

CHINA'S GLOBAL PORT EXPANSION:

A Maritime Security Threat to U.S. Geographic Combatant Commands

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 24-03-2020		2. REPORT TYPE FINAL		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) N/A	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE CHINA'S GLOBAL PORT EXPANSION: A Maritime Security Threat to U.S. Geographic Combatant Commands				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER N/A	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER N/A	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER N/A	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel Marshalee E. M. Clarke, USMC				5d. PROJECT NUMBER N/A	
				5e. TASK NUMBER N/A	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER N/A	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Writing & Teaching Excellence Center Naval War College 686 Cushing Road Newport, RI 02841-1207				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER N/A	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) N/A	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) N/A	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; Distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES A paper submitted to the faculty of the NWC in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the curriculum. The contents of this paper reflect my own personal views and are not necessarily endorsed by the NWC or the Department of the Navy.					
14. ABSTRACT In October 2013, the Maritime Silk Road focused primarily on the Western Pacific and the Indian Ocean; however, by 2020, port development interests expanded to the South Pacific, the Mediterranean, and the Atlantic with access to an extensive network of sea lines of communication. China's activities invite concerns regarding maritime security in each geographic combatant commands' area of responsibility. With a network of ports in 69 countries, China has become a serious threat to U.S. maritime superiority. The dual-use potential of these ports manifests as the COCOMs' greatest threat, the "civ-mil port conversion." This paper reviews the commercial, political, and military objectives of Beijing's port acquisition in a global strategic context, identifies three risks to COCOMs associated with Chinese port infrastructure projects, and examines China's acquisition of or access to global strategic locations within each COCOM. The main conclusion is ports 1) being operated, funded, and built by a Chinese firm, 2) ports where China owns over 50 percent equity shares, and or 3) ports in strategic locations are vulnerable to exploitation by China as strategic weapons during times of conflict or political impasse.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS (Key words) China, Civ-Mil Port Conversion, Combatant Commands, Maritime Security, Maritime Silk Road					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: UNCLASSIFIED			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT N/A	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Director, Writing Center
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 401-841-6499

Introduction

Conversations about maritime security often provoke interests in piracy, illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, and other threats to the blue economy. However, as the discussion of great power competition matures, China's practice of economic statecraft is now a threat to maritime security. Since 2013, China has exercised strategic patience in acquiring global support for the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). A key component of the BRI is the Maritime Silk Road (MSR), which is Beijing's strategy to enhance global connectivity through port development. In October 2013, the MSR focused primarily on the Western Pacific and the Indian Ocean; however, by 2020, port development interests expanded to the South Pacific, the Mediterranean, and the Atlantic with access to an extensive network of sea lines of communication (SLOCs). China's activities invite concerns regarding maritime security in each geographic combatant commands' (COCOM) area of responsibility (AOR).¹ With a network of ports in strategic locations, China has become a serious threat to U.S. maritime superiority.

The dual-use potential of these ports manifests as the COCOMs' greatest threat, the "civ-mil port conversion." Civ-mil port conversion is the conversion of a civilian port to military infrastructure or to routinely use a commercial port for military benefit. Chinese Academy of Social Sciences scholar Zhang Jie highlights the steps to achieve the civ-mil port conversion in stating that, China should

Use main ports as investment points, use local resources, establish an economic development zone, complete steel industry, shipbuilding industry, mineral processing industry... [and] make these ports gradually possess the capability for offering logistical support to Chinese vessels and become China's strategic support points in Southeast Asia to create an advantageous external environment for China's rise.²

In three sections, this paper reviews the commercial, political, and military objectives of Beijing's port acquisition in a global strategic context, identifies three risks to COCOMs

associated with Chinese port infrastructure projects³, and examines China's acquisition of or access to global strategic locations within each COCOM.

China's Port Expansion Objectives

Beijing's port investments achieve three objectives: to gain a commercial, political, and military foothold in specific strategic locations around the globe. Commercially, ports are used to establish a gateway for trade and economic development using investment, loans, and financial aid. The Economist Intelligence Unit noted that "besides facilitating trade, ports provide broader economic value, such as valuable data on logistics and the local economy."⁴ These data help China determine which countries are likely to benefit from and would be less resistant to Chinese partnership on future infrastructure development projects. In addition to providing economic benefits to both China and the host country, these partnerships also serve as a "release valve" for China's construction and machinery sectors, which suffer from domestic overcapacity.⁵ Port construction affords China the opportunity to export domestic capacity (labor and equipment) to other global economies.

In addition to establishing a commercial foothold, the second objective is to use port investments to gain political leverage and expand political influence in new regions of the world. China's success in port development is attributed to the manner in which it, initially, respectfully interacts with future business partners and political influencers. For example, since 2000, President Xi visited Latin America six times with frequent engagements in Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Chile, and Mexico. In July 2014, he conducted a 10-day visit to Latin America with 70 bilateral and multilateral meetings with more than 20 heads of states or governments and signing over 150 contracts totaling an estimated \$70 billion.⁶ Similarly, over the past ten years, China's top leadership (the president, premier and foreign minister) made a total of 79 visits to 43

different African countries and visited 26 of the total 33 African countries classified as least developed by the United Nations.⁷ These visits eventually translate to commercial contracts with diplomatic ties that are further matured to gain political leverage.

