



Diagnósticos a preservar

Selección de tuits en X de @RnaudBertrand

REDACCIÓN



Durante décadas, el historiador del tiempo presente ha trabajado con artículos de prensa, ensayos políticos, memorias o documentos institucionales como fuentes privilegiadas para comprender la percepción contemporánea de los acontecimientos. Sin embargo, el ecosistema comunicativo del siglo XXI ha desplazado una parte sustancial de la producción de diagnósticos políticos hacia espacios digitales caracterizados por la inmediatez, la fragmentación y la circulación masiva.

La red social X —antes Twitter— se ha convertido en uno de los lugares donde analistas, periodistas, empresarios, académicos y actores políticos formulan interpretaciones casi simultáneas a los hechos. Estas intervenciones, pese a su brevedad y volatilidad, constituyen hoy un material de gran valor para el historiador del futuro: no tan-

to por su exactitud o su capacidad predictiva, sino porque condensan percepciones, marcos interpretativos y conflictos narrativos propios de una época.

La presente selección responde a esa lógica: **preservar diagnósticos del presente antes de que desaparezcan en el flujo digital.**

La historia del tiempo presente se enfrenta a una transformación profunda de sus fuentes. Si durante el siglo XX la producción de interpretaciones políticas se concentraba en medios relativamente estables —prensa, ensayo, documentación institucional—, el ecosistema digital ha desplazado una parte sustancial del debate hacia plataformas caracterizadas por la inmediatez, la fragmentación y la volatilidad.

Este cambio obliga a reconsiderar qué constituye hoy un documento histórico. Siguiendo la reflexión sobre los regímenes de historicidad formulada por François Hartog¹, el presente contemporáneo se caracteriza por una aceleración del tiempo histórico y por una creciente dificultad para establecer distancias interpretativas. En este contexto, las intervenciones producidas en redes sociales no son meras opiniones efímeras, sino expresiones privilegiadas de la autointerpretación inmediata de una sociedad.

Presentamos aquí algunos tuits desarrollados por el *influencer* **Arnaud Bertrand** (@ el cual representa un tipo de figura intelectual característica del ecosistema contemporáneo: un analista no procedente del mundo académico tradicional que, sin embargo, alcanza una gran influencia pública a través de plataformas digitales. Empresario tecnológico francés —fundador de HouseTrip (vendida a TripAdvisor) y Me & Qi, *business angel* y posteriormente vinculado a proyectos relacionados con la medicina tradicional china²—, Bertrand ha desarrollado una notable presencia como comentarista geopolítico, especialmente en relación con China, el orden internacional y la evolución del sistema occidental.

Su relevancia no reside únicamente en sus posiciones, sino en el modo en que articula sus argumentos: hilos extensos, razonamientos encadenados, apelaciones a fuentes verificables y una constante crítica a lo que denomina narrativas dominantes. En este sentido, sus textos constituyen un ejemplo significativo de **producción intelectual desintermediada**, donde el análisis circula sin el filtro editorial clásico.

¹ François Hartog (2015), *Régimes d'historicité: Présentisme et expériences du temps*, Points

² Arnaud Bertrand vivió ocho años en China (2015-2023). Publica regularmente en su cuenta de Substack, como otros analistas independientes, pero también en *Le Monde Diplomatique* o Tablet. Asimismo, concede entrevistas en YouTube.

Para el historiador del presente, este tipo de voces resulta particularmente valioso porque permite observar cómo se forman y difunden interpretaciones alternativas o contranarrativas en tiempo real.

Los hilos publicados por Arnaud Bertrand en X constituyen un ejemplo significativo de este fenómeno. Su forma —argumentación serializada, reacción inmediata a acontecimientos internacionales, circulación masiva— ilustra una modalidad emergente de producción intelectual desintermediada. Para el historiador del presente, estos textos permiten observar la formación de narrativas, contranarrativas y marcos explicativos en el mismo momento de su aparición.

