

**US GRAND STRATEGY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE
TRUMP AND BIDEN ADMINISTRATION**



Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

In

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

By

MUHAMMAD KAMRAN

Reg. No: 02132113005

**SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY,
ISLAMABAD
JUNE 2023**

**US GRAND STRATEGY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE
TRUMP AND BIDEN ADMINISTRATION**



Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

In

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

By

MUHAMMAD KAMRAN

Reg. No: 02132113005

**SUPERVISED BY
DR.MUHAMMAD NADEEM MIRZA**

**SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY,
ISLAMABAD
JUNE 2023**

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that Master of Philosophy (MPhil). dissertation on “**US GRAND STRATEGY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE TRUMP AND BIDEN ADMINISTRATION**” by **MUHAMMAD KAMRAN** has been approved for submission by the Department of School of Politics and International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

Dr. Muhammad Nadeem Mirza
(Supervisor)

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my research and that it has not been submitted concurrently to any other university for any degree.

Muhammad Kamran

JUNE 15, 2023

DEDICATED TO

My family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly thankful to my supervisor, Dr Muhammad Nadeem Mirza who has been so cooperative throughout my thesis writing, his expertise in the field has made my research work effective and productive. I owe great regard to my supervisor who ran me through step-by-step guidance. Furthermore, I would like to extend thanks to my family who have been with me throughout my studies. Lastly, I owe a great appreciation to the SPIR staff and faculty.

ABSTRACT

The research intends to highlight the contours of grand strategy that have been prevalent throughout the aftermath of World War 2. The pursuit of American-led political, and social, and its preeminence at international standing is a struggle of the US foreign policy. How strategic compulsion leads to the bipartisan approval of foreign policy. How partnerships and collective security are essential factors in retaining a hegemonic position at the international level for the US? The strategic compulsions drive the US foreign policy, which has liberal and realist orientation. The grand strategy is used as a theoretical framework to conduct the study. The liberal internationalist version tracing back to Wilson till the present and the offensive realism of John J Mearsheimer have been discussed. The spheres of influence and preeminence of the US are among the crucial elements of its foreign policy. The US is at the top of international standing and the US-Led world order where it sets the rules for trade and its global commitments across the world. The international environment that compels the US to opt for a specified course of action is thoroughly discussed. The factor of restraint in realism in the backdrop of great power politics inherent in an anarchic world is explained concerning internationalist and realist propositions. Strategic environment, US interests at home or abroad, and its relative prowess in unrivaled domains shape the major contours of grand strategy. The invincible power as per the guide of offensive realism is of spatial importance to thrive in an anarchic world. On the contrary, the pursuit of liberal hegemony by the US is one of the highly recommended foreign policy postures by liberal internationalists. The competing views of both realists and liberalists are at play throughout policy action. The sphere of influence and the global challenge emanating from belligerent states, terrorists, and potential rivals that can challenge the US-led system are the key elements of national security strategy. The research is a comparative case study of the Trump and Biden administrations, using national security strategy documents of each administration. The G. John Ikenberry and John J Mearsheimer analysis have also been incorporated into the study. The bipartisanship of the foreign policy over China and the US preeminence got support from both Republicans and Democrats. The partnership and network of alliances are formidable factors of the US foreign policy to retain the central positions at the international level

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	V
ABSTRACT	VII
INTRODUCTION	1
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	1
HYPOTHESIS	2
THE STRATEGIC COMPULSIONS DRIVE THE REALIST AND LIBERALIST ORIENTATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES' FOREIGN POLICY.	2
LITERATURE REVIEW	2
SCOPE OF THE STUDY	7
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	8
ORGANIZATION OF CHAPTERS	8
CHAPTER 1	10
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK; GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE UNITED STATES	10
1.1 LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM	10
1.1.1 American led world order	10
1.1.2 Continuation of Wilsonian idealism	11
1.2 Dimensions of liberal internationalism and partnership	12
1.3 Internationalism and Cooperation.....	13
1.4 OFFENSIVE REALISM	14
1.4.1 Perpetual struggle of power pursuit and security dilemma.....	15
1.4.2 Is cooperation possible in a realist world?	16
1.4.3 Grim picture of international politics.....	17
1.4.4 Selective military engagement	17
1.4.5 Power politics and Realism.....	18
CHAPTER 2	20
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	20
2.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	20
2.1.1 TRUMAN DOCTRINE	20
2.2 MARSHAL PLAN, 1948.....	21
2.3 CREATION OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO)	22
2.4 SUEZ CANAL CRISIS	23
2.5 THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS , OCTOBER 1962	24
2.6 NPT (NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY 1968).....	25
2.7 SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN 1979 TO 1980	26
2.8 GEORGE H W BUSH FOREIGN POLICY ERA	27
2.9 SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACK AND GEORGE W BUSH RESPONSE.....	28
2.10 GRAND STRATEGY AND THE DYNAMIC TRENDS IN WORLD POLITICS OF THE 21ST CENTURY	29
2.11 SOUTH ASIA.....	32
2.12 PREEMINENCE AND IMPERIALISM.....	32
2.13 KILLING OF OSAMA BIN LADEN	33
2.14 ABRAHAM ACCORD	33
2.15 DOHA ACCORD	34

CHAPTER 3	35
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY UNDER TRUMP AND BIDEN ADMINISTRATION: A GRAND STRATEGY METRIC	35
3.1 THRIVING IN A COMPETITIVE WORLD.....	36
3.2 AN AMERICA FIRST NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY	36
3.3 PROTECTING HOMELAND AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE.....	37
3.4 PURSUING THREATS TO ITS SOURCE	38
3.5 Defeating jihadist networks	38
3.6 PROMOTING AMERICAN PROSPERITY	39
3.7 PROMOTING FAIR, FREE, AND RECIPROCAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS.....	40
3.8 THE US STRATEGY IN THE REGIONAL CONTEXT.....	40
3.8.1 Indo pacific	41
3.8.2 Primary actions	42
3.8.3 Europe.....	42
3.8.4 Primary Action.....	43
3.8.5 Middle East.....	44
3.8.6 Priority action.....	44
3.8.7 The south and central Asia.....	45
3.9 THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY UNDER BIDEN ADMINISTRATION, A GRAND STRATEGY METRIC	45
3.9.1 Strategic approach.....	46
3.9.2 Strengthening America and Its Competitiveness.....	47
3.9.3 Building the Strongest Coalition.....	48
3.10 THE UNITED STATES' PRIORITIES ACROSS THE GLOBE	49
3.10.1 China.....	49
3.10.2 Europe.....	50
3.10.3 Middle East.....	51
3.10.4 Terrorism.....	52
CHAPTER 4	53
COMPETING PERSPECTIVES ON THE US GRAND STRATEGY	53
4.1 Anarchy and hierarchical structures.....	53
4.2 The American system	54
4.3 Grand Strategy in Imperial Context.....	56
4.4 Multilateral and Interdependence	57
4.5 Multilateralism endures	57
4.6 Liberalism abroad; A fallacy	59
4.7 Restraint factor of realism.....	59
4.8 Where is the US being led?.....	60
CONCLUSION	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65

INTRODUCTION

The means of grand strategy have been used in the United States' foreign policy in the aftermath of World War 2 and its quest for special American virtue started emerging. The United States leadership role began in 1945 when the World War 2 ended. The aftermath of World War 2 necessitated the need for alliance, institution-building, and security arrangements to avert the potential threat of war. The US put in place offensive and defensive measures to retain its leadership role and status quo; one important factor has been consistent and constant in the aftermath of World War 2. It is the grand strategy that has been consistent for the upcoming decades. It is argued that Hegemonic stability theory; ardently advocates the role of hegemon to be necessary to keep a check on the smooth functioning of the world. In other words, the hegemon is responsible for keeping a check on rising power, striking the right balance in the distribution of power in the defined sphere of influence. Hegemonic states tend to coerce the state that shows an unwillingness to adapt to change set forth by them, liberal values, capitalism, and monetary system are some of the intervening variables that make grand strategy consistent amid the swing of interests of the United States. The monetary policy and trade regime aptly describes the pursuit of American virtue and it exhibits almost the same pattern of hegemon. The grand strategy of the US has been consistent and perpetual throughout its course of history, the role of the US as a superpower since 1945 has incurred considerable wealth from nation-building to a sustainable world order. This study intends to comprehend the contours of the grand strategy of the Trump and Biden administrations and what the most important means in the pursuit of the grand strategy from alliance-making to sustaining global affairs and making herself at the helm of global affairs in the Trump and Biden administration. To sustain its role in international standing, each administration employed a grand strategy, Forging alliances and institutions. G. John Ikenberry and John J. Mearsheimer's competing views on the grand strategy are discussed with their respective relevance. The national security strategy of the Trump and Biden administrations will be dissected to understand the priorities that are common in both administrations.

Research questions

- How do strategic compulsions lead to bipartisan approval on foreign policy issues?

- How partnerships and collective security are essential factors in retaining a hegemonic position at the international level for the US?

Hypothesis

The strategic compulsions drive the realist and liberalist orientations of the United States' foreign policy.