China's third objective of port investment projects is to use commercial and political currency to facilitate People's Liberation Army (PLA) mobility also known as "strategic delivery."⁸ According to the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,

China's growing economic strength and overseas strategic interests and commitments, such as the [BRI] and peacekeeping operations, are providing impetus for the PLA's development of strategic delivery capabilities and overseas bases. The PLA considers a strategic delivery capability as a strategic deterrent, an important factor in determining the outcome of a war, an important requirement enabling overseas logistic support and joint operations, and an important means for gaining global influence... The threat to U.S. and allied interests globally will likely increase in the future, as the PLA's joint logistics, strategic delivery, and integrated joint operations capabilities and experience increase both quantitatively and qualitatively, combined with Beijing's more aggressive strategy.⁹

Similar to other world powers, The Economist Intelligence Unit noted that China recognizes the "strategic advantages [of] port investment... as they bring with them tighter control of key sea lanes and energy supply routes."¹⁰ Commercial ports serve the dual purpose of facilitating trade and providing the People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) access to key areas and mobility across the globe.¹¹ The possibility of dual-use facilities is evidenced by Djibouti serving as home to a contingent of the PLAN. Similarly, PLAN port visits, also serve as confirmation that the PLAN deploys to ports in advance of contractual negotiations to assess strategic locations for future investment, as well as during and post construction.¹² For example, China Harbor Engineering Company (CHEC) signed the Port of Walvis Bay's New Container Terminal construction contract in November 2013¹³ and while under construction, the 16th escort task force visited in June 2014.¹⁴ Correspondingly, China started contractual negotiations for the Lagos, Nigeria Lekki Deep Sea Port in 2012¹⁵, followed by the 16th escort task force visit in May 2014¹⁶, then the 28th escort task force visit in May 2018¹⁷, consequently followed by a \$629

million agreement in 2019 to build, fund, and operate the port.¹⁸ From 2014 to 2018, five different PLAN task force made a total of 16 visits to nine different African countries.¹⁹ As of 2020, eight of the nine countries are engaged in port contracts or contract negotiations for a total of 13 different port projects with four completed. According to Timothy Heath, “analysts have noted a strong correlation between where Chinese antipiracy warships have docked ashore and Chinese-funded port development projects in South Asia, the Middle East, and Africa.”²⁰ Attention to China’s port visits pre and post construction highlight the value of commercial port investments as a strategic advantage over the U.S., resulting in significant risks for the COCOMs.

Risks Associated with Port Investment Projects

As China works to achieve its three objectives of gaining a commercial, political, and then a military foothold, there are three risks to the COCOMs associated with port investment projects. First, China could potentially restrict access to its rivals in two ways. China could use restrictive contractual terms to prevent competitors from engaging in contractual negotiations for similar projects in the same country. Even if China fails to complete a particular project as agreed, it could hold true to the terms of restricting competition within the respective country to block third party involvement. Additionally, based on China’s equity shares, it could also restrict access to adversaries during times of military conflict or political impasse. For example, with a 50-year contract granting control of the entry and exit points of the Panama Canal (i.e. Panama’s Margarita Island Port), China now has influence over a key global maritime chokepoint.²¹ In essence, restricting port access could provide China a strategic advantage in future conflicts and challenge COCOMs to consider other routes to transit around the globe.

To further gain an advantage, the second risk of China's port investment projects is the potential to exploit ports during times of political impasse. For example, Christopher O'Dea noted that after acquiring a 67 percent equity in the Piraeus Port Authority SA (PPA),²² State-Owned Enterprise (SOE) China Ocean Shipping Company Limited (COSCO) acting as owner, operator, and developer for the Piraeus Port used heavy-handed diplomacy to motivate "Greece [to block] a European Union statement at the United Nations criticizing China's human rights record," calling the statement "unconstructive criticism of China."²³ Such behavior is an indicator of possible diplomatic threats forthcoming in the COCOMs where China has high investment stakes and economic influence. Essentially, China's success in gaining political leverage is also a significant risk to the U.S. during times of crisis when countries may be challenged to choose between the U.S. and China.

As important as political leverage, the third risk is China's use of commercial ports as listening posts to collect intelligence about the host country or visiting international forces. Eyal Pinko²⁴ told *Asia Times* that, "Chinese port operators could closely monitor the movement of U.S. and NATO warships, gather information about their maintenance operations and have access to sensitive systems and equipment through interception of electromagnetic signals, intelligence-gathering by use of electronic sensors, visual and human intelligence."²⁵ Matt Youkee expanded on this concern by highlighting former U.S. Ambassador John Feely's warning about the Panama Canal that China could engage in "industrial espionage" by accessing detailed shipping schedules and confidential information stored in offline port databases.²⁶ Consequently, any port asset managed, operated, or developed by Chinese state-owned corporations is at risk for exposing allied and friendly information for use at a more opportune time in the future.

These three risks collectively indicate that single-ownership ports or port terminals, where China is the majority stakeholder, are vulnerable to exploitation by China as strategic weapons during times of conflict. This could be achieved by restricting access to gain an advantage, using political leverage to gain diplomatic support, and using commercial infrastructure to collect intelligence.

China’s USCOCOM Port Infrastructure Blueprint

China’s success in achieving its first two objectives is evidenced by its growing international port portfolio²⁷ of 128 port assets in 69 countries²⁸ providing access to key trade routes, SLOCs, and political alliances (see Table 1). In light of this success, the greatest threat to COCOMs is China achieving the third objective of civ-mil port conversions, which may result in future challenges for the U.S. Navy specific to forward presence, deterrence, sea control, and power projection.

