “Chinese nation,” is central to modern Chinese nationalism, simultaneously connoting a national, ethnic, and racial community. The Chinese Communist Party uses the phrase to encompass people within China and people of Chinese descent worldwide. In his speeches, Xi distinguishes between the terms 民族 (*minzu*), or “nation,” and 国家 (*guojia*), which means “state” or “nation-state.”
  6. At the 19th Party Congress, Xi said: “实现祖国完全统一, 是实现中华民族伟大复兴的必然要求.” Communist Party Members Network, “习近平: 决胜全面建成小康社会 夺取新时代中国特色社会主义伟大胜利—在中国共产党第十九次全国代表大会上的报告,” October 18, 2017, <http://archive.today/MGZKr>.
  7. “现场实录”习近平: 在《告台湾同胞书》发表40周年纪念会上的讲话,” Xinhua News Agency, January 2, 2019, <http://archive.today/fwH4r>.
  8. See “习近平在纪念辛亥革命110周年大会上的讲话(全文),” October 9, 2021, archived at <http://archive.today/u0CxM>.
  9. “两岸长期存在的政治分歧问题终归要逐步解决, 总不能将这些问题一代一代传下去,” 习近平: 政治问题不能一代一代传下去,” *China News*, October 7, 2013, archived at <http://archive.today/pVrSw>.
  10. Jeff Mason and Trevor Hunnicutt, “Xi Told Biden Taiwan Is Biggest, Most Dangerous Issue in Bilateral Ties,” Reuters, November 15, 2023.
  11. Mason and Hunnicutt, “Xi Told Biden.”
  12. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “习近平同美国总统拜登举行中美元首会晤,” press release, November 16, 2023, <https://archive.ph/OJ9JW>.
  13. Xi Jinping, “以史为鉴、开创未来 埋头苦干、勇毅前行,” *Qiushi*, January 1, 2022, <https://archive.ph/3kxGX>.
  14. Xi, “以史为鉴.”
  15. Xi, “以史为鉴.”

16. Xi, “以史为鉴.”
17. John Pomfret and Matt Pottinger, “Xi Jinping Says He Is Preparing China for War,” *Foreign Affairs*, March 29, 2023.
18. Pomfret and Pottinger, “Xi Jinping Says.”
19. Pomfret and Pottinger, “Xi Jinping Says.”
20. Pomfret and Pottinger, “Xi Jinping Says.”
21. Pomfret and Pottinger, “Xi Jinping Says.”
22. Matt Pottinger, Matthew Johnson, and David Feith, “Xi Jinping in His Own Words: What China’s Leader Wants—and How to Stop Him from Getting It,” *Foreign Affairs*, November 30, 2022.
23. For a useful and creative exploration of new financial tools the United States could develop to strengthen deterrence of Beijing, see Hugo Bromley and Eyck Freymann’s forthcoming report “On Day 1: An Economic Contingency Plan for a Taiwan Crisis,” expected from Hoover Institution Press in 2024.
24. General Christopher G. Cavoli, private presentation attended by author, May 2023. The quotation is used with permission of General Cavoli.
25. Leo Shane III, “Amid Recruiting Woes, Active Duty End Strength to Drop Again in 2024,” *Military Times*, December 14, 2023.
26. The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (CSBA) puts Department of Defense spending in FY 1983–85 at 6.7 percent of GDP, and the Office of Management and Budget historical tables put FY 2022 defense and international spending at 3.4 percent of GDP. Katherine Blakely, “Defense Spending in Historical Context: A New Reagan-esque Buildup?,” Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, November 8, 2017; Office of Management and Budget, “Table 14.5—Total Government Expenditures by Major Category of Expenditure as Percentages of GDP: 1948–2022,” Historical Tables, accessed December 22, 2023.
27. “Criticising ‘Asia for Asians,’ Jaishankar Says ‘Narrow Asian Chauvinism’ against Regional Interests,” *The Wire*, August 30, 2022.
28. White House, “Remarks by President Biden on the United States’ Response to Hamas’s Terrorist Attacks Against Israel and Russia’s Ongoing Brutal War Against Ukraine,” press release, October 20, 2023.
29. Xi Jinping, “把握新发展阶段, 贯彻新发展理念, 构建新发展格局,” *Qiushi*, April 30, 2021, <https://archive.ph/negvH#selection-73.1-73.24>.
30. Ren Tianyou and Zhao Zhouxian, eds., *Strategic Support for Achieving the Great Chinese Resurgence* (Beijing: National Defense University Press, 2018), 217. Originally cited, with a slightly different translation, in Ian Easton, *The Final Struggle: Inside China’s Global Strategy* (Manchester, UK: Eastbridge Books, 2022), 115.

31. “China’s Xi Tells Putin of ‘Changes Not Seen for 100 Years,’” Al Jazeera, March 22, 2023.
32. For an exploration of strategic de-prioritization in statecraft, see A. Wess Mitchell, Jakub Grygiel, Elbridge A. Colby, and Matt Pottinger, *Getting Strategic Deprioritization Right*, prepared by the Marathon Initiative for the Office of Net Assessment, US Department of Defense, June 26, 2023.
33. Marc A. Thiessen, “Ukraine Aid’s Best-Kept Secret: Most of the Money Stays in the U.S.A.,” *Washington Post*, November 29, 2023.