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Executive Summary

Title: American Grand Strategy in the 21st Century

Author: Major, Jason A. Pieri, United States Army

Thesis: The United States should continue to maintain the current system of international order, globalization, and free trade. The practical responsibility for maintaining the system was transferred to the United States from Great Britain after the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. America became strong under the system, and should not abandon supporting the manner in which the free world operates.

Discussion: The purpose of this paper is to forward ideas for the future grand strategy of the United States. America’s place in the world might be in question. The rise of China as a world power, Russia’s renewed strength, and various regional powers gaining the ability to influence local events all challenge America’s hegemony. The United States finished a war in Iraq, highly unpopular among the people of many countries, and currently is winding down a war in Afghanistan; neither war can be called a decisive victory. Combined with domestic and economic troubles, America could even be viewed as in decline.

Faced with these challenges, America should not abandon the system that allowed it to become the world’s economic, military, and diplomatic leader. America risks losing power if the system changes. The United States does need to rethink how it goes about supporting that system.

America can support the international system differently, while maintaining effectiveness, in three ways. First, America should seek to strengthen states around the world by training partner state security forces. Stability in the state system maintains order. Orderly states participate in the international system. Those states also may maintain an allegiance to American hegemony. Second, the United States should share the responsibility of maintaining the international system to select partners who also have a vital interest in maintaining order. Last, America needs to secure the system from the strategic defensive. Third, the United States should adopt the strategic counter-attack. Changes in the international order often come in the form of invasions or infringement of sovereignty of some sort. In responding to these threats, America has always been perceived as a liberator. America is adept at winning conflicts in which the United States is perceived as the “good guy.”

This paper is written in narrative form. As the author of the paper, I role-play a magazine journalist in the year 2024. The article reviews American strategy from 2013 to 2024, the changes in both policy and situation, and how the American policy led to foreign policy success during the twelve years.

Conclusion: America can support its current position of maintaining the world’s system in a different and more effective manner. If the United States adopts the position outlined above, America can strengthen the security and order inside of states around the world, save money, and share responsibility of maintaining the system to responsible partners. America can also return to her historical position as a global counter-puncher, perceived as getting involved for the benefit of other states.
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Citizens of the United States can trace the success of American foreign policy over the past fifteen years to decisions made after the 2012 Presidential election. America faced a
multitude of foreign policy challenges before and after 2012: the rise of China, unrest in various parts of the world, and a domestic financial crisis that threatened to impair American ability to project military power throughout the world in a sustained manner. Many Americans expected the challenges the United States faced to result in a change in the strategic course of the nation. President Barack Obama and his new cabinet members disagreed and instead chose to maintain America's traditional strategic position. Though future presidents would change the manner in which the United States would implement this policy, *America continued to maintain the current international order, globalization, and free trade*. America would continue to defend the system, under which, it grew into a world power.

**President Obama Charts an Old Course**

President Obama articulated the American policy objectives in his National Security Strategy in 2014. He listed American strategic policy as four objectives, which were identical to his objectives in the 2010 National Security Strategy. American would maintain her place in the world by ensuring the security of the United States, its citizens, and U.S. allies and partners; fostering a strong, innovative, and growing U.S. economy in an open, international economic system that promotes opportunity and prosperity; showing respect for universal values at home and around the world; and supporting an international order advanced by U.S. leadership that promotes peace, security, and opportunity through stronger cooperation to meet global challenges. This language essentially placed America in her traditional position of maintaining the global international system.

The position the President outlined served the nation well in the past. The United States became a power in part through the global market, and maintaining the order of the world clearly
fell well within American interests. The United States solidified its position as the global leader of the free market after the Bretton Woods agreement in 1944. The world relied on America for security of the free market as the world’s largest economy after World War II. After the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, leaders in Washington chose to define the American policy as maintaining the world position as the most robust international competitor in a globalized society. The President’s policy placed the United States in the best position to maintain, or improve, the nation’s place in the world system during peacetime as well as war.