Table 1. Chinese Port Assets in each COCOM

USCOCOM AOR	Countries	Ports
AFRICOM	24	48
CENTCOM	8	12
EUCOM	11	19
INDOPACOM	13	24
NORTHCOM	1	3
SOUTHCOM	12	22

Although civ-mil port conversion appears to be a long-range objective, China’s military leaders are eager to disperse around the globe. Liu Zhe, captain of the *Liaoning* aircraft carrier, stated that China needs to employ an “exterior strategy”²⁹ to secure the “motherland” out of fear that the United States’ ‘Pivot to the Pacific’ has restricted the PLAN’s strategic mobility to the South China Sea.³⁰ According to Martinson, “an exterior strategy would involve deploying Chinese forces beyond China’s near-seas defence perimeter in order to exert effects on the

strategic situation within it.”³¹ To address this issue, China’s port assets are positioned to provide the PLAN strategic delivery capability with “exterior lines”³² to “expand great power competition contention to other parts of the world”³³ instead of fighting at China’s doorstep. Martinson notes that exterior lines enable China to get “more involved in the Atlantic...[to] ...‘pin down’ the US and contain its ‘hegemonism’.”³⁴ Moreover, PLA generals view economic cooperation and ports access as ways to achieve the ends of “toppling and reorganizing the international political and economic order.”³⁵

With PLA leadership ready to deploy around the globe to achieve China’s third objective, it is important to clarify the four roles that enable China’s global port acquisition: ownership, financing, construction, and operation.

- Ownership, tied to financing large equity shares, involves SOE and private firms owning and operating ports in control of the “inbound supply chain for essential commodities ...[providing] China with a higher degree of self-reliance and decreases the amount of political and economic leverage that other countries can apply.”³⁶
- Financing involves “Chinese-backed loans or the purchase of minority equity shares.”³⁷ The Chinese government, through SOEs and state-owned banks, finance most international port construction projects. For example, state-owned China Development Bank provided COSCO shipping \$26.1 billion for BRI projects.³⁸
- “Construction enables China to collect intelligence on port infrastructure, establish a dependency on Chinese technology [i.e. Huawei] and expertise, and ensure long-term interoperability with Chinese materials and technology.”³⁹
- Operation is defined as “ports in which Chinese entities are contractually granted the right to operate facilities or ports in which Chinese entities own more than a 50 percent

equity share.”⁴⁰ The top three SOE terminal operators are Hutchison Ports (Hong Kong), COSCO, and China Merchants Port Holdings (CMPorts), also ranked 4th, 5th, and 6th in the world for terminal operation in the major economic regions.⁴¹

Of the 128 port assets in China’s international portfolio, 49 are classified as high risk due to: 1) being financed, constructed, or operated by a Chinese company, 2) China owning over 50 percent equity shares, and or 3) the port’s strategic location. Based on these three criteria, a global assessment using the COCOM framework further identifies areas of high risks in each COCOM’s AOR. (COCOMs are presented in order from least to most at risk AOR).

NORTHCOM

Notably, China has already made significant inroads regarding port control in the United States. The NORTHCOM threat includes 49 percent Chinese ownership in both Houston’s Terminal Link Texas and Miami’s South Florida Container Terminal and 13 percent ownership in the Port of Seattle.⁴² While in a national emergency, these ports could be denied to Chinese firms, the same is not true outside the United States.

SOUTHCOM

In Latin America, China has 22 port assets in 12 countries: Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.⁴³ Chinese companies have been contracted to build 14 port assets, is the majority stakeholder for two, and owns three out-right. Of strategic importance is China’s ownership of Panama’s Margarita Island Port, Balboa Port, and Cristobal Port. These ports collectively provide “access to one of the most important goods distribution centers in the world.”⁴⁴ Shandong Landbridge Group purchased Margarita Island Port for \$900 million.⁴⁵ Unique, in comparison to most privately held companies, Landbridge’s deputy CEO is a former military officer, the company has its own

militia, and Landbridge works with the Chinese military in sharing technology and scientific research.⁴⁶ According to Peter Jennings, of the Australian Strategic Policy Institute, “less than a year after Landbridge invested in Panama, the country dropped its recognition of Taiwan.”⁴⁷ In recognizing the mainland instead, Panama acceded to one of China’s most significant political requests.

CENTCOM

In the Middle East, China’s 12 port assets span nine countries: Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Oman, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). In this region, there are three strategic locations of value to China. First, China’s Shanghai International Ports Group will build and serve as Israel’s Haifa Port operator for 25-years providing China access to a key shipping lane through the Suez Canal.⁴⁸ Second, Pakistan’s Gwadar Port is under China’s control with a 43-year port lease and a 99-year land lease to SOE China Overseas Port Holding Company (COPHC).⁴⁹ Gwadar is 400 kilometers from the Straits of Hormuz, recognized as one of the world’s largest crude importers with a strategic oil route in and out of the Gulf.⁵⁰ China intends to use Gwadar as the economic artery to connect China to Africa and Europe, now referred to as the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor.⁵¹ Third, China is building the China-Egypt Suez Economic and Trade Cooperation Zone with 20 percent equity in the Suez Canal Container Terminal⁵² which is the primary connection between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. The canal extends to Egypt’s Port of Said where China holds a 20 percent equity.⁵³ In the future, this geo-economics dynamic may affect the 70 percent of the U.S. Navy based in the Pacific with an estimated 35 to 45 naval ships transiting through the Suez Canal annually.⁵⁴