Literature review

¹In his Article "America's Imperial Ambition" Ikenberry argues that amid the backdrop of the War on terrorism of the Bush administration, The US made a unilateral decision that given the circumstances that liberal aspirations were challenged, with the help of coalition partners, The US would go to preserve the status quo and meting out justice across the world. The countries have to align their behavior internally or externally and should be in accordance with rules and regulations set forth by the US. Sovereignty would be of least concern for the US if its global dominance has ever been challenged. The world order established by the US from the Bretton wood system, trade regime, and security arrangements should not be challenged at any cost. The United States had to ensure the tweaks to be made in the existing grand strategy in taking unilateral action. Since the 1940s, foreign policy has been principled under two grand strategies: one has a realist orientation that seeks deterrence and keeps a check on rising power that could challenge US preeminence. The touchstone of it is containment which resulted in a partnership of nuclear cartels and partnership that remained intact throughout the Cold War. NATO and the US are security providers to its allies. The second being is liberal in orientation which revolves around nation-building and making a complex web of interdependence and free market that would make cooperation highly likely and thus minimize the potential conflict that would arise out of competition among states. The liberal grand strategy is premised around making the open market, institutionalized framework, conflict resolution, and multilateral trade system under which the world would thrive, the fundamental objective is to make a system with liberal aspirations that would serve as a congenial model politically and economically. It is further argued that the system would make complex layers of interdependence that bind

¹ America's Imperial Ambition
Author(s): G. John Ikenberry
Source: Foreign Affairs, Sep. - Oct., 2002

integrative democracies together to work in a mutually reinforcing way. Bush junior and Clinton focused mainly on the Transatlantic community and Asia-Pacific and were convinced that partnership would endure sustainably of existing order under common sharing values and reduce the trust deficit. Richard Haass planning policy director at the Department of State contended that the “ primary objective of US foreign policy is to integrate other countries and institutions into arrangements that would help US to stay at the helm of global affairs and align them with US interests. ²The liberal and realist grand strategies have been working together for the past 50 years: one created a political rationale for making security arrangements that has connotations with the realist paradigm while the other assisted it in pursuit of a leadership role by promoting core liberal values by keeping the fabric of international community intact. Political security, partnership, and rule-based agreement were mutually reinforcing for the US and the rest of the world. The US provided security assurance to European and Asian partners and gave access to technology and the American market within a free trade economy. In turn, the member countries would give diplomatic support to the US on national interests. The joint decision-making process within an institutionalized framework makes it “User-friendly” which helps the ongoing political process smooth. The bargain of the institutionalized framework has been working robustly, since the 1940s. The coalition partners and international system are yielding fruitful outcomes. The US bolstered its technological edge in artificial intelligence, Robotics, lasers, satellites, and precise munitions. The terrorists have to deal with the befitting response that poses a threat to the US and its allies. The Bush Administration made it succinctly clear to the world that either you are with us or against us, leaving other nations with the exclusive choice of joining a US-led counter-terrorism operation. The sovereignty of other nations was conceived as less important.. The US has to value the European Union, NATO, and the security arrangements, the US has had with other countries. The international stability has been the foremost concern in grand strategy calculus

³Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order Ikenberry argued that, liberal international world is not merely confined to a fixed set of principles but

² America's Imperial Ambition
Author(s): G. John Ikenberry
Source: Foreign Affairs, Sep. - Oct., 2002

³ America's Imperial Ambition
Author(s): G. John Ikenberry
Source: Foreign Affairs, Sep. - Oct., 2002

progressive change, democracy, rule of law, open markets collective security, collective problem-solving approach, and institutional frameworks are the hallmarks of the liberal world. There has been variation over the last half-century. The first version 1.0 was associated with Woodrow Wilson, the second is associated with Cold War liberal internationalism, and the third one according to him is 3.0 which he would identify with several indicators. Liberal international ideas evolved periodically and reinvented over the course of history, championed by Woodrow Wilson but rekindled by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. Liberals hold the strong conviction that cooperation among states is deeply embedded in mutual interests and would create incentives that could potentially lead to a rule-based world order. There has been an optimistic assumption in liberal internationalism that the security dilemma could be overcome. Since 1945 the United States has become the hegemonic organizer of the liberal-led world order; its economic, political, alliances, technology, and currency are incorporated into the existing system. The Westphalia state system is where states cooperate together for mutual benefits. Liberal internationalism 1.0 embodies the following characteristics; state system defined in the Westphalia context, membership without discrimination, non-intervention collective security. Liberal internationalism 2.0 with the following characteristics West-centric economy, mutual reciprocity, and a security system. The American-led world system, economically, politically, and socially. Liberal internationalism 3.0 revolves around the diversified strands of core liberal values including the promotion of institutionalized framework, furthering policy domains, and the Westphalian state system. In Wilsonian idealism, it is argued that the most aggressive state could be tamed under the umbrella of collective security umbrella. Second, Wilson did not condemn the rule of Great Britain in India but was convinced enough that political maturity was necessary

G John Ikenberry argues that interdependence remained arguably prevalent after the Cold War since the cooperation among industrialized democratic states and the partnership after the Cold War is still viable. Europe and Japan have been the most smooth partners in the arena of cooperation. What abtains Western states from the concentration of power is emanating from the underlying assumptions that institutional arrangements are cohesive enough to withstand maligned human nature tendencies.⁴ The viability of a liberal-led world

⁴ America's Imperial Ambition
Author(s): G. John Ikenberry

is everlasting since it has incorporated its roots in the political, economic, and social sphere, which is highly unlikely and it is intangible layers of interdependence and hard to bring about changes in it. The institutionalized and perpetual changes in its core essence are the fundamental logic of enduring legacy. The structure of existing world structures is hinged on the pillars of the internationalist world which is inextricably connected. “The hegemony of the US is proportional to the durability of institutional frameworks vis a vis political, economic and social spheres” the difficulties pertaining to altering the existing world. Reciprocity, win-win situation, and international security arrangements have been the most decisive factors in it.

⁵ Ikenberry in his article “The Illusion of Geopolitics: The Enduring “Power of the Liberal Order” floated an argument in response to Walter Russel Mead that the existing world order led by America is not that fragile enough to undo it with the coalition of belligerent states. The Chinese and Russian economies are deeply integrated into the world trade system. The cobweb of liberal internationalism has an intimate connection, which is really hard to disentangle given the fact that it is all-inclusive and caters to the need for engagement in industrialized democratic economies. The German and Japanese economies have been growing ever since the practice of openness in trade was incorporated into the World trade system despite the fact they were belligerent states during the Cold War and it signifies the non-discriminatory practices of a liberal world. In order to avert the economic downturn alike 1930s, the factor of reciprocity is a prerequisite and the US has been overseeing the smooth functioning of affairs⁶

In a review article, Brian C. Schmidt elucidated the recurrent pattern of world politics of Mearsheimer that relative gain is a huge concern for a state in their strategic calculus, and this metric accounts highly when it comes to the balance of power. The security dilemma is the most prevalent phenomenon in international politics. The major assumptions underpinning offensive realism are, how great power is likely to behave and how did they behave in the past. The Bush administration unilateral decision was predominantly inspired by offensive realist assumptions though Mearsheimer is against crusading of American foreign policy since 9/11. In addition, Mearsheimer argue that offensive realism can aptly elucidate the

Source: Foreign Affairs, Sep. - Oct., 2002

⁵ Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order Author(s): G. John Ikenberry

⁶ The Illusion of Geopolitics: The Enduring Power of the Liberal Order Author(s): G. John Ikenberry

international politics for late 17th century. He declares that an environment where state inhabit is prone to endless violence and pattern of great power politics is prevalent. All states possess some offensive military capabilities that could be used potentially against other state. Second, state is loss aversive and does not trust the intention of other states. It is rarely possible for any state to gain an absolute hegemony argues Mearsheimer.⁷ There have been contrarian views about American hegemony but that is not to be discussed. A sound theory helps describe, explain and predict the phenomenon.

In *The False Promise of International Institutions*, the author John J. Mearsheimer draws the grim a grim picture of politics. The absolute gains account for the unbridled competition among the state which is inevitable and contended that power is the most important element that helps govern the desired outcome in governance of world politics. In addition, hegemonic states tend to coerce the state that shows an unwillingness to adapt to change set forth by the hegemon, liberal values, capitalism, and the monetary system are some of the intervening variables that make grand strategy consistent amid the swing of interests of the United States. The monetary policy and trade regime aptly describes the pursuit of American virtue and it exhibits almost the same pattern of hegemon. Liberal internationalists are diametrically opposed to what the proponents of offensive realism argue; ⁸it stresses the need for institutional building, security arrangements, and the world and accomplishments of liberal values deemed as congenial for the world to be stable and all the core liberal values are put in place. “ President Clinton perceived and was convinced that” in a world where freedom, not tyranny is on the march the cynical calculus of pure power politics simply does not compute. It is ill-suited to a new era”. The Clinton administration’s national security adviser hurled a criticism against the Bush administration for having been a part of a classical way of thinking that perceives the world through the prism of the classical balance of power.⁹ Mr Clinton was tilted way more towards Wilsonian Idealism than his counterpart.¹⁰ The European coal and still community, NATO, and conference on security and cooperation in Europe were constituted primarily to make cooperation and peaceful Europe in the backdrop of the Cold War and making an interlocking structure and reinforcing institutions that ensure mutual complementarities and assigned role-playing within institutions are of spatial

⁷ Schmidt, Brian C. 2004. "Review: Realism as Tragedy." *Cambridge University press*.

⁸ Mearsheimer, John J. 1994-1995. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *The MIT Press*.