La preservación de este tipo de materiales responde a una necesidad historiográfica concreta: evitar que la abundancia digital se traduzca en amnesia documental. En términos cercanos a la historia conceptual de Reinhart Koselleck³, estos textos permiten captar la tensión entre experiencia y expectativa en el instante mismo en que se formula.

Presentamos, a continuación, varios ejemplos de la creatividad de este autor, centradas en los dramáticos sucesos que protagonizó el presidente Donald Trump en enero de 2026, aunque la serie comienza con una reflexión sobre el *storytelling* que data de marzo del año anterior. En cualquier caso, la selección aquí presentada no pretende validar interpretaciones ni establecer jerarquías analíticas, sino contribuir a la construcción de un archivo del presente que permita a los historiadores futuros comprender no sólo los acontecimientos, sino también las formas contemporáneas de pensarlos.

Sobre los peligros del *storytelling*

Arnaud Bertrand, 29 de marzo, 2025

I know it's the norm nowadays but it's still amazing to see flat-out lies like this in major media outlets.

Putin didn't in the least "endorse Trump's Greenland takeover", in fact he called it "concerning" because it shows that "NATO countries are increasingly often designating the Far North as a springboard for possible conflicts." And he added that Russia needed to "proceed from current realities and respond to all this."

I'm using the exact same Putin speech The Guardian references in their article (<https://theguardian.com/world/2025/mar/28/putins-endorsement-of-trumps-greenland-takeover-reflects-their-vision-of-a-new-world-order>), which he made "at

³ Reinhart Koselleck (2016), *Le futur passé. Contribution à la sémantique des temps historiques*, Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales

an Arctic policy forum in the northern Russian city of Murmansk":
<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/76554>

Anyone can verify this for themselves: read Putin's speech and then read The Guardian article and you'll see it's a complete misrepresentation.

The Guardian then uses this supposed "endorsement" by Putin to make the case that he is an "enthusiastic ally" of "Trump's transactional view of the world, as well as his deep suspicion of transnational organisations set up after the second world war," like "the United Nations."

But this is of course shockingly wrong too, as Russia, together with China and Global South countries in general keep emphasizing that they actually want a much bigger role for the UN in a future multipolar world order.

For proof just take the extraordinary 8,000-word joint statement released by Russia and China in May last year:

(<https://x.com/RnaudBertrand/status/1791303781218693145>), in which they describe in minute details their vision for a new world order.

The foundation of this order? "The achievements of World War II and the post-war world order established by the UN Charter."

In Russia and China's view THEY are the true guarantors of the post-WW2 order, when the West—the U.S. very much included—has completely betrayed its spirit and principles.

The joint statement was particularly critical of the United States, writing that its adherence "to hegemonism and power politics" was contrary to the trend towards a multipolar world order, and that the "US, with its Cold War mentality and camp confrontation model, puts 'small group' security above regional security and stability."

They also wrote that they has "serious concern about the United States' attempts to undermine strategic stability to maintain its absolute military superiority."

So the notion that Putin would now be an "enthusiastic ally" of Trump as he doubles down on power politics, further undermines the post-WW2 order and makes a complete mockery of the UN Charter is laughable at best.

I strongly believe that this sort of Orwellian misrepresentation of reality is one of the key reasons, if not THE key reason, for the West's decline and Europe's in particular. It's why all their actions feel completely disconnected from reality. Because they are! When you take decisions based on lies you tell yourself, don't be surprised if those decisions lead to disastrous outcomes. And trap you in a vicious cycle where false narratives drive poor policy choices, which then require even more distorted reporting to justify their failures.