EUCOM

In the EUCOM AOR, China has 19 port assets in 11 countries: Belgium, France, Greece, Istanbul, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands, Russia, Spain, and Ukraine. Five are controlled by China with more than 50 percent equity. There are four strategic locations worth noting in this AOR. First, with 100 percent equity in the Piraeus Container Terminal⁵⁵ and 67 percent equity in Piraeus Port Authority, China intends to upgrade this port to serve as the largest port in the Mediterranean.⁵⁶ Additionally, ownership of Piraeus will further facilitate additional PLAN visits in the future similar to the PLAN's 18th Chinese naval escort task fleet's visit in 2015⁵⁷ and task force group's 150 visit in 2017.⁵⁸ Second, China has acquired significant influence in Belgium with CSP Zeebrugge Terminal, the largest roll-on/off vehicle facility in the world⁵⁹ now controlled by COSCO shipping with 85 percent equity.⁶⁰ Third, in the Netherlands, China holds a 35 percent equity in Euromax Terminal Rotterdam, Europe's largest port.⁶¹ Last, in the Arctic, China has partnered with Russia on two port projects. First, Zarubino Port, located near the Chinese border southwest of Vladivostok, will be developed "into the biggest port in northeast Asia."⁶² Second, Arkhangelsk Deep-water Port, situated on Russia's northern coast, is currently in a decade long planning phase.⁶³

AFRICOM

In the AFRICOM AOR, there are a total of 48 Chinese port assets in 24 countries: Angola, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, São Tomé e Príncipe, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, and Togo.⁶⁴ In Sub-Saharan Africa, China financed 27 of 47 port projects, operates 75 percent of the financed projects, and constructed or is in the process of constructing 90 percent of these port assets.⁶⁵ Of continued concern is CMPorts' 23.5 percent equity in the Port of Djibouti⁶⁶ and the

ownership and operation of the Doraleh Container Terminal, which allows the PLAN to reside within proximity to one of the world's most critical maritime chokepoints, the Gulf of Aden. Additionally, with a projected completion date of 2030, Kenya's Lamu Port will be the largest port in Africa.⁶⁷ Once constructed, other BRI infrastructure projects will allow for South Sudan's oil to be delivered through the pipelines running through the Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia corridor directly to Lamu Port.⁶⁸ Last, there should be apprehension regarding the number of deep-sea ports China has invested in. There are 12 African ports that could support extensive PLAN activity inclusive of subsurface vessels: seven in West Africa, one in Central Africa, and four in Southern Africa.⁶⁹

INDOPACOM

In the INDOPACOM AOR, China's port portfolio includes 24 port assets in 13 countries: Australia, Brunei, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, North Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam. Similar to Africa, China has extensive investments in areas of strategic importance to the U.S. In Australia, Darwin Port is controlled by Landbridge Group with 80 percent equity and a 99-year land lease.⁷⁰ Darwin also "hosts a military base used by US Marines."⁷¹ Additionally, Chinese firms have a 50 percent equity in the Port of Newcastle⁷² and has complete ownership of the Port of Melbourne.⁷³ China's investment further spans the Pacific with complete ownership of Cambodia's Koh Kong New Port, which is a part of the Chinese-backed investment zone, Dara Sakor.⁷⁴ Dara Sakor occupies 20 percent of the Cambodia coastline and is under Chinese control with a 99-year lease.⁷⁵ Fostering ties with North Korea, China owns a 60.46 percent equity in Chongjin Port.⁷⁶ With 40 percent equity accompanied by a 99-year lease and 49 percent equity accompanied by a 99-year lease, Chinese firms control Kuantan Port and Melaka Gateway Port, respectively.⁷⁷ These ports are located near the Strait of

Malacca, which is the critical valve to the economic artery for the Indian Ocean, Pacific Ocean, and Asian economies. China also benefits from a 70 percent equity and a 99-year lease for Sri Lanka's Hambantota Port⁷⁸ and 85 percent equity in the Port of Colombo, connecting the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.⁷⁹

From this data, it is evident that China has the economic and political upper hand to use commercial port assets to employ an exterior strategy. Based on port investment activity, one of China's desired end state is to eventually convert strategic ports to dual-use facilities or military ports to enable strategic delivery. With such a large port infrastructure footprint, when compared to the 15 U.S. Navy Forward Deployed bases around the world, China's growing global port assets are a threat to COCOMs.

Military Engagement: A Natural or Intentional Progression?