¹⁰ Mearsheimer, John J. 1994-1995. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *The MIT Press*.

importance, argued Warren Christopher, on the contrary, asserts that". In order for Europe to remain peaceful after the Cold War hinges on the perpetual pattern of institutional framework. Institutional theories are predominantly aimed at the core logic of realism that perceives the world through Hobbesian, Machiavellian, Morgenthau, and pessimistic lenses that put inherently flawed human nature and superiority over others (diffidence) as fundamental aspects of international politics. Liberal internationalists by hurling criticism maintain that an interlocking structure and complex cobweb of interdependence make the war highly unlikely but realists are strongly convinced that cooperation is a relative gain one is winning at the expense of others it speaks of cynicism that has long been prevalent for the past three millennium. Institutional theories underpin the logic of reciprocity and win-win situation but realists see international politics from a cryonicist world. It paints a nasty picture of existing realities and believes the competition would endure perpetually. The question of relative gain is outrightly omitted in the calculus of reciprocity of cooperation. The question of who is gaining at the expense of others still needs to be addressed. Security dilemma where the fear of adversary is looming and the threat spectrum from anarchic world is still unheeded." Stronger states do what they want and the weaker ones accept what they must" Hobbes. There is empirical evidence of comparative advantage in strategic trade theory which lucidly stresses the state to gain comparative advantage over other states, where the state limits its dependency on others to focus primarily on absolute gain. The question of relative gain is the least addressed in internationalist calculus. The distribution of power in the international system is predominantly the crucial factor, the fear of being exploited is always prevalent in anarchic world. The stronger state in institutional arrangements does not fear the consequences of cheating with smaller states. To put things in perspective, A smaller state in regional integration or institutional arrangements is subject to constant fear of cheating, so the point of reciprocity doesn't make sense at all. The League of Nations' failure resulted from the fear of being exploited by the strong states and thus found no incentives to cooperate with each state. The Concert of Europe was constituted essentially after Napoleonic France but lasted from 1815 to 1823 and did well but was unable to work as a coordinating body among great powers

Scope of the study

The study is focused on the national security strategy of the Trump and Biden administrations. The priorities each administration has and the commonalities are discussed.

With primary focus on the contours of grand strategy and competing views on grand strategy by John J. Mearsheimer and G. John Ikenberry have also been discussed. The factors that are dependent on the primacy of the United States as a global power are regional stability, great power competition, internationalist order, partnership, and US preeminence have been elucidated.

Research methodology

The research attempts to highlight the contours of grand strategy and intends to use critical analysis to describe the grand strategy over the course of US foreign policy. The secondary data; books, research articles, and primary data from national security archives of George Washington University and State Department websites have been used to carry out the study. The study is qualitative in nature, to carry out the comparative analysis. The dominant scholars of grand strategy and their writings have been cited as the most fundamental base in the continuation of writing. The dimensions of grand strategy are explained accordingly.

Organization of chapters

The introduction intends to explain the existing literature on grand strategy over the course of history. How the institutions building and collective security was brought in place.

The first chapter explains the theoretical framework of how offensive realism and liberal internationalism are at play, and how it came under the grand strategy duress. How the institution building and absolute power go hand in hand.

The second Chapter attempts to describe the course of the US foreign policy history in the aftermath of World War 2. The tilt towards the institutional building from governing the rules related to trade alliance and partnership. The era of containment against the sovereign union to the engagement of the United States across the world are discussed. The grand strategy throughout this course is highlighted.

The third chapter intends to explain the national security strategy document under the Trump and Biden administrations. What priorities do the United States have across the world? what

are the most prerequisites and what priorities should be given precedence over others? The commonalities of those priorities have also been highlighted.

The fourth chapter draws the picture of international politics from the liberal hegemony lens what prognosis are there in the US leadership role under the pursuit of liberal hegemony? Furthermore, paints a grim picture of international politics and sees the world through absolute power that is unrivaled and sees selective engagement to retain the leadership role and focus more on harnessing key domains that are prerequisites to sustain global affairs and being unrivalled

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK; GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Theoretical framework is indispensable in discerning the patterns of events and theory helps in understanding, explaining, and predicting the phenomenon that is recurrent and the events that have rarely occurred. The framework used here is grand strategy which implies that strands of liberalism and realism are at play given the factor of strategic calculus in time and space factor. Grand strategy is taken as a theoretical framework due to the fact that it characterizes both realist and liberalist features. Liberal internationalism and offensive Realism are the central elements in a theoretical framework. of G John Ikenberry's liberal internationalism. On the contrary, John G Mearsheimer's underpinning assumptions about international politics and cooperation factors that drive state behavior. The rationale for the grand strategy to be used as a theoretical framework underlies several factors: John J. Mearsheimer who is an offensive realist that advocates survival which is dependent on power maximization to ensure survival. On the contrary, G. John Ikenberry's assumptions are institutions building that are beneficial for the nations. Liberal internationalists consider the fear of aggression less relevant given the credibility of Western democratic nations. The grand strategy embodies both realist and liberalist orientations.

1.1 Liberal internationalism

1.1.1 American led world order

The United states after 1945 took the leadership role in its course of foreign policy era. The bipolar world order started emerging. With US bloc staunch ardent of liberal order and congenial capitalism based on free market and indiscriminate trade with nations that supported the world with institutional frameworks and collective security mechanisms. On the other hand, the bloc led by soviet union that desired a world which is diametrically opposed to capitalism and liberal led world order. Number of institutions came into existence followed by the aftermath of world war 2 by the US keeping the view of stable and prosperous world by making financial institutions. ¹¹Securitized framework for collective

¹¹ Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order Author(s): G. John Ikenberry

security matters in the form of North Atlantic Treaty organization and creation of European Coal and steel community in 1951 under the aegis of United States which would later become European Union. France and Germany the arch rival would now cooperate in European Union and would open up their respective economy, setting aside their long established rivalry it is the free world that open door for cooperation. The quest for US-led world order which is capitalism and liberal aspirations would last till USSR disintegrated in 1991 and the emergence of unipolar with US at top of calling shots in preserving the smooth functioning of global affairs with focus on capitalism and internationalist order.

1.1.2 Continuation of Wilsonian idealism

G John Ikenberry holds an underpinning assumption about international cooperation that liberal world does not embody the fixed set of idea in political, economic institution building and open markets but it is the dynamic process and is in the pursuit of prosperous and better world where rules work out in favor of mutual reciprocity. Liberal internationalism 1.0 is associated with the idea of President Wilson which is the foundation of liberal world and free trade system. The idea has evolved over the course of US foreign policy history which transcends from the fixed system and that accentuate the viability of liberal internationalism that would take it's trajectory from version 1.0 to 3.0. Given the context of liberal aspirations and values that revolve around the promotion of democracy, rule of law, progressive change and collective security matters on consensual basis. ¹²The liberal internationalist ideas championed by President Wilson was rekindled by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. The capitalist and economic system brought by the west rose to preeminence in early twentieth century. The liberal states adopted a multitude of ways to bring about changes in Social, economic system, innovation and adaptability to change, congenial structure of governance and acquisition of liberal aspirations. The first version liberal internationalism 1.0 which Anglo-American brought after World war 1 settlement. While the second version 2.0 is primarily linked with cold war settlement where the need of forging institutions were necessitated and institutionalized framework was of spatial importance. To cushion the

Source: Perspectives on Politics , Mar., 2009, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Mar., 2009), pp. 71-87 Published by: American Political Science Association

¹² Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order Author(s): G. John Ikenberry Source: Perspectives on Politics , Mar., 2009, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Mar., 2009), pp. 71-87 Published by: American Political Science Association

downturn of international structures became necessary in an era of 1945 Post Cold War. The version 3.0 is post hegemonic era where the US being hegemonic organizer of global affairs.

1.2 Dimensions of liberal internationalism and partnership

Liberal internationalism embodies the broad array of factors that makes it congenial and acceptable to world. The version 1.0 is characterized by several key elements. *Universal membership*, which is not associated with regime location. *Westphalian state system*, which implies non intervention. *Organized political authority*. Wherein a rule based order is carried out. Free market economy where trade is carried out under the principle of World trade organization and collective security matters are discussed under consensual basis. The version of internationalism, embodies the *west-led economic and security system*; *Modified Westphalian sovereignty* that is subject to compromise in order for state to exercise maximum state sovereignty with the US being at the helm of affairs in provision of Patron-Client relations and sustaining public good and rule-based order. In addition, complex web of inter-governmental relations are made sure under US being at the helm of affairs. The Patron-Client relation is ensured. Liberal version 3.0 embodies the diversified characteristics; universal scope of institutionalized framework which characterized the expanding membership within governing institutions to keep the non western state away. There has been robust inclusion of other states within economic and security institutions keeping the post Westphalian model in consideration. The hierarchical network where a various group of dominating countries occupy the governing position. Interdependent networks that span to broader area of interests.¹³

In 1940's when US reinitiated the liberal project after the League of Nations failed to prevent the second world war. Roosevelt instilled the strands of realism into its policy to seek responsible role from great powers the previous version of internationalism was required to ensure that US remain at the helm of affairs with the cooperation of other great power but Roosevelt's version was aimed at reinvigorating liberalism ; consolidating and rebuilding Europe, integrating Germany and Japan, pledging commitment and opening up a market, provision of security, Containing soviet communism. In the backdrop of cold war and Soviet communism, the US initiated a Liberalism 2.0 which would ensure the smooth functioning of

¹³Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order Author(s): G. John Ikenberry Source: Perspectives on Politics , Mar., 2009, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Mar., 2009), pp. 71-87 Published by: American Political Science Association

world affairs. Roosevelt initiated the great power cooperation and open trade practice into international politics that would soon be adopted into the legal framework. The vision Roosevelt held anticipated more compromises than Wilsonian idealism. The concept of Sovereignty has the least regard in this version.