Trato personal entre Xi Jinping y Donald Trump

Arnaud Bertrand, 5 de febrero de 2026

Always hilarious to read China's transcripts of Trump-Xi calls because you can always find these incredibly sophisticated classical Chinese references with layers of implied meaning that you just know completely went over Trump's head. It's like Xi is speaking to Trump as if addressing a fellow scholar of classical statecraft and the guy is like "so we're doing 25 Million Tons of soybeans for next season, that's a lot of beans folks!" This time it's particularly funny because the Chinese transcript (https://fmprc.gov.cn/eng/xw/zyxw/202602/t20260205_11851262.html) has Xi telling Trump: "It is always right to do a good thing, however small, and always wrong to do a bad thing, however small." This proverb might not sound like much but it's actually extremely meaningful when you understand the reference. Those are in fact the parting words of Liu Bei, the legendary emperor of Shu Han during the Three Kingdoms era, to his son and heir Liu Shan right before dying. The original text is this: "Do not do a bad thing because it is small; do not neglect a good thing because it is small. Only through wisdom and virtue can one earn the allegiance of others."

("勿以恶小而为之 · 勿以善小而不为 · 惟贤惟德 · 能服于人" - Wù yǐ è xiǎo ér wéi zhī, wù yǐ shàn xiǎo ér bù wéi. Wéi xián wéi dé, néng fú yú rén) Why did he say this? Two reasons: 1) Because his son Liu Shan was notoriously mediocre in ability and weak in character. The meaning is basically: I don't ask you to be brilliant but at least please maintain basic moral standards because the stakes are too high. 2) The Kingdom - Shu Han - had very unstable foundations, beset by threats both internal and external. Internally, national strength was severely depleted and popular confidence shaken by military defeat. Externally, the powerful states of Wei and Wu (the other 2 kingdoms of the "Three Kingdoms") loomed. Liu Bei, who had risen from nothing through benevolence and moral authority, knew that if his heir couldn't at least hold the line on basic decency, the whole edifice would crumble. The outcome, as you'd expect, was that what his father told him completely went over Liu Shan's head. Shu Han collapsed. Liu Shan's nickname was "Adou" (阿斗) and, to this day, his name is synonymous with hopeless incompetence with the very famous idiom "Adou who cannot be propped up" ("扶不起的阿斗", Fú bù qǐ de ādǒu). When you tell someone in China that he is an "Adou", it's very insulting. Now, to be fair, even most Chinese wouldn't get this reference from the transcript. To most of them, "It is always right to do a good thing, however small, and always wrong to do a bad thing, however small" is just an idiom. Which is of course meaningful in and of itself when Xi tells this to Trump: it is used in daily life as a way of telling someone to maintain basic decency. But for those who catch the historical reference it's devastatingly precise. Let's just say Xi's speechwriters earned their salary on this one

Sobre el golpe de Trump en Venezuela

Arnaud Bertrand 06 de enero, 2026

Venezuela killed the US. Or rather, it revealed it was already dead.

In the history of the US's relation with Latin America, what just happened in Venezuela is hardly unique: the U.S. government has intervened to change governments in Latin America a total of 41 times. What is unprecedented however is the brazenness, the unabashedly predatory nature of the intervention. Trump is not pretending this is about anything else than resource extraction. He explicitly stated "we're going to be taking out a tremendous amount of wealth out of the ground" and that this wealth would "go to the United States of America in the form of reimbursement for the damages caused us by that country."

Stunningly, the US isn't even insisting on regime change. They're quite happy for the Chavista government to stay in place under acting president Delcy Rodríguez as long as she "does what we want," vowing to bomb the country again if she didn't. In other words, there is absolutely zero pretense there: submission to the U.S.'s will is the only variable that matters. Never before in its entire history has the U.S. been so nakedly... bad.

This might sound almost trivial. "So what if they admit they're bad, at least they're not hypocritical about it anymore," you might tell yourself. Some might even find that refreshing in its honesty. Quite the contrary. The story a nation tells itself is not trivial – it is everything. We, human beings, for better or worse, are structured by mythology and self-deception. Think about yourself, what drives your own behavior? You have, doubtlessly, ideals you want to live up to.