*"Wherever there is Chinese business, warships will have a transportation support point."*⁸⁰

Contrary to the argument that China is a maritime threat, some scholars believe China's primary focus is to protect its investment and energy interests by engaging in security efforts to counter terrorism, conduct peace-keeping, and promote maritime and regional security.⁸¹

Correspondingly, in 2016, PLAN Admiral Sun Jianguo argued that "opening the Djibouti [military base]... will better support China's military as it carries out escort missions, humanitarian missions, and other such tasks."⁸²

To further lessen interest in China as a maritime threat, some scholars argue that heightened concerns about President Xi's aggressive global investment strategy and PLAN's increased strategic engagements are unwarranted because China's interest in the maritime domain dates back to the 1980s. Phil Baxter noted that "between 1985 and the end of 2013, warships from the [PLAN] made 127 appearances at foreign ports, from Incheon to Portsmouth to

Valparaiso.”⁸³ Moreover, as a rising power, China is demonstrating that it is a responsible global actor by providing maritime security to facilitate global trade.⁸⁴ To do so, the PLAN needs to leave the homeland, patrol the seas, establish, and sustain global supply and logistics nodes. Moreover, Wade Shepard stated that the “Port of Singapore Authority operates terminals in 15 countries, Denmark's Maersk Line has 76 ports in 41 countries, Switzerland's Mediterranean Shipping Co (MSC) has 35 terminals in 22 countries, while Dubai's DP World runs 77 ports in 40 countries.”⁸⁵ Similarly, European, Asian, and Middle Eastern firms also have large international terminal portfolios. Essentially, China’s port infrastructure investments are in line with the rest of the world.

However, the important differences lie in the degree to which China’s port projects are directed or exploited by Chinese leadership to support broader strategic goals. Although China’s actions may appear to be in line with global investment trends, it would be strategically irresponsible to disregard China’s focus on developing exterior lines. The concept of civ-mil port conversion should be recognized as a credible threat to the maritime domain. China’s use of commercial development, political leverage, and PLAN engagements are indications of an intentional progression to ensure that commercial ports are being built with the goal of transitioning into what Chinese scholar Zhang Jie refers to as “strategic support points”⁸⁶ that can “assist China in defending maritime channel security and grasp[ing] key waterways.”⁸⁷ According to Conor Kennedy, “strategic support points” are locations that “provide support for overseas military operations or act as a forward base for deploying military forces overseas.”⁸⁸ Regardless of the risks respective to each host country, senior Chinese leaders and PLAN generals have been vocal in their desires to expand their global maritime military footprint. Moreover, PLAN leaders believe this approach avoids scrutiny from the international

community,⁸⁹ protects China's national interests, and preserves strategic transportation channels.⁹⁰

Conclusion & Strategic Implications

“China presents the greatest challenge the United States will face in the medium and long term.”⁹¹

Opening the aperture for identifying China as a maritime threat is overdue. Although expanding, the literature and discussion of China's threat to maritime security are limited. There is relatively scarce data showing analysis of specific threats to each COCOM. What was once considered a challenge for U.S. INDOPACOM has morphed into a maritime threat across the globe. As Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rep. Mac Thornberry stated, “anyone who believes that China is only concerned about the Indo-Pacific region is ignoring the clear evidence in Africa and elsewhere.”⁹² With the exception of NORTHCOM, every COCOM has substantial Chinese maritime interests with deep ties in economic investment and political leverage. Contractual restrictions, intelligence gathering, and military port access denial are real threats that could handicap future U.S. maritime operations. China's global maritime footprint in 69 countries and growing is the greatest maritime security threat the U.S. will face in the future.

¹ Christopher R. O’Dea, “China’s Commercial Maritime Expansion Raises Security Concerns,” *National Review*, May 8, 2018, <https://www.nationalreview.com/2018/05/china-commercial-maritime-expansion-global-security-concern/>.

² Zhang Jie, “SLOC Security and the Construction of China’s Strategic Support Points,” *International Security Studies* 2 (2015): 100-118. Cited in Devin Thorne and Ben Spevack, C4ADS “Harbored Ambitions. How China’s Port Investments Are Strategically Reshaping the Indo-Pacific” (2017): 24, footnote 80, <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/566ef8b4d8af107232d5358a/t/5ad5e20ef950b777a94b55c3/1523966489456/Harbored+Ambitions.pdf>.

³ Judd Devermont, Amelia Cheatham, and Catherine Chiang, “Assessing the Risks of Investments of Chinese Investments in Sub-Saharan African Ports,” Center for Strategic and International Studies, June 2019, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/assessing-risks-chinese-investments-sub-saharan-african-ports>.

⁴ “China’s Expanding Investment in Global Ports,” The Economist Intelligence Unit, October 11, 2017, <http://country.eiu.com/article.aspx?articleid=985980482&Country=Norway&topic=Economy&subtopic=Regional+developments&subsubtopic=Investment>.

⁵ “China’s Expanding Investment in Global Ports.”

⁶ Michael D. Swaine, “Xi Jinping’s Trip to Latin America,” *China Leadership Monitor* 45, October 21, 2014, http://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/research/docs/clm45ms-xi_jinpings_trip_to_latin_america.pdf.

⁷ Kemi Lijadu, “Chinese Leaders Visit Africa More Often Than You Think and Not Always the Places You Expect,” *Quartz Africa*, July 26, 2018, <https://qz.com/africa/1335418/chinese-leaders-visit-africa-more-often-than-you-think-and-not-always-the-places-you-expect/>.

⁸ Hearing on “China’s Military Reforms and Modernization: Implications for the United States,” February 15, 2018, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 115th Congress, 2nd Session, <https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/transcripts/Hearing%20Transcript%20-%20February%2015,%202018.pdf>.

⁹ “China’s Military Reforms and Modernization.”

¹⁰ “China’s Expanding Investment in Global Ports.”

¹¹ James Kynge, Chris Campbell, Amy Kazmin, and Farhan Bokhari, “Beijing’s Global Power Play. How China Rules the Waves,” *Financial Times*, January 12, 2017, <https://ig.ft.com/sites/china-ports/>.