1.3 Internationalism and Cooperation

The central argument of Ikenberry is that the US-built order and its continuation are highly likely in the future. Ikenberry holds a proposition that the Westphalian system advocates territorial integrity, the right to the working of the establishment of government structure. The state under Westphalian maintains the traditional balance of power as per the assertions of Ikenberry and other ambitions of other states are checked. The possibility is not high under a unipolar world, yet a coalition can challenge the unipolarity of the hegemon. In addition, unipolar can impose a hegemonic way of governance and set of stipulated rules for the smooth functioning of affairs. It can use coercion to bring the belligerent state to the negotiation table. The imperial state with the consensus of allied states calls the shots in sustainability of affairs. Second, the hegemon state creates a hierarchy to promote the liberal internationalist idea that was brought in by Anglo-Americans following the aftermath of the First World War 1 settlement through the pathway of diplomacy. The brilliant feature stemming from the liberal order for Ikenberry is the multilateralism that gives traction to subordinate states to give credence to the interlocking structure over preferred policies that assure mutual gain.

Furthermore, G John Ikenberry emphasized the foreign policy posture of the United States during the Cold War; which was tilted simultaneously toward the traditional balance of power to the Soviet union during the Cold war and the liberal strategy toward East Asia and Western Europe, seemingly practicing restraint in using coercion. Permissive foreign policy posture was prevalent Under George H. W. Bush and William J Clinton's presidencies wherein unilateral decisions were made having least regard for sovereignty which undermines Westphalian tenets. ¹⁴It is highly likely that Westphalian order would collapse if liberal values are outrightly rejected. In order to create a viable atmosphere for international cooperation the strands of liberal values have to be incorporated into governance structure

¹⁴ Interlocking Institutions: The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)," NATO Basic Fact Sheet No. 6 (Brussels, June 1994). Also see Jacques Delors, "European Unification and European Security," in European Security after the Cold War, Part 1, Adelphi Paper No. 284 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies [IISS], January 1994), pp. 3-14.

with states that share a common vision for international governance and the United States has been pursuing a liberal grand strategy over the past six decades. Ikenberry is cognizant of the fact but not equally liberal to all states. The US interfered numerous times covertly and overtly in Latin America which was illiberal in nature. During the Arab Spring in 2011, The US did not support democracy fearing the unwanted consequences of the emergence of an anti-US regime. There has been considerable variation in US foreign policy towards different regions not wholly embracing liberalism and is diametrically opposed to embracing a democratic world. In order for the, US to project liberal aspirations it has to embody the strands of the Westphalian state system. The strategic compulsion would require the US to make tweaks to its liberal agenda.

1.4 Offensive Realism

Realism is the school of thought that perceives human nature with a nasty and grim picture and it is based on the premise that human nature is inherently flawed and not capable of cooperation and it is driven by glory, diffidence, and absolute gain. Realism asserts that war is an inevitable phenomenon, in order to avoid war we must prepare ourselves for war. It deems the pursuit of power as the perpetual and integral element of international politics. The *offensive realism* theory posits that the state is compelled to maximize its power lest it get suppressed by the potential hegemon. The inherent fears and security dilemmas are driving factors that make a state behave to surpass another state, fearing the consequences of being attacked. The survival in international system is foremost prerequisite elements of state's power maximization. Self help, Power maximization and survival. Great powers have some offensive capabilities and maximizing the power is rational choice.¹⁵

¹⁵ (REALISM, 2005, pp. 29-52)

1.4.1 Perpetual struggle of power pursuit and security dilemma

John J. Mearsheimer explains whether institutional arrangement prevent war or not? He further elucidates the theories of international relations and delving deep into the underpinning realities of international politics. first in responding to institutional theories he argues that underlying assumptions about institutions being the only way to sustain peace is opposed to what realism argues. In a response to institution theories, realism argue the distribution of power is reflected through institutions formation. The interlocking structure of European Union and institutional arrangement here is considered gold standard for interconnectivity. Realism maintains that institutions are merely inspired to cater the need of concerned states, to put things in Perspective it is the Stringent calculations of how a certain move can certainly affect the relative gain.

¹⁶Mearsheimer further argues and put an emphasis on institutions that it has least effect on state behavior and it does not promise future stability and he term it as flawed assumptions. The institutions stipulate the set of rule and regulations for desirable and unacceptable behavior. These rules are formalized. The rules and regulations are further incorporated into laws and¹⁷ agreements which are binding upon the states. The realism paint the struggle for power as a relentless process where every state dissuades other to reach the lofty position. International relations is the relentless pursuit of security competition, the probability of war is highly present in it. The cooperation exists in international system but there is underlying logic in it, it is motivated by certain security concerns and countering susceptibility of existing state from the dominating one. The essential logic of realism is that there exists anarchy in international system wherein a structure is dominated by no overacting authority and that is the primarily the driving factor behind state's behavior that causes it to increase it's prowess. The second underlying realism assumption employ that states tend to possess some offensive military capabilities that give them an opportunity to exploit the situation of other states and can cause a potential harm to other state. A state military prowess can be gauged by some of weaponry it has at her end. The third assumption holds skeptical intentions of other state. To doubt intentions of other state and it's military should be heeded, there is no way to trust the intention of other since the absolute certainty in international

¹⁶ Interlocking Institutions: The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)," NATO Basic Fact Sheet No. 6 (Brussels, June 1994). Also see Jacques Delors, "European Unification and European Security," in European Security after the Cold War, Part 1, Adelphi Paper No. 284 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies [IISS], January 1994), pp. 3-14.

¹⁷ The False Promise of International Institutions Author(s): John J. Mearsheimer

politics is not completely reliable. The fourth assumption is survival which is indispensable in the international system. The fifth is a state, a rational actor which thinks strategically. However, the state calculations can be wrong since the international environment is endlessly unpredictable. These elements fundamentally give the motive to the state to behave in an offensive and defensive way. The suspicion from which states see each other is always present and the anticipation of danger varies from time and space factor. To avert the aggression of a potential state, a constant struggle for the pursuit of more power becomes imperative for another state. While quoting Kenneth Waltz, that alliances are only temporary marriage of convenience, it doesn't guarantee the likelihood of sustainability. The state has to acquire a relative power gain to offset the loss of itself relative to others. States are simultaneously offensive and defensive in their posture of balancing in an international environment. They also make sure that other state doesn't take advantage of them. The possibility of war is highly likely given the nasty presence of competition.

1.4.2 Is cooperation possible in a realist world?

What obstructs cooperation in a realist world are; relative gain and highly possible cheating. The cooperation is highly doubtful and the pretense under which state cooperate are aimed at strategic calculus. The cost and benefits analysis of the cooperation is deeply investigated. States in accordance with realist paradigm are predominantly concerned with the balance of power and always make sure that no loss to it should be incurred at the expense of other state's gain. The probability of cheating is always present and the threshold of trust is always at the lowest ebb. The cooperation factor among state is nullified when an absolute gain of other state is ensured. The military build-up increases the susceptibility which ensue paranoia and instill a fear, given these factor states are reluctant to ratify a treaty and agreement. The Germany and Soviet gathered around against Poland in 1939. The agreement ratified during cold war aptly exhibits the cooperation factor that doesn't work out in a longer run; it only exhibits the balancing the power calculus.¹⁸

There has been a point of contention in realist school of thought that institutions are made to ensure to share the chunk of power sharing in world politics or to maximize it to the fullest way possible. Institutions are merely the intervening variable, on the contrary, balance of

¹⁸ The False Promise of International Institutions Author(s): John J. Mearsheimer

power is an independent variable that instigates war and peace. The West won the Cold War and NATO is reflecting the balance of power under the aegis of institutions.¹⁹

1.4.3 Grim picture of international politics

The institutional theories of liberal institutionalism have failed to address the question as to how exactly the war is averted. They hold the altruistic assumption that economic and environmental benefits would compel the state to cooperate with each other omitted the fundamental reality that has been consistent throughout ages where cheating ample great witness. The factors of absolute gain is always omitted in liberal internationalism and the concept of win-win situation has no relevance from the realists world view. The securitized lens where there is thriving competition among states are outrightly ignored and liberal approach is to ameliorate rather than addressing. It's assumption are fixated more or less on security and political economy but emphasis is mainly on latter. Institutions do not guarantee the win situation and fail to control relative gain. It doesn't have control over the skeptical intentions of states. The causal logic of absolute gain is always present and it gives an opportunity to deceive other states. In addition, institutional theorist does not provide a plausible logic to an intimate connection between economic and military might, the moment the former is augmented it tends the state to increase military might, so the cooperation factor leads to theoretical falling..Grieco explained the viability of the GATT General agreement on trade and tariffs and came up with the conclusion that an absolute gain has always been given precedence and the primary objective of reciprocity in institutions. Institutions are used to pressure the states in order to acquiesce another state to get a desirable behavior. The theory of collective security emphasizes the importance of peace through an institutionalized framework but does not address how to prevent war. Lastly, realism does not support the idea that war should be fought to attain the liberal dream rather it advocates the balance of power.