---

Strategy setters: President Obama, in his second term, with Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel.
The Economic Game Changes

The economic situation underpinned America’s ability to maintain its position in the world, and ultimately led to President Obama’s security strategy. America’s economic position steadied and improved through the ability to extract shale oil by fracking, and a regression to the mean of the growth of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) economies. However, the United States faced major economic problems. When China and many other countries pegged their currency to the American dollar, the BRICS worked together to replace the U.S. dollar as the world’s reserve currency. China worked to move trade away from the U.S. dollar, starting with Brazil in 2013. Other nations began to move away from the U.S. dollar, starting with China and Australia in 2013, as well. China also owned over a trillion dollars in U.S. debt, and over $3 trillion in American securities. The United States devalued its dollar to keep interest rates low, along with allowing the Treasury Department to pay off American debt with a devalued currency. The situation forced the United States into a precarious position. America needed to continue to devalue its dollar to pay off what remained of its debt, primarily by balancing its budget and taxes on oil revenue. While the U.S. dollar remained devalued, America accepted risk if the dollar lost its position as the world’s reserve currency, and if China sold off American securities. If both occurred, the dollar would devalue rapidly, sending the United States into a deep recession or depression.

The news was not all gloom and doom for America. The economists failed to study history. Their projections of a new economic order, headed by the BRICS, used straight-line analysis, making the assumption that the rate of growth for the BRICS would remain the same over long periods of time. Their economic predictions stated that if the BRICS, and most importantly China, continued to grow at the same rate, America would no longer remain the
world’s top economy. China would take that position. Once there, China, along with the other BRICS, would re-write the economic rules and set a new global economic order. While the projections were straight-line, in reality the BRICS growth settled.

The “new” global economic order appeared remarkably similar to the old global economic order. The per capita gap between developed nations like the United States, Japan, and members of the European Union, and developing nations of the world remained the same between 2012 and 2027 as it had been in 1950. Additionally, the BRICS nations and most of the Asian Tiger economies (some economies in southeast Asia where economic growth exploded in the later part of the 20th Century and into the 21st Century) slowed to growth levels under 5%. Few nations can maintain a growth rate above 5% for long. Brazil, Russia, India, and China proved no different. Brazil’s economy slowed from 4.5% to 2% growth by 2012, and maintained that rate for the next decade. Russia slowed from 7% to 3.5%, and India slowed from 9% growth to 6% growth by 2012 before settling below 5% like Brazil. The largest Asian Tiger, China, saw economic growth slow from double digits to 7% by 2012; China slowed to under 5% shortly thereafter. The Chinese slowdown was traced, in part, to reaching the Lewis Turning point, the point where excess rural labor declines in number. The Chinese successfully transitioned excess rural labor into industry, which contributed to an increase in growth. When the increase in the transition of Chinese excess rural labor finally plateaued, steadied, and then reached a lower rate, Chinese growth slowed. Recent economic growth seems to follow this pattern of a dramatic rise in growth followed by a leveling off. In the 1980s, Americans feared the Japanese economy would overtake their own. The Japanese economy grew rapidly, then steadied, with the United States remaining the larger economy. The fears of Chinese economic growth proved false as well, and the American economy remained the world’s largest.
More importantly, the United States' ability to become a net exporter of oil allowed America to pull itself out of its financial woes and enormous governmental debt load. American oil imports peaked in 2005, then fell 33% by 2012. By 2012 the United States became a net oil exporter for the first time since 1949, ending a 40 year decline in domestic oil output. In early 2013, the Bureau of Land Management eased drilling and fracking regulation in the United States and its coastal waters, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico. Environmental concerns were partially calmed by the low greenhouse gas emission ratings of fracked US oil, and American oil companies began drilling and fracking. Fracking began in the large shale oil fields at Bakken/Three Forks in North Dakota, fields in Colorado and Wyoming, and Eagle Ford in Texas. Oil companies drilled offshore in the Gulf of Mexico and off Alaska, nearly to maximum capacity. America became the world's fastest growing hydrocarbon producing region of the world.
The results of the increased American production were staggering. Eight years after the policy changes by the Bureau of Land Management, the United States matched Saudi Arabia in oil production; over the past four years, the United States has surpassed Saudi Arabia in oil production. From 2020 on, the United States became energy independent as well as becoming a major oil exporter. American corporations made over $7 trillion in oil profits, which produced trillions of dollars of tax revenue for the American government.