¹² Phil Baxter, “What Crunching the Data Tells US About China’s Naval Port Visits,” *War is Boring*, March 3, 2015, <https://warisboring.com/what-crunching-the-data-tells-us-about-china-s-naval-port-visits/>; Joanna Kakissis, “Chinese Firms Now Hold Stake in Over a Dozen European Ports,” National Public Radio National Edition, October 9, 2018, <https://www.npr.org/2018/10/09/642587456/chinese-firms-now-hold-stakes-in-over-a-dozen-european-ports>.

¹³ “Port of Walvis Bay’s New Container Terminal,” *Ship Technology*, <https://www.ship-technology.com/projects/port-walvis-bays-new-container-terminal/>

¹⁴ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power,” *The RSUI Journal*, December 16, 2019, 164 no. 7, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03071847.2019.1700684>.

¹⁵ Nicci Botha, “USD629 million Chinese Investment Gets Lekki Port Project Moving,” *Dredging and Port Construction*, October 28, 2019,

<https://dredgingandports.com/news/2019/usd629-million-chinese-investment-get-lekki-port-project-moving/>.

¹⁶ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

¹⁷ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

¹⁸ Devermont, “Assessing the Risks”; Botha, “USD629 million Chinese Investment Gets Lekki Port Project Moving.”

¹⁹ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

²⁰ Timothy R. Heath, *China’s Pursuit of Overseas Security* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2018), https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR2200/RR2271/RAND_RR2271.pdf.

²¹ Callum Wood, “China Buys Panama’s Largest Port,” *The Trumpet*, June 22, 2016, <https://www.thetrumpet.com/13973-china-buys-panamas-largest-port>.

²² Christopher R. O’Dea, “Ship of States,” *Naval War College Review* 72, no. 1 (Winter 2019): 56-88, <https://www-jstor-org.usnwc.idm.oclc.org/stable/pdf/26607111.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A81e1474fd66c6f1b9427afd888c105e1>.

²³ Robin Emmott and Angeliki Koutantou, “Greece Bocks EU Statement on China Human Rights at U.N,” *Reuters*, June 18, 2017, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-eu-un-rights/greece-blocks-eu-statement-on-china-human-rights-at-u-n-idUSKBN1990FP>.

²⁴ Maritime and intelligence expert at Israel’s Bar-Illan University.

²⁵ Emanuele Scimia, “China-Operated Ports Raise Security Fears for US, NATO,” *Asian Times* (June 2019), <https://www.asiatimes.com/2019/06/article/are-chinese-operated-ports-a-security-risk-for-us-nato/>.

²⁶ Matt Youkee, “The Panama Canal Could Become the Center of the U.S.-China Trade War,” *Foreign Policy*, May 7, 2019, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/05/07/the-panama-canal-could-become-the-center-of-the-u-s-china-trade-war/>.

²⁷ Research in support of this thesis revealed China’s investment portfolio consists of 128 ports assets; however, in 2019, Wang et al. confirmed that as of 2017, there were 157 ports along the “MSR.” There are three differences: all 128 port assets are not along China’s declared MSR, the 157 ports are not all associated with China port development companies and the 128 ports assets are inclusive of ports and terminals.

²⁸ Sources: **AFRICOM**: Devermont, “Assessing the Risks;” R. Evan Ellis, “The Future of Latin America and the Caribbean in the Context of the Rise of China,”

<https://www.csis.org/analysis/future-latin-america-and-caribbean-context-rise-china>; Drazen Jorgic, “Kenya says Chinese Firm Wins First Tender for Lamu Port Project,” *Reuters*, April 11, 2013, <https://www.reuters.com/article/kenya-port-lamu-idUSL5N0CX38D20130411>; “Port of Walvis Bay’s New Container Terminal”; Neil Munshi, “Noodle Maker plans Busiest Port in West Africa,” *Financial Times*, October 22, 2019, <https://www.ft.com/content/805ecb02-f0c7-11e9-bfa4-b25f11f42901>; “China Merchants Buy into Lago Container Terminal,” *SeaTrade Maritime News*, November 9, 2010, <https://www.seatrade-maritime.com/asia/china-merchants-buys-lagos-container-terminal>; David Rogers, “Africa’s Ports Revolution: West Coast to welcome the world,” *Global Construction Review*, February 7, 2017; Nicci Botha, “USD629 million Chinese Investment Gets Lekki Port Project Moving”; **CENTCOM**: Scimia, “China-Operated Ports Raise Security Fears for US, NATO”; Daniel Estrin and Emily Feng, “There’s a Growing Sore Spot in Israeli-US Relations: China,” National Public Radio National Edition, September 11, 2019, <https://www.npr.org/2019/09/11/757290503/theres-a-growing-sore-spot-in->