1.4.4 Selective military engagement

Mearsheimer elucidates the pattern of great power behavior by emphasizing the offensive realism theory major argument that includes regional hegemony that the state should pursue. It is further argued that achieving maximum hegemony would become non feasible since the projection of power is highly unlikely because the world has many oceans that would obstruct the great powers to maximize it's hegemony given the fact that presence of large bodies of

¹⁹ The False Promise of International Institutions Author(s): John J. Mearsheimer

water. They make sure that even balance in power to ensure that multiple power exist to maintain the regional balance. He further gives an example of the United States that it attained regional hegemony in late 1800s.

It is further argued that great power tends to increase the wealth as it maximizes the chunk of wealth sharing as it is correlated to military might. For instance, the United States abstained Soviet Union from dominating Western Europe and Middle East. Had the United States not done that, the calculations of traditional balance of power would have been altered. Mearsheimer contends that major powers tend to attain nuclear superiority over their counterparts. He further argues that mutually assured destruction isn't sufficient enough to live in an international environment rather acquiring an edge and superiority over other is fundamental aspect in an international environment. The United States was expanding power and began an expansion acquiring major mass of land from European power. The European power and presence were expelled and the US by the end of 19th century almost completed expansion and no power would challenge American hemisphere²⁰

1.4.5 Power politics and Realism

Mearsheimer attempts to unveil the intimate connection between politics and human nature. Human are social beings that are bound together by social fabric. Culture is a binding factor that helps bind the people with a common heritage but culture solely is not sufficient. The political institutions are necessary that drive the behavior within group. It stipulates the preconditions that society should abide by. The political institutions is necessary, it needs to contend with threat and put in place measures that ensure the viability of it in the future. The politics comes in governing the institutions. It is essentially who write the rules and regulations and governance. Political and social are aligned with each other and go hand in hand. To envision a world where a competition doesn't thrive is a utopian idea and it is diametrically opposed to each Hobbesian human nature.²¹ The interplay of politic and human nature have intimate connection. The group will have then competing perspective which would then lead to the competition over imposing dominance. Social groups are bound to make political institutions that to govern the affairs. The interplay according to Mearsheimer is hard to disentangle. The sameness of global culture is hard despite the fact that Britain and American culture infiltration across the world with rapid globalization, it is yet impossible to

²⁰ (Mearsheimer, 2001)

²¹ The False Promise of International Institutions Author(s): John J. Mearsheimer

achieve cultural sameness. ²²The heterogeneity of cultures that world has make it hard to acquire sameness of culture. The conception of global society is hard to conceive. In addition, social groups have their own stipulated set of rules and regulations according to which the want to govern their political institutions. Ideational aspects are factored into equation that help determine the collective standards for the acceptable standards which is not equal given the pluralistic culture across the world.

Unique human endowments uplift them above all creatures they have faculty of thinking to enable them to make the best use of their abilities. Humans are social species it is highly likely that they would have contending perspectives and the reasoning over dominating perspective would persists. ²³The Age of Enlightenment from 1650 to 1800 saw a great advancements in the field of philosophy and realization of separating religion from statecraft. The question still remained about the dominating perspective and how to get it viable over other group of people. There is no overarching authority over social groups. The survival factor among existing groups are always present and since there is no policing authority to punish the perpetrator so the propensity of perpetrating atrocities by other is highly likely that competition for who get right to write the rules. In order that each group rules are not threatened the counterpart strive to outsmart the other. The desire for maximizing the military power and economic might are increased so as to minimize the potential harm that could come in between the pursuit of survival, the fear has always been major source to gain advantage over other, to understand this in anarchic system, it is “A strong do what they want and the weak accept what they must.”

²³ 2 Human Nature and Politics
(pp. 14-44) (MEARSHEIMER, 2 Human Nature and Politics, 2018)

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Historical background

The United States since it took the role of leadership in 1945 took the helm of affairs and it deliberated efforts to bring in stability in Europe and incorporated grand strategies to promote democratic norms and US led order free market economy and capitalism. The historical background will cover up the contour of US foreign policy under the duress of grand strategy from establishment of institutions, defining sphere of influence, containment period and demise of Soviet Union. What fundamental elements were incorporated in the foreign policy of united states. The chapter intends to highlight the overview of the US foreign policy under the grand strategy duress. The contours of grand strategy would be emphasized as to when exactly the posture of foreign policy were tilted towards realist and liberalist orientations given the international environment.

2.1.1 Truman doctrine

The Truman doctrine by , President Harry S. Truman incorporated the political, economic and military support for the democratic countries that were confronted with authoritarian threats. That brought a shift in the US foreign policy orientation from aloofness to interference in a regional conflict in a selective way. The power was transitioned from Great Britain to the US, when the announcement from Britain came amid that Greece would no longer be supported against communist party by Britain. The Truman asked the congress approval to support Greece against the communist party and it also included the aid to Turkey since it was reliant on aid from British government.²⁴

Truman requested congress to provide assistance of \$400,000,000 to Turkey and Greece of civilian and military dispatch to them. The underpinning rationale behind doing that was, it would potentially put a risk of engulfing Middle East because civil war in Greece would be dependent on Turkey's political stability. It could have caused a political turmoil in the region and this potential situation could have had undermine, the United States strategic

²⁴ <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine> (HISTORIAN, The Truman Doctrine, 1947, MILESTONES: 1945–1952)

calculus. Truman was convinced that it is obligatory under the US-Cherished values to support the free world against authoritarian states, in order that peace and stability of the world is ensured. Truman argued that it is not in the favor of the United States national security the expansion of Soviet Union into the free nations of the world. The government of Greece should be given an all-out support in their effort against democratization. The Truman doctrine was aimed at keeping the democratic countries away from Soviet influence.

The United States after world war 2 rose as the most indispensable economic, political and military power. The period in which wars were being fought helped the US to augment its economy and taking it out of economic downturn of 1929 and assisted her to generate a great revenue for her. The economic mean of the US assisted her to use it a strategic aspect to further its foreign policy goals. The United States provided a considerable support to the Europe and Asian that had been struggling to recover. The British Prime minister and the President Truman infamous speech “Iron curtain “ where the United States became the first member of international organization set-up that would be promoting international security, trade and the law. The colonies of European power were left and had difficulties in maintaining were taken care by the US it exhibited interest in them. The United States faced a stiff resistance from the communist superpower and struck a counter balancing approach in spreading of communism in Western Europe.

George F. Kennan, formulated the US foreign policy of containment to fight a cold war which spanned from(1947-1989) to contain USSR expansion and that would be later on incorporated into Truman foreign policy. It embodies the element of containing USSR expansion but that would be later on taking the new course of reducing the Soviet Union influence in the Eastern Europe. Truman urged to increase the military budget underpinning the pretext that defeat of free institutions is defeat everywhere and for that US has to flex it’s military muscle and to ensure political integrity of democratic nations.

2.2 Marshal plan, 1948

Europe fell in ruin after deadly World War 2 and it needed to be revamped in order that it does not fall prey to the outside powers to be taken over by them, the Europe felt a desperate need to reinvigorate its structure financially and Politically.²⁵The secretary of state George C. Marshal announced a call to revamp Europe. It was confronted with the looming threat of

²⁵ The Suez Crisis, 1956. U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian.

Soviet expansion and to avert that threat it had to turn to Europe. In March 1948, the economic act was successfully passed by the congress and the fund was approved that would eventually lead to \$12 billion for the reinvigoration of the Western Europe, with that plan being put in place would now rekindle the European industrialization and the west poured a huge of investment into the Europe that could assist in recovering the deteriorating economy. The European market would now be the best destination for the US goods. The Marshall plan became institutionalized framework of Aid programs and would become an essential element of US Foreign policy.²⁶

The European recovery was indispensable for the security of the US so as to avert the Soviet expansion in the Western Europe and the Marshall plan would now be served as a model in the future aid program. The economic indicators showed a positive prognosis and output of industrial growth surpassed the 1938 and reached the level of 48%. It also convinced American policy makers that an economic mean could be used as effective diplomatic mean to revert the Soviet policy. The governing structure and skilled labor were already in place and the Marshall plan proved to be an ideal setting for Western Europe to pull the ailing economy out of downturn. The Marshall plan was proved to be successful to the prosperity of Western Europe and American interests.²⁷

2.3 Creation of North Atlantic treaty organization (NATO)

The NATO was established by the United States, Canada and numerous European nations in order to provide a collective security framework against the Soviet union. It was the first of its kind that was established after the deadly world war 2. It was indispensable for the Europe to reinvigorate its economy and have a security assurance against the belligerent state and the Soviet union. The events in Turkey and Greece led the President Truman to ruminate over the assistance of economic and security assistance to the nation that is subject to humiliation. The threat of Soviet was looming, it backed the coup in Czechoslovakia which was next to border of Germany and communist regime was installed successfully. The number of communist voters increased in Italy. The resolve of the west had been tested by the Stalin by putting berlin blockade, the events were leading to the brink of conflict but was pacified. Amid the

²⁶ The Marshall Plan Reconsidered: A Complex of Motives Author(s): Diane B. Kunz
Source: Foreign Affairs , May - Jun., 1997, Vol. 76, No. 3 (May - Jun., 1997), pp. 162- 170
Published by: Council on Foreign Relations

²⁷ The Suez Crisis, 1956. U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian.

looming threat of Security concerns, the Western European countries gathered around to establish a military alliance, Great Britain, Belgium Luxembourg France, and Netherland ratified a treaty In Brussels in 1948, assuring the collective defense of Europe.