President Stephens and a New Manner to Wield Power

Senator David Stephens succeeded President Obama as the 45th President of the United States, and benefitted from America’s economic position. While President Obama re-affirmed America’s commitment to maintaining the global international system, Stephens focused internally upon the United States and the management of its debt load and government deficit. While oil revenues increased, President Stephens took advantage of the favorable economic situation to reduce government spending and begin paying back American debt. Defense cuts reduced American military might, and a major increase in defense spending was delayed until after the debt level reached pre-Global War on Terror levels. Debt reduction was scheduled to reach that level near the end of 2025. President Stephens’ administration needed to determine a manner in which to continue to maintain the global system without allowing defense spending to skyrocket.

Though the United States influenced the world through economic competition and diplomacy, a shift in American military strategy underpinned both. The previous National Military Strategy listed countering violent extremism, deterring and defeating aggression, strengthening international and regional security, and shaping the future force as its major
objectives. The updated National Military Strategy listed only three objectives, but they re-oriented the manner in which the United States would maintain the global system. The first military objective was to engage and strengthen states internationally via a “by, through, and with” method that trained partner nations to secure themselves. The second objective was to allow states willing to actively maintain the global system to do so regionally in lieu of American forces. The last objective stated that the “United States would deter and defeat aggression from a strategic counterattack posture.” The changes within the American Department of Defense, generated from this policy statement, proved to be profound for the future security of international system.

The overall military strategy could be described as a physical drawdown globally; it was not isolationism as the United States intended to interact internationally on a smaller scale, as well as physically intervene to maintain the international system. While the United States pulled its major forces back, especially its land forces, it maintained presence throughout the world through smaller special operations units. These units helped to train partner states to develop military and security forces necessary to secure themselves. The goal of the partner nation was obviously internal security. Insurgencies increasingly became the primary threat to these nations, and the state system itself. Non-state organizations wishing to keep the state out of its affairs, and organizations wishing to overthrow the state government, became more prevalent. As non-state organizations through the world grew in strength and capabilities, threatened states around the world looked for answers to cope with the instability these groups caused inside state borders. America’s low-profile assistance was the right choice for many nations in this situation. The nations America partnered with got a good deal: an increased ability to secure themselves without much visible outside help, which supported the partner nation’s own legitimacy in the
eyes of its own people. The United States profited from stable partner nations in the international system less susceptible to violent extremism, and less likely to cause disruptions in the global system. The symbiotic relationship worked in places like Columbia and the Philippines, where the American presence became hardly noticeable. That was the point.

The United States also partnered diplomatically and economically with nations that desired to secure the international system in their region. Many nations around the world benefit from the free trade, and many had an interest in seeing the system maintained, even if their capabilities only allowed them to secure the system locally or regionally. The United States partnered with those nations, easing the burden of American defense spending. India became the prime example of a regional partner securing trade. Trade through the Indian Ocean was and still is India’s economic lifeline. So India secured the Indian Ocean for international trade (one may read “control”), the United States reduced its presence in the Indian Ocean, and both nations benefitted.

The third military objective represented the manner in which the United States would go to war. The United States pulled back its legions from the far reaches of the world, and took up the strategic counterattack. The strategic counterattack made sense. A counterattack is a defensive strategy which seeks to preserve, and America was trying to preserve the international system. A defensive posture also tends to allow the defender to grow in military strength after being attacked, while the attacker grows weaker. America’s fight against Japan in the Second World War underscores the point. Japan grew steadily weaker as the war went on because the Japanese attacked beyond their capability. America got stronger throughout the war, eventually moving from defense to offense. This type of war is natural for Americans. The United States entered both world wars after provocation (or attack in the case of Pearl Harbor), and involved
itself against Iraq in 1991 after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. These types of “counter-punching” wars end well for America, both in perception and reality.