[israeli-u-s-relations-china](#); **EUCOM**: Joanna Kakissis, “Chinese Firms Now Hold Stake in Over a Dozen European Ports”; Robin Emmott and Angeliki Koutantou, “Greece Bocks EU Statement on China Human Rights at U.N.”; “China’s COSCO Makes Piraeus 2nd Largest Port in Mediterranean,” *National Herald*, February 4, 2019, <https://www.thenationalherald.com/229205/chinas-cosco-makes-piraeus-2nd-largest-port-in-mediterranean/>; Thorne and Spevack, “Harbored Ambitions”; Arctic: Zhang Chun, “China’s Arctic Silk Road,” *Maritime Executive*, January 10, 2020, <https://www.maritime-executive.com/editorials/china-s-arctic-silk-road>; **INDOPACOM**: “Chinese Investment in Australia Growing and Diversifying,” KPMG, April 10, 2016, <https://home.kpmg/au/en/home/media/press-releases/2016/04/demystifying-chinese-investment-in-australia-11-apr-2016.html>; Cecile Lefort and Byron Kaye, “Australian Port Sold for \$7.3 billion to Consortium; China Fund Among Backers,” Reuters, September 18, 2016, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-australia-privatisation-ports-idUSKCN11P040>; Philip Heijmans, “The U.S. Fears this Huge Southeast Asian Resort May Become a Chinese Naval Base” Bloomberg, July 18, 2019, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2019-07-18/u-s-fears-cambodia-resort-may-become-china-naval-base>; Xu Tianran, “China Inks Second Port Deal with North Korea,” *Global Times*, September 1, 2012, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/732625.shtml>; China Merchant Port Holdings Company Limited, *Annual Report 2017*; Davies, “A Game of Risk”; **NORTHCOM**: COSCO Shipping Ports Limited, <https://ports.coscoshipping.com/en/Businesses/Portfolio/#OverseasTerminals>; **SOUTHCOM**: Han Wei, “China’s COSCO Sails Into Peruvian Ports for South America Gateway,” *CX Tech*, January 25, 2019, <https://www.caixinglobal.com/2019-01-25/chinas-cosco-sails-into-peruvian-ports-for-south-america-gateway-101374130.html>; Youkee, “The Panama Canal Could Become the Center of the U.S.-China Trade War”; Wood, “China Buys Panama’s Largest Port”; Trudy Rubin, “In China’s Investments, a Sea Change for the U.S.: As Beijing Gains a Stake in More Ports and Other European Infrastructure, Washington is Tested,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 7, 2019; American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Foundation, “China Global Investment Tracker,” undated <https://www.aei.org/china-global-investment-tracker/>; Ellis, “The Future of Latin America and the Caribbean in the Context of the Rise of China.”

²⁹ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

³⁰ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

³¹ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

³² Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

³³ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

³⁴ Martinson, “China as an Atlantic Power.”

³⁵ Ji Mengkui, “Pressure Point Style” Periphery Diplomacy’s “Offensive Moves,” *China Net*, January 21, 2016, http://opinion.china.com.cn/opinion_41_143441.html. Cited in Thorne and Spevack: 21, footnote 71.

³⁶ Wade Shepard, “China’s Seaport Shopping Spree: What China is Winning by Buying up the World’s Ports,” *Forbes*, September 6, 2017, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/wadeshepard/2017/09/06/chinas-seaport-shopping-sprees-whats-happening-as-the-worlds-ports-keep-going-to-china/#7251d3864e9d>.

³⁷ Devermont, “Assessing the Risks.”

³⁸ Shepard, “China’s Seaport Shopping Spree.”

³⁹ Devermont, “Assessing the Risks.”

⁴⁰ Devermont, “Assessing the Risks.”

⁴¹ Liehui Wang, Yuanbo Zheng, Cesar Ducruet, and Fan Zhang, “Investment Strategy of Chinese Terminal Operators along the 21st-Century Maritime Silk Road,” *Sustainability*, 11, no. 2066 (2019): 4.

⁴² COSCO Shipping Ports Limited.

⁴³ Ellis, “The Future of Latin America and the Caribbean in the Context of the Rise of China”; Wei, “China’s COSCO Sails into Peruvian Ports for South America Gateway.”

⁴⁴ Wood, “China Buys Panama’s Largest Port.”

⁴⁵ Wood, “China Buys Panama’s Largest Port.”

⁴⁶ Wood, “China Buys Panama’s Largest Port.”

⁴⁷ Jamie Smyth, “Australia Port Project Highlights Schism Over Chinese Investment,” *Financial Times*, July 18, 2017, <https://www.ft.com/content/b4d35440-5a68-11e7-9bc8-8055f264aa8b>.

⁴⁸ Scimia, “China-Operated Ports Raise Security Fears for US, NATO”; Estrin and Feng, “There’s a Growing Sore Spot in Israeli-US Relations: China.”

⁴⁹ Ross Davies, “A Game of Risk: The Indian Ocean’s Most Strategically Important Ports,” *Ship Technology*, September 5, 2019, <https://www.ship-technology.com/features/a-game-of-risk-the-indian-oceans-most-strategically-important-ports/>.

⁵⁰ Davies, “A Game of Risk.”

⁵¹ Davies, “A Game of Risk.”

⁵² COSCO Company website:

<https://ports.coscoshipping.com/en/Businesses/Portfolio/#OverseasTerminals>.

⁵³ “COSCO Pacific to Acquire Stake in Port Said Terminal,” *Joint Commerce onLine*, December 12, 2005, https://www.joc.com/maritime-news/cosco-pacific-acquire-stake-port-said-terminal_20051229.html.

⁵⁴ Jim Michaels, “U.S. Military Needs Egypt for Access to Critical Area,” *USA Today*, August 17, 2013, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/08/17/egypt-morsi-obama-hagel-gulf-heritage-brookings/2665903/>.

⁵⁵ Kakassis, “Chinese Firms Now Hold Stake in Over a Dozen European Ports.”

⁵⁶ “China’s COSCO Makes Piraeus 2nd Largest Port in Mediterranean,” *National Herald*.