It is further argued that institutions that last for a generation would be highly likely that the sustainability of that institution would be far better than before it was created. The military alliance emanated from the turbulent era of the Second World War and the chaotic era of the Cold era. NATO has a bureaucratic structure and articles under which the consultation is being carried out.

2.4 Suez canal crisis

The Suez Canal crisis emerged in 1956 when the Egyptian president Gamal Abdul Nasser nationalized the canal. It is the waterway that controls the major flow routes of oil which is primarily used by Europe. The France and British forces gathered around which became a source of tarnished relations with the United States and potentially could have led the Soviet Union to the brink of war with the US. The Israeli forces sneaked into the Egypt Suez Canal. Israel was backed by the France and British. The attack emanated from the nationalization of the canal by Gamal Abdel Nasser. Egypt was subject to British rule before the Anglo-Egypt treaty. The Nasser forces had been engaged with Israeli forces on the border since Nasser was strongly in opposition to Zionist nation policy. The Suez Canal was made under the aegis of France and British in 1869. It stretches 120 miles long and it serves as a major point of junction between the Mediterranean Sea and to Indian Ocean. Served the major purpose of goods to be shipped to and forth from Asia to Europe. It became the major source of conflict during the Cold War when it became nationalized.²⁸

Arab nationalism started emerging under Nasser's leadership. The Soviets poured in arms from Czechoslovakia to Egypt in 1955. The Soviet Union funded the Damn project since the United States refused to provide funds. The Soviet Union leader Nikita Khrushchev was enraged by the joint forces operation of Israel-France-British forces intrusion in their allied country Egypt given the alliance commitment and threatened to Bomb Western Europe with Nuclear weapons, Should the forces not withdraw. President Dwight Eisenhower in response to the Russians emphasized that such action would exacerbate the conflict. The United States intervened and stressed the withdrawal of troops. France, British, and Israel were directed to

²⁸ he Suez Crisis, 1956. U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian.

withdraw their respective troops immediately lest severe sanctions are imposed on them. The respective countries withdrew their forces and ceded their control of Suez Canal to Egypt in March 1957. The United Nations peacekeeping mission forces was sent there to end skirmishes over there. The event marked the increasing influence of Soviet union and the US in a contrast to weakening position of France and British in international structural settings.

2.5 The Cuban Missile Crisis , October 1962

The Cuban missile crisis was among one of the major conflicts that could have potentially led two superpowers in a direct confrontation and war with each other. The miscalculations from both side of superpowers were the integral element that served as a catalyst to have brought the situation on the brink of war. It was distinct in its since there was no involvement of bureaucracy in it which has usually been involved in foreign policy process, The kremlin and Washington was directly involved in a confrontation with each other. The foiled attempt of the US to dethrone Castro Regime the bay of pig invasion was failed. ²⁹ The Nikta Khrushchev reached an agreement covertly with Cuban Government to deploy nuclear missiles with assistance of Fidel Castro to avert any invasion in the foreseeable future. The construction of missile sites were being carried out and the US intelligence agency successfully detected the build-up of arms and presence of Soviet IL-28 bombers led President Kennedy to disseminate the public awareness of Soviet offensive weapons being deployed into the Cuba.. The US spy aircraft took the pictures of unusual movement of Arms medium range and intermediate -range and it was later on presented in the White House. The President Kennedy after a thoroughly ruminating over options presented to him, opted to declare Quarantine which signifies the existence of war. The letter was sent to Kremlin that no offensive weapons would be bearable to threaten the security of western hemisphere. The military preparedness at this crucial juncture by the US led Khrushchev to respond that it is an act of aggression and Soviet ship would proceed without any hindrance.

The Abc reported to White House that a Soviet agent approached its correspondent that an agreement could be reached, should the United States assure that it would not invade an island in order that Soviet Union remove its missile. The white house did not miss an opportunity of the back channel offer to upend the crisis. The Nikita Khrushchev warning of Nuclear holocaust signifies the importance of viable resolution to avert the nuclear doom, on

²⁹ <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/cuban-missile-crisis> (HISTORIANS, 1961–1968)

October 27, the Khrushchev sought the assurance from the United States to remove its Jupiter missiles from Turkey in return for Soviet missile removal. The consensus reached by the both the US and USSR to go according the demands set forth by the each other. However, the US, demanded that removal of Jupiter Missiles from Turkey would not be a part public resolution. The resolution of that event helped strengthen the image of Kennedy and both Super Power and started ruminating over curb of nuclear arms race.

2.6 NPT (Nuclear nonproliferation treaty 1968)

The Nuclear non proliferation treaty was signed amid the backdrop of fear that Nuclear weapons would spread and to put a curb in forming institutionalized framework and the arms race. Nuclear powers and non nuclear powers pledged their allegiance to have a specified course of action that would assist in the curb of Nuclear weapons. On July 1, 1968 the nuclear Non-proliferation treaty was signed and opened for registration.³⁰ The treaty had been put into force before it extended in 1995 . 191 states joined the treaty given the significance of its text pertaining to the curb of Nuclear weapon and disarmament. It further envisages the peaceful use of nuclear energy and would help curtail the doomsday of nuclear weapon. The conventions of nuclear weapon states as per the Treaty are those who happened to have acquired nuclear weapon before January 1,1967 and among them are the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France and China. While Pakistan, India and Israel are thought to have acquired nuclear weapons however, Israel holds conspicuous move to show it and aforementioned acquired their Nuclear weapons after 1967. The bargaining process that revolved around the Nuclear non proliferation treaty is that nuclear weapons states would share a benefits with those states that have not acquired. The treaty is subject to a review after 5 years so that tweak could be made in it but underwent a change of extension indefinitely. There had been a fear of surging nuclear weapon states before nuclear non proliferation was signed. There was general conception about the surge in nuclear weapons states during cold war to 30 states had the nuclear non proliferation treaty were not signed. The NPT would adopt measures that could assist in prevention of nuclear weapons spread. Nuclear weapon states helped establish nuclear non proliferation regime that would make any country go through a complex process before making nuclear weapons.³¹ It put a ban on nuclear supply groups and made a cartel that would ensure the acquisition of nuclear weapon hard. Though

³⁰ <http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/npt>
(affairs, 2021)

³¹ <http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/npt> (Nations)

probability was low yet some countries acquired it. International atomic agency was put in place strict measures that would help in retaining check and balance mechanism. There are 10 article of nuclear nonproliferation treaty which embody the diversified framework where peaceful and curtailing its spread are ensured.³²

2.7 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan 1979 to 1980

Soviet Union invasion of Afghanistan came as a backdrop of treaty signed between the USSR and Afghanistan in 1978. Thousands of troops dispatched to Afghanistan. It was general conception that having control over Afghanistan would help retain the position of communist bloc and sphere of influence of Soviet union.³³The exiled leader of Marxist people's Democratic Party Kamal Babrrak was throned as a head of the government and Soviet forces faced stiff resistance from the paramilitary and Jihadist groups and the rational behind the resistance was that an atheist's or Christian of Soviet union doesn't have a right to have a control over Afghanistan. The internal political instability started erupted among residing tribal groups and groups residing in urban areas over the Soviet reforms in Afghanistan. The seeds of rebellion grew against the Soviet union and the preparations for expelling soviet forces started emerging. It was strong conception among Afghan that Soviet presence and reforms are opposed to the Islamic teachings and Afghan culture.

The Mujahedeen's used guerilla tactics to render a terrible loss to soviet soldiers and rugged mountains of Afghanistan provided an opportunity to guerilla fighters to spread across and ambush the Soviet forces nevertheless the strategy used by Soviet forces of bombing the Mujahidin area and evacuating the populating area further sparked the resentment. Millions of Afghan migrated to the neighboring countries Iran and Pakistan fleeing the conflict. The Mujahedeen's were aided by the United States against Soviet Union as the were a competing super powers in Cold war. They were provided with antiaircraft missiles that were Shoulder - Fired missile which assisted Mujahedeen's to repel the Soviet attacks. The United States dispatched the ammunition via Pakistan and sponsored the rebels to expel the Soviet unions. The Jihad was sponsored by the United States and Muslims gathered around to fight against the Soviet union. The Carter administration put sanctions on the USSR to dissuade Moscow to cede support to communist government. The Fierce battle among the Mujahedeen's and

³² (affairs, 2021)

³³ (Britannica, 2023)

Soviet forces kept perishing till it withdrew its forces by 1989 and Taliban government took over the control of Afghanistan that would in the future give sanctuary to the Osama Bin Ladin.³⁴

2.8 George H W Bush foreign policy Era

The fall of the Soviet union and the triumph of capitalist world attributed to the phase of Bush senior foreign policy. The approach was signified by conservative and pragmatism. The Chinese government foiled and suppressed the peaceful Pro-Democrats in 1989 in Tiananmen Square. The peaceful protesters were killed and the Bush administration stayed aloof to the crisis that took place in Beijing his administration was convinced that instead of paying heed to responding harshly over the killing of hundred by the Chinese government it opted for the option of putting slight sanctions on China. The Bush administration focused on improving the tarnished relations with the China. The economic relations, benefiting the both nations were given preference.