In any war, America is easily portrayed as the world’s Goliath. Anyone fighting the United States can gain world sympathy by playing the role of David, the tiny opponent with no chance of winning. America becomes the hostile opponent picking on the weaker David. World opinion sides with David. The strategic counterattack avoids this problem entirely.24 No matter how much weaker Japan was than the United States in 1941, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor portrayed America as the good guys. The same happened in 1991. Iraq was no match for the United States. Yet, because Iraq invaded Kuwait, and America responded, Goliath was no longer a bully. He was a liberator. After the liberation, American forces went home.

American military forces, primarily land forces, moved from overseas bases into the Continental United States as part of the strategic counterattack posture. There were other, more immediate reasons to make these moves, primarily due to the expenses related to basing forces abroad. Along with moving forces back to America, the Department of Defense downsized (sans the Navy, which remained about the same size), pushing the majority of forces into the reserves, while retaining a small but robust force with the mobility to respond to global threats. While treaties with allies and non-formal support for friends could spur the United States into action, the primary trigger for American forces to intervene internationally became the point when the international order was upset and the global economic system was threatened. America was recycling strategy from prior to the 9/11 attacks, when the United States was the world’s lone superpower, and primarily intervened when the global system was threatened, such as when Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990.
The combination of President Obama’s recommitment to maintaining the current international order and the revised National Military Strategy under President Stephens recalibrated America’s position as the global hegemon. While the American economy grew through President Stephens’ first and second terms, the United States was able to maintain the world’s economic system while sharing the security burden. The stance helped pay America’s enormous debt load, and subsequently revalue the U.S. dollar, but it was a bit of a gamble, particularly in allowing other nations to take on their share of the security of the system. In a similar situation, ancient Athens secured the Delian League itself, and eventually the Athenian Empire, itself, with money from member cities. America did not follow suit, partially relying on securing international order through other states, with only an American threat of military action backstopping the system. This system, and grand strategy, was tested in President Stephens’ second term in office.

**The Sino-American War – 2023**

“"The growth of the power of Athens, and the alarm which this inspired in Sparta, made war inevitable."

- Thucydides

The war with China, and the manner in which it was terminated, represented the greatest success for American foreign policy. Prior to the outbreak of war, China made the largest gains as a result of the new American foreign policy. America continued regional port calls but reduced large-scale regional military training and operations. The American presence in the region ringed the area: the United States maintained a small land presence in Australia, and maintained air and naval forces in Japan and South Korea. American special operations forces continued training regional forces for internal national security, but the forces were small and
hardly noticeable. Major American operations by and large ended, allowing China to fill the void. For five years, the Chinese regulated peaceful trade activity among the Asian Tiger nations of Southeast Asia, maintaining freedom of navigation and even putting aside their Spratley Island claims in the South China Sea.

When America refocused itself economically, the Chinese recognized the change. China’s previous position emphasized avoiding conflict with the United States. China believed that America would decline on its own, and China simply needed to wait the Americans out to become the world’s hegemon. With slowed Chinese growth, and America fixing itself economically, the Chinese recognized the initial strategy wasn’t working. The Chinese decided to act by engineering a small conflict with the United States that allowed China to sell off U.S. Securities under the veil of conflict retaliation.

The sea routes through the Indian Ocean were China’s lifeline. The majority of Chinese oil travelled from the Persian Gulf through the Indian Ocean enroute to China. Chinese interest in the Indian Ocean therefore remained high. And China recognized the potential conflict in the region with India. Under American policy, India shared responsibility for ensuring freedom of navigation in the Indian Ocean. In reality, the Indian Navy did most of the work aside from a few U.S. Navy patrols in the region. This could put China and India into conflict, forcing the United States to choose sides. China bet that America would choose India, therefore allowing the Chinese to sell U.S. Securities as retaliation. The sell off would hurt American recovery efforts, cause an economic downturn, and allow China to ascend as the world’s largest economy. That, in turn, would allow China to change the global system to its liking.

China started the process by pushing the People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLA Navy) into the Bay of Bengal, citing the need to secure its trade. As the PLA Navy and Indian Navy
sailed in close quarters, China diplomatically disputed India’s role as part of American policy. China escalated the dispute through threatening naval maneuvers, which were reciprocated by the Indians. India shared the security responsibility for the global system in the Indian Ocean, and looked to America for help.