⁵⁷ Wang Mingjie, “The Very Model of a Modern Navy,” *China Daily*, January 16, 2015, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/201501/16/WS5a2b4c71a310eefe3e99f7ef.html>.

⁵⁸ “Chinese Naval Fleet Arrives in Greece for Friendly Visit,” *Ekathimerini*, July 23, 2017, <http://www.ekathimerini.com/220324/article/ekathimerini/news/chinese-naval-fleet-arrives-in-greece-for-friendly-visit>.

⁵⁹ European Ports-Belgium, *Automotive Purchasing and Supply Chain*, 31,

<https://magazine.automotivepurchasingandsupplychain.com/magazine/issue31/european-ports-belgium.html>.

⁶⁰ COSCO Shipping Ports Limited.

⁶¹ Kakassis, “Chinese Firms Now Hold Stake in Over a Dozen European Ports”; COSCO Shipping Ports Limited.

⁶² Chun, “China’s Arctic Silk Road.”

⁶³ Chun, “China’s Arctic Silk Road.”

⁶⁴ “China Global Investment Tracker”; China Merchant Port Holdings Company Limited, *Annual Report 2017*.

⁶⁵ Devermont, “Assessing the Risks.”

⁶⁶ “China Global Investment Tracker.”

-
- ⁶⁷ Jorgic, “Kenya says Chinese Firm Wins First Tender for Lamu Port Project.”
- ⁶⁸ Jorgic, “Kenya says Chinese Firm Wins First Tender for Lamu Port Project.”
- ⁶⁹ Devermont, “Assessing the Risks.”
- ⁷⁰ “Chinese Investment in Australia Growing and Diversifying,” KPMG, April 10, 2016, <https://home.kpmg/au/en/home/media/press-releases/2016/04/demystifying-chinese-investment-in-australia-11-apr-2016.html>.
- ⁷¹ Smyth, “Australia Port Project Highlights Schism Over Chinese Investment.”
- ⁷² Turloch Mooney, “China Merchants Takes Newcastle Stake amid Australia Trade Friction,” Global Ports, June 15, 2018, https://www.joc.com/port-news/asian-ports/australia%E2%80%99s-review-china-merchants-newcastle-buy-occurs-amid-trade-tension_20180615.html.
- ⁷³ Lefort and Kaye, “Australian Port Sold for \$7.3 billion to Consortium; China Fund Among Backers.”
- ⁷⁴ Heijmans, “The U.S. Fears this Huge Southeast Asian Resort May Become a Chinese Naval Base.”
- ⁷⁵ Heijmans, “The U.S. Fears this Huge Southeast Asian Resort May Become a Chinese Naval Base.”
- ⁷⁶ Tianran, “China Inks Second Port Deal with North Korea.”
- ⁷⁷ Thorne and Spevack, “Harbored Ambitions.”
- ⁷⁸ China Merchant Port Holdings Company Limited, *Annual Report 2017*.
- ⁷⁹ Davies, “A Game of Risk.”
- ⁸⁰ “Chinese Battleship Docking at Foreign Port Achieves One-stop Service Chinese Businesses Provide a Big Favor,” *China Net*, September 30, 2016, <http://military.china.com/important/11132797/20160930/23686875all.html>. Cited in Thorne and Spevack: 19, footnote 58.
- ⁸¹ P. V. Rao, “Managing Africa’s Maritime Domain: Issues and Challenges,” *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region* 10 no. 1, March 3, 2014: 113-118, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19480881.2013.847559>.
- ⁸² Sun Jianguo, “Contribute Chinese Wisdom to Lead Global Peaceful Development, Cooperation, and Win-Win,” *QStheory* (2016), http://www.qstheory.cn/dukan/qs/2016-04/15/c_1118595597.htm. Cited in Thorne and Spevack: 21, footnote 68.
- ⁸³ Baxter, “What Crunching the Data.”
- ⁸⁴ Mercy Kuo, “The Power of Ports: China’s Maritime March,” *The Diplomat*, March 8, 2017, <https://thediplomat.com/2017/03/the-power-of-ports-chinas-maritime-march/>.
- ⁸⁵ Shepard, “China’s Seaport Shopping Spree.”
- ⁸⁶ Conor Kennedy, “China’s Strategic Strongpoints,” Jamestown China Brief 2019, March 22, 2019, <https://jamestown.org/program/strategic-strong-points-and-chinese-naval-strategy/>.
- ⁸⁷ Zhang Jie, “SLOC Security and the Construction of China’s Strategic Support Points,” *International Security Studies* 2 (2015). Cited in Devin Thorne and Spevack: 24, footnote 80.
- ⁸⁸ Kennedy, “China’s Strategic Strongpoints.”
- ⁸⁹ Liang Fang, “On Maritime Strategic Access,” *Beijing: Current Affairs Press* (2011): 314–333. Cited in Thorne and Spevack: 21, footnote 69.
- ⁹⁰ Yang Jingjie, “Captains Courageous,” *Global Times*, December 24, 2012. Cited in Thorne and Spevack: 21, footnote 70.
- ⁹¹ Adam Erel, “The US Needs a Real Plan to Counter China in Africa,” *Defense One*, February 4, 2019, <https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2019/02/us-needs-plan-counter-china-africa/154626/>.
- ⁹² Martin, “Could China Squeeze the U.S. Out of its Only Permanent Military Base in Africa?”