Over the course of the cold war the United States began to avert the spread of communism in Latin America and had been robustly involved in the measures to make sure that communism doesn't spread across. The CIA informants were robustly involved in sustaining the affairs related to espionage to keep an eye on the Soviet union. The Bush administration after it came to know that Panama dictator Noriega attempt to foil the democracy in his country and subsequent killings of the US service man and his wife led the United States to launch an operation "Just cause " to send in 10.000 military personnel to the Panama to overthrow the military rule. The Noriega sought refuge in the Vatican embassy situated in the city of Panama until he surrendered to the US forces and later on he was brought to the Miami, Florida where he had been convicted of charges pertaining to drug and languished in prison. The" Operation just cause" touted the Bush leadership as a decisive and pragmatic. The military deployment in the Panama has been considered the largest one after Vietnam war. It rendered few casualties to the US forces in it's triumph against the Panama's dictator.

When Bush take the helm of affairs, he expressed his desire to improve the relations with the Soviet union and was reported to have said that great nations are heading towards democracy that embodies freedom. The communism in the Eastern Europe ended when the Berlin a

³⁴ (HISTORIAN, The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan and the U.S. Response, 1978–1980, MILESTONES: 1977–1980)

Wall broke down, the demise of communism in the Eastern Europe. The new era started. The Bush administration opted diplomatic posture over Soviet Union demise and earned him reputation of being a calculated leader among conservatives. The Summit in Malta between Gorbachev and Bush the two leaders ruminated over the reduction of arms. Followed by the summit in Malta, the summit of Washington took place in 1990 where the US and USSR reached an agreement of reduction in the nuclear arms. The efforts were being carried out to establish a cordial relations with USSR after cold war. Bush and Gorbachev met at Moscow in 1991 and signed a strategic arms reduction treaty which is known as START.³⁵

On August 1990, Saddam Hussain invaded Kuwait, he had kept an eyes on Kuwait's oil, land and wealth. The intelligence agencies observed the build-up of Iraqi military yet had not conceived that Saddam would invade Kuwait. The Bush administration was apprised that Saddam's forces invaded Kuwait. The event led the Bush administration to form a coalition against the Iraq with cooperation of Arab countries and the Soviet union. The United States launched "operation Desert storm" was initiated to restore the government in Kuwait. The operation yielded a profitable results in the US military operation in Persian Gulf and subsequently Kuwait was declared free from Saddam Hussain invasion.

³⁶On January 16, 1991, The Bush while addressing the nation justifying the Persian war contended that³⁷ an order of free world which is devoid of tyranny compelled the US to initiate a war against Saddam invasion into Kuwait with allied powers. He asserted that now begins the dawn of era where rule of law will govern not the law of jungle that operates In favor of the strongest. The new order would embodies cooperation and collective security framework that is necessary for the future aspiration of new world order. The United States gained strong foothold in the Middle East after with the assistance of the Arab countries and now the United States would be its core ally in its balancing relations with the world.

2.9 September 11 attack and George W Bush response

The event was characterized by the hijackings of airplanes and tremendous loss to the people of the United States , two of planes were crashed into the world trade center in the New York City, the third hit the Virginia and fourth in Pennsylvania. The attack carried out against the US resulted in the killing of around 3000 people. The attack was carried out by the Osama

³⁵ <https://millercenter.org/president/bush/foreign-affairs> (Knott, N/A)

³⁶ <https://www.britannica.com/event/Soviet-invasion-of-Afghanistan> (Encyclopaedia, 2023)

³⁷ <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1977-1980/soviet-invasion-afghanistan>

Bin Laden under the rationale that the US support to Israel and Presence in the Persian gulf is not acceptable. The loss to the people of the US prompted George W Bush to initiate a campaign against the terrorist with the assistance of allied nations and initiated global war on the Terror. The campaign of war on terror is often compared with the cold war. The war was waged primarily to curb the terrorism and the place where operations were predominantly carried out was Afghanistan,³⁸

2.10 Grand strategy and the dynamic trends in world politics of the 21st century

The United States of America after September 11 took on a new pathway in its regard to way of dealing with the threats offshore, which would have otherwise followed conventional way of deterrence and containment. The Bush administration under the consideration of the United States primacy and the loss incurred to her by the Al Qaeda. The administration opted for preemptive measure and the decision was unique given the harsh response to September 11 event and tweaks were made to the traditional approach of the United States grand strategy that it had been pursuing since 1945. Grand strategy theory revolves around the state survival in an anarchic environment in an international political setting. State choosing a grand strategy has to see a right for the pursuit of these strategy keeping the view of political, economic and military elements and strategy associated with these factors are at play in order that grand strategy works in favor of state's goal. For the country like the United States who has been enjoying the hegemonic position make sure that traditional balance of power works in her favor. Second, being the sole hegemonic power can have a several choices of the grand strategy; one being the isolationism wherein there is assumption that state no longer respond to the threats unless it's is threatened directly by the adversary. In this particular approach it is convinced that security is acquired through by not engaging in the alliance arrangements.

The second being an offshore balancing wherein a peace is achieved though cooperation among great powers and to preserve balance of power, A state has to respond to the threats when it is imminent. It is predominantly used in offsetting the threat. Third, being the "selective engagement " this particular approach usually deal with striking a right balance of power and cooperation among Powers and engagement is carried out pro-actively in the selective areas of the world to ensure the check on arising threats. The third being "*Preserving primacy*" the underpinning principle underlying this approach is to preserve the

³⁸ <https://www.britannica.com/event/September-11-attacks>

Unipolarity and status quo that and for seeking preponderance a multilateral framework is needed and cooperation is ensured. The fourth being “*Imperialism*” this approach usually deals with preserving unipolarity.

Over the period of cold war the United States had been pursuing the grand strategy in maintaining alliance, ensuring the security striking the right balance in the defined sphere of influence that was mainly focused on establishing the US-led Political, social and economic model that would determine the future of the world. The calculation of interests, threats, and cooperation comes under the grand strategy duress for the state to pursue it. The US kept the check on rival power in the cold war era to augment it’s preeminence in the regions where interests of the US were defined in North East Asia and Western Europe. The NATO Alliance formation was meant to ensure the security under the umbrella of US security assurance and so did US-Japan alliance. The alliance withstood in an era of the cold war. The state pursuing a preeminence is often seen through envious lens and the probability of competing states are highly likely and thus crucial factors of grand strategy is to foresee and forestall the eventuality. It has been argued that among scholars community that the US gave assurance to Japan and Germany that it would remain partially great powers in its pursuit of aspired unipolar order.³⁹

The United States proclaims every year it’s documents that outline its national security strategy which comes under national security council. The entirety of the principles and interests of the US are unchanged, nevertheless the administration that is at the helm of affairs can have a different reflection on the interests of the United States. Bill Clinton asserted in a document of national security that few elements had remained constant. Furthermore it was argued that American interests and it’s people at home and abroad should be protected. It’s value and institutional should stay prevalent. Its promotion to other nations is of crucial importance. The September 11 attack led the Bush Administration to opt out new ways. The measures were taken to shun the terrorist attack that happened on the soil of the United States. As per CIA, the Al -Qaeda is destined to attack the US homeland and the regrouping that would pose a threat to home and US interests abroad. The 9/11 attack signified the terrorist willingness to attack the US through conventional means that includes radiological, chemical, nuclear and cyber attack that could pose a serious threat to US. As per the reports of CIA there are several countries that are home to safe heavens for the terrorists

³⁹ Beyond Primacy: American Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 Era (Sloan, 2003)

Bush administration made two things clear, after terrorist attacks that the US would eliminate each and every terrorist presence across the globe. The US would be pursuing a harsh response to the nations aiding terrorist and providing safe sanctuary to them and the goal can be accomplished using the means of military force. The event was unprecedented the United States instead of relying on alliances, it with assistance of coalition forces and willingness of other nations to pursued the strategy and crafted a way of sending coalition NATO into Afghanistan.⁴⁰The United States mission was to eliminate Al Qaeda having footprint and during that war on terrorist not only was the United States who squarely participated in that war but it was accompanied by the Britain and to some extent Australia, France, Germany, Norway, Canada and Denmark also participated nevertheless there is no metric by which efficacy of campaign against terrorists is gauged. They contributed equally as of that rendered by the United States. The military power yielded result it crushed the Taliban government and brought down some of the Al Qaeda elements since Bush asserted several time that US would brought down networks. It would require military and even police cooperation to bring them down that are operating within the border. It would not be merely that case though, the US can use the doctrine of Preemption measure that would underpin the rationale that US can execute anti terrorist operations to eliminate and brought down the possible presence of terrorist network, lest they be fully formed as an organized group. To crush the element of Al Qaeda the US would require multiple fronts that will be diplomatic, financial and military, the anti terrorist campaign would be expedited across the world to eradicate terrorism. The Bush administration made it clear to every nation residing in the world that “ Either you are with us or with terrorists. The traditional approach of deterrence as per evidence does not work for the state that live out of international system. During the course of cold War the weapon of mass destruction was deemed as a last resort against the aggressor that would have otherwise been unwilling to change keeping the metric of mutually assured destruction.”⁴¹

September 11 event made a shift in the United States and Russia relations in recalibrating their relations to redefine threats that terrorists pose to the world security. The Bush administration tried to integrate Russia into European security during the time and was making an attempt to make Russia into to the US-Led system⁴²

⁴⁰ Beyond Primacy: American Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 Era (Sloan, 2003)

⁴¹ Beyond Primacy: American Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 Era (Sloan, 2003)

⁴² Beyond Primacy: American Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 Era

2.11 South Asia

The attempt to integrate Pakistan and India has been successful after 9/11. The United States consolidated its diplomatic effort with India while relations with Pakistan plunged into a good trajectory and was transformed after the September 11 attack and it became a close ally. The country that was seen through the Nuclear proliferation stage was now set to work together to shun terrorism together which was international. The United States would now serve as a channel to chalk out the way for resolving tension between India and Pakistan. The terrorists operation would now be easily served from coalition forces which include defense cooperation.