If you have kids you have ideals of what a good parent ought to be. If you have a spouse you have ideals of what fidelity and partnership mean. If you have a job you have some conception of integrity. You probably fall short – we all do – but the ideals still structure your behavior. They give you something to reach for, they provide the terms in which you can be criticized – including by your own internal dialogue. They make it possible for you to do better tomorrow.

The hypocrisy – the gap between ideal and reality – is not the problem. It's the proof that the ideal still has a hold on you, that you can still be called back to it. As the saying goes, hypocrisy is the tribute vice pays to virtue.

Now imagine you renounce all this. Imagine you stop being a hypocrite in the sense that you abandon your ideals entirely, that you start owning up to your worst self

and become comfortable with your vices. You cheat on your spouse and stop pretending it bothers you. You neglect your children and make peace with it. Have you thus become “refreshingly honest”? Maybe. But you’ve also died inside. You’ve become something deeply broken – beyond shame, beyond appeal. You’ve lost the internal architecture that makes moral life possible. The little light that said “this is not who I want to be” is extinguished.

That is what the United States just did. The consequences of this are, frankly, terrifying. What happens when a nation stops telling itself it should be good?

Sobre la crisis de Groenlandia

Arnaud Bertrand 07 de enero, 2026

I actually suspect that, for the U.S., Greenland has absolutely nothing to do with Russia and China (or minerals, for that matter). That's just the PR around it. What I suspect it's all about is Europe, the preemption of a near-future where the US has withdrawn from the continent as a "protector," a process which has already largely started. In that future, Greenland becomes a potential beachhead - European territory that could one day give Europe independent strategic positioning in the Western hemisphere, like early warning systems, submarine facilities or air defense systems. If it becomes American however, in that future Greenland could play a not dissimilar strategic role to the one it played during WW2 against the Germans. At the very least a denial and intimidation role. This makes so much more sense than the lazy Russia/China framing. It works as PR precisely because it requires no one to think too hard, but it doesn't survive scrutiny. For one thing the notion that China would launch an amphibious assault to take over an island 60 times the size of Taiwan in the North Atlantic is beyond absurd.

Entre Cuba y Gaza

Arnaud Bertrand, 11 de febrero, 2026

Gaza will be remembered as the moment the world looked away. Cuba is the test of whether it learned anything from this. Both situations are terrifyingly similar, and there's little doubt that U.S. actions on Cuba were enabled by the world's lack of concrete response on Gaza. Look: In both cases it's collective punishment: a siege that cuts off essential supplies for an entire people. In both cases the perpetrator is acutely aware of the consequences of their own actions. Israel's Yoav Gallant (who, as a reminder, is wanted in The Hague) said "no electricity, no food, no water, no fuel." Here you have a sitting U.S. Congresswoman saying "no electricity, no food, no medi-

cine, only blackout". The exact same language, almost word for word. In both cases the suffering of the people is cynically blamed on the victims, as if starving an entire people were justified if you disapprove of their leaders. Here Salazar blames the Cuban "regime", and in Gaza it was Hamas. In both cases it's a decades-old project: the Cuban embargo started in 1962 and the the blockade and occupation of Palestine dates back to 1967. In both cases it's done against the will of virtually the entire world: Israel is consistently the only country that votes with the U.S. at the UN to maintain the Cuba embargo. The U.S. was the only country that always vetoed cease-fire resolutions at the UN Security Council to shield Israel. It's a mutual protection pact for the collective punishment of a small besieged people. And both cases we're witnessing a terrifying escalation in brutality compared with an already very brutal past: starvation and the engineering of a humanitarian catastrophe on an entire people as a method of warfare. The playbook is the same, the language is the same, the intent is the same. The only thing that can be different this time is the world's response. Otherwise, we're effectively confirming that the U.S. has a license to genocide any nation that doesn't bend the knee.