The Chinese moves triggered an immediate political response from the United States, who could not ignore the issue. President Stephens denounced the aggression and told the Chinese to move back from their position, or face future American action to protect American interests. American interests centered on trading with the economies in the region. China’s actions threatened America’s ability to trade with Indian and other southeast Asian nations. Twenty-five percent of the world’s oil tanker traffic moved through the straits linking the Indian Ocean to the South China Sea. A naval war between China and India could stop or slow trade. A war won by China might place the Chinese in position to control the oil trade in the Indian Ocean. America could not afford to allow trade to slow in the region, nor allow the Chinese to control oil trade from the Middle East to Southeast Asia. While China technically had not stopped trade, America could not risk that Chinese naval aggression was only the first step in a larger Chinese plan. America chose to oppose the Chinese actions.

China responded. Justifying its actions through its oil trade, China warned America not to get involved with PLA Navy maneuvers in the Bay of Bengal. China demanded that America stay out of the conflict, and also demanded that American diplomats would influence the Indian government to back down their naval maneuvers. The demand was backed by the threat to sell off American Securities. The Chinese also began to attack America over the Internet. The Chinese conducted cyber-reconnaissance for years, determining where American cyber networks were vulnerable to intrusion. Now the Chinese attacked into these vulnerabilities, degrading
the American economic, governmental, military, and infrastructure networks. The Chinese bet that American policy favoring India, the threat of economic attack, and a coordinated cyber attack would force President Stevens' hand into supporting India and opposing China.

Despite possessing the world's most capable military, President Stephens' options were limited. American ends were critical since the Chinese action did not pose a threat to America proper, but did threaten the economic system. The potential battle area was far from America; the battlefield for China was much closer. President Stephens and his national security team weighed a set of less-than-perfect options. America could sail the U.S. Navy into the Bay of Bengal to support the Indians. Coercion through a bombing campaign was considered. Economic pressure was also considered. Eventually, the President settled on a far naval blockade which combined indirect and direct pressures against China. 28

President Stephens decided to blockade China in the Arabian Sea, and beyond the second island chain in the Pacific Ocean. The far blockade placed US Navy forces outside the range of Chinese aircraft and missile range, allowing the Navy to stop sea traffic without starting a major conflict. A more aggressive posture would put American Air Force and Navy flyers into range of Chinese anti-aircraft missile defense systems, and would also put American aircraft carriers at risk. China developed ballistic missiles designed to sink aircraft carriers. America might run out of carriers before China ran out of missiles. A large naval battle might also escalate into a nuclear exchange, which President Stephens sought to avoid. Much like President John Kennedy's decision to blockade Cuba to force the Soviet Union to remove nuclear missiles from the island in 1962, the President chose a naval blockade to force the PLA Navy to back away from the Bay of Bengal.
The far naval blockade had advantages that the United States sought. America's ultimate goal would always be to return the situation in the Bay of Bengal as close as possible to the situation that existed prior to Chinese aggression. Destruction of Chinese land areas and trading vessels could lower China's economic place in the world system, which would not be desirable. Actions on mainland China met skepticism among American leaders for this reason. A blockade afforded a lower end struggle that, while longer in duration, America could control like a thermostat. The United States provided incentives to the Chinese to leave the Bay of Bengal, namely, the end of the blockade. Any combat along the blockade would occur far from the Chinese shore, with results easily explained to the Chinese people, leaving the Chinese government the possibility of an honorable option to terminate the conflict and reestablish stability in the region. The blockade was not without risk. Blockading China required most of the Navy's surface and submarine fleet. America kept its fingers crossed that no other trouble spots flared up while the Navy worked against China.