2.12 Preeminence and Imperialism

The pattern of US foreign policy after 9/11 suggests that grand strategy resonates with the preeminence of the United States and the desire to call the shot vis-a-vis prevailing influence. The reinvigoration of military and political strategy revolves around offsetting the counter force to NATO and giving reassurance to the status quo power of Japan and Germany. Furthermore, the attempt was made to integrate Russia and China into the US-led world order. The tendency to dominate the global stage remains as it was before and is likely to continue. It has been signified by the military strategy, where the coalition of like-minded nations is gathered around to mitigate the offsetting potential threat that might confront them. The United States reserves the right to act unilaterally to the threats that are crucial to its interests. It was evident from the Iraq war where the United States invasion was by some political commentators that the act was completely unilateral and exhibit an imperialist posture given the fact that it had not been sanctioned by the United Nations security council. In addition, the United States happens to have immunity from the International Court of justice where it can bypass the stipulated provisions when it comes to the use of military force. The United States' willingness to cooperate with great powers is signified by attempts with collaboration to eradicate international terrorism and resolving the issue of proliferation in Korean Peninsula. The United States pinned high expectations on NATO in its resolve in the gulf war.⁴³

(Sloan, 2003)

⁴³ Beyond Primacy: American Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 Era
(Sloan, 2003)

American grand strategy is the blend of retaining primacy and imperialism. The picture being portrayed is much bigger than shown. As per the Bush perspective, the balance of power is characterized as the shared values of nations that support freedom. However, the Chinese leaders are of the view that gaining economic supremacy would lead to political and social freedom that will become a source of national greatness. ⁴⁴The promotion of shared values and collective security is the bedrock for American policy maker that collective security framework that United States, Russia, China, Europe and Japan are under common security sharing agenda. Given the strategic Calculus, the Bush administration engaged selectively across the world keeping the cost and benefits analysis.

2.13 Killing of Osama bin laden

The whereabouts of Osama Bin Ladin had been chased after the cold war by the United States. The United States made several attempts to convince the Taliban government after soviet collapse to relinquish their support to Osama Bin Ladin. The Pakistani government was apprised multiple times of its policy of counterterrorist activities but the results were not fruitful and attempts by the IS government was botched in its dealings with Pakistani officials. The soil of Pakistan became a safe heaven for terrorists. The efforts made by the US went into disarray and Pakistan government officials refusal of Taliban and Al- Qaeda leadership presence and sanctuary in Pakistan led Obama administration in on May 1,2011 assigned mission to the NAVY of secret operation to eliminate Al-Qaeda leader in his safe home in Abbottabad area situated in Pakistan. The United States launched this mission unilaterally and secretly without apprising its ally Afghanistan and Pakistan. The mission was successful and the United States successfully killed Osama Bin Ladin. ⁴⁵

2.14 Abraham accord

The Abraham accord is the significant and series of collaborative normalization of ties between Israel and United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. It marked the new era to normalization of relations specifically Israel with other Arab nations. After that two other Sudan and Morocco joined the Abraham accord. The accord has spatial importance, it aims to promote interfaith and intercultural dialogue and promoting peace among Abrahamic religions. The US believe that most effective way in the pursuit of peace are dialogue and

⁴⁴ Beyond Primacy: American Grand Strategy in the Post-September 11 Era (Sloan, 2003)

⁴⁵ <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/node/2707> (UNIVERSITY, 2011)

cooperation, friendly relations among the Middle East would pave the way for prosperity and peace in the future that is prerequisite for the states to advance their interests. Promoting tolerance and regard for ethnicity, religion and race are the integral element of lasting peace.

⁴⁶ In addition, the support for the Art, science, medicine and trade for the inspiration of mankind should be highly encouraged that are the crucial and effective metric for the success of nation. The Abraham accord underpins the fundamental principles that would pave the way for the de-escalation and prosperity in the Middle East.

2.15 Doha Accord

The agreement which is also termed as “Doha accord” was signed by the US and Taliban to end the war from 2001 to 2021 war in Afghanistan. The deal stipulated the restrictions of fighting be it Taliban and US forces, and withdrawal of NATO force that had been stationed in Afghanistan. In turn for that Taliban would have to intensify the counter terrorism activities and would adhere to the rule set forth by the United States. The reduction of NATO troops would be withdrawn in a series within 14 months and afterward the complete withdrawal would be ensured. The exchange of prisoners would be made by both side in order to reach the bargaining process. The Taliban assured and pledged not to provide safe heaven to terrorists that have link with Al-Qai-da to respect the stipulations set forth in the accord.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ <https://www.state.gov/the-abraham-accords/> (STATE)

⁴⁷ ^ Qazi, Shereena (February 29, 2020). "Afghanistan's Taliban, US sign agreement aimed at ending the war". Al-Jazeera. Retrieved March 6, 2021.

CHAPTER 3

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY UNDER TRUMP AND BIDEN ADMINISTRATION: A GRAND STRATEGY METRIC

A prosperous and safe America would not only ensure the well-being of the United States but of the world. The liberty, rendering peace meting out justice, and creating an American way of competitive advantage for the people of the United States would be untimely dependent on the prosperous America's prevailing influence. It is obligatory and the foremost prerequisite for our government to put America first. For the US and world to be prosperous, A strong America is vital to the world and for the interest of itself to be preserved. The national security strategy put America first. It is based on the fundamental principles underlying the US interests to be seen through clear-eyed vision. The strategy has strands of realism that are principled realism, which underlies the assumption that outcomes are more important than Ideology and the United States would employ the available means to cope with any challenge being confronted with. It is further based on the premise that peace, security, and prosperity hinge on the strengthened nations' cooperation to and their safety at home and abroad. The realization of those principles is an American-stipulated rule for the lasting peace and prosperity in the world. The strength of the American people and the world solely belongs to us. The inalienable right to live, prosperity, and the pursuit of happiness is something that Americans are looking for and has much to do with the American way of life. There is a conviction that unacceptable political power is a tyranny and it has to be checked with a formidable strength that US possess through the strength of other like minded nations. The government where the US lives in, is the results of the forefather who strove to bring about the enlightened ideas that is linked with the prosperity. ⁴⁸The constitutional right not only entrust the US the inalienable right but specify the scope to which it can yield its influence.

The United States over the course of its history has had to contend on multiple fronts to preserve the security and prosperity of the nation at home it had been through civil war and it relinquished slavery too at home. The United States had been in two deadly world wars. It brought about a free market economic system and congenial government structure to the

⁴⁸ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

world. The United States fought an authoritarian government during the Cold War and contained communist expansion in the world. The US strengthened its military and rebuilt the order following the war that wreaked havoc in the world. With allied nations, it made security arrangements that would bring peace to the world. NATO was established and other institutional arrangements were made to further the shared future peace and stability. After the Cold War and the victory of free nations the United States emerged as a sole power and unparalleled. There was a strong conviction that it would be unchallenged and it is self-sufficient to weather any downturn.

3.1 Thriving in a competitive world

The United States would be responding to any challenges that it confronts that are Economic, political, and military that it faces. China and Russia are seemingly inclined to challenge the American preeminence, that would compromise American security and prosperity. Their determination has been more into making the economic system less viable which could be a least free economic model that would ultimately lead to the Chinese and Russian military might by weakening the existing economic system. The dictatorship of North Korea and Iran are perceived to bring chaos in the region and it could potentially hurt the United States's interests. The threats that are posed by transatlantic terrorist groups are to be dealt with befitting response. The democracy would be disparaged by the rival groups and the terrorist groups like ISIS and AL-Qaeda would employ the means to malign democracy to spread the barbarism to which they are glued. The American influence would be at stake since the groups have adopted a new and modernized approach to discredit the Western-led system. The United States' strength involves confronting challenges and a strong America is vital to the interest of the US and the world.

3.2 An America First national security strategy

The challenges confronting the US require it to be strengthened and prowess to contend with it. The United States has unparalleled military, economic, political, and technological advancement but to sustain them it requires promoting and protecting four vital interests to thrive in a competitive world. The first and foremost is to protect the homeland, the people of America, and the American-led way of life.⁴⁹ To protect the critical infrastructure of the

⁴⁹ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

homeland and make an invincible defense system that could save the US from potential aggressors.⁵⁰ The US reserves the right to pursue the threat to the source. Secondly, the United States would strive to promote American prosperity, it would consolidate its economy which in turn would benefit American workers and firms. The free and fair practice will be carried out in order that reciprocal economic relations are established. The US has to make sure that it leads in research and innovative technologies so that its edge is unparalleled. The intellectual theft from the US market should be protected and the energy dominance should be preserved in order to strengthen its economy.

Third, peace will be acquired through our strength and it is necessary to consolidate our military strength to yield our influence and make our adversary weak. The United States would ensure the striking right balance of power in the region of the world and its partners have to go hand in hand with our resolve in maintaining alliance strength