The United States Navy led operations during the blockade. The U.S. Navy blockaded the Arabian Sea, stopping Chinese oil trade with the Middle East. The Navy also stretched the blockade from Borneo to Japan. The majority of the blockade stretched outside of the majority of Chinese missile systems, and well outside the range of Chinese aircraft. The only area inside China's range was the Korea Strait and closer to Japan, which the United States blockaded with smaller craft that presented a more difficult target. The Indian Ocean saw the majority of American naval activity. Most of China's oil travelled through the Indian Ocean, and American ships operating off India were far beyond the range of Chinese land based missiles. Chinese naval power, while considerable, could not compete with the US Navy, the world's best. America could operate her navy in the Indian Ocean effectively for an extended period of time.
China could only surge her navy, and only as far west as the Bay of Bengal in strength. After the US Navy deployed in strength to the Arabian Sea, the United States stopped all shipping to and from China. If China intended to remain strong in the Bay of Bengal, it would do so at the cost of its overseas trade and access to oil.

Cutting the lifeline: America cuts Chinese oil and trade route in the Indian Ocean, well outside of Chinese missile and naval range.\(^\text{30}\)

China had few options. Financially, China could sell off U.S. Securities. While this would cripple large sections of the American economy, the United States would survive. Its oil trade would continue intact, and America could fund its Navy indefinitely. China initially challenged the U.S. Navy by continuing with shipping, thinking that the blockade was a bluff. Chinese leaders realized that America was serious when ships that left Chinese ports returned with their goods after being turned around by the US Navy. China's trade halted. Oil did not reach Chinese ports. America's energy and agricultural production ensured that American
consumers could last longer than those in China. America still traded freely with the nations of the world, even those inside the blockade. And China's largest export market, America, would no longer be open to trade. America could endure the situation far longer than the Chinese.

China also had few options to break the blockade. While the Chinese aggressively expanded the PLA Navy, the vast majority of the Chinese naval craft were best used in coastal defense. The Chinese had one aircraft carrier, which would have to fight against multiple U.S. Navy carriers in the open Pacific Ocean. Chinese destroyers and frigates, without air superiority, would become targets for American Navy flyers. China possessed fewer submarines than the U.S. Navy maintained destroyers and frigates, and the United States had nearly a two-to-one advantage in anti-submarine warfare capable ships over Chinese submarines. China could inflict damage on the U.S. Navy, but would do so at a loss of its navy. And China would not break the blockade fighting any of these options.

With few options available offering a chance of victory, China backed down. In late 2023, Chinese leaders agreed to begin negotiation with India and the United States for security cooperation in the Indian Ocean. China agreed to allow freedom of navigation in the Bay of Bengal. Chinese leaders applauded their own actions as ensuring an open market for Chinese goods while avoiding a war with the United States. The American presence in the region remained mostly at sea, away from the public and in a manner that did not embarrass the Chinese leadership. President Stephens and his national defense team left the Chinese an honorable option out of the situation, which the Chinese took. America succeeded by returning the Indian Ocean to the world international system without any major combat actions, and without China selling U.S. Securities.\textsuperscript{32}

The American Grand Strategy Success

The success of American grand strategy since 2012 started with the American commitment to maintain the current international order of globalization and free trade. The system allowed America to become an economic superpower and the world’s lone hegemon following the fall of the Soviet Union. Internal challenges America faced 15 years ago caused many in America and around the world to recommend that the United States pull back from world affairs in a military manner, and focus solely on domestic problems. Despite the rise of China as a global competitor, America made a wise choice to maintain the manner in which the United States derived her power.

That policy decision was followed by a decision to change the manner in which the United States maintained the world’s system. Reducing large-scale military interaction, offering to support and build partner military capacity, and even ceding regional control of maintaining
the system allowed America to save money in defense spending by focusing on a counter-attack force that could deploy to return the world’s system to order. America then established the criteria that would cause intervention, namely any challenge to the world’s system.

Through the Sino-American conflict, little has changed in the world’s system. The long anticipated war with China fizzled into negotiations as America wisely chose a course of action that allowed China a manner in which to return to the international order of states. China was left to determine a new course to become the world’s hegemon, but for now, America has remained on top. A “new” international order was set at the end of the conflict, though the new order was not the expected order. The fears of China overtaking the United States proved false. The “new” order looks a lot like the old order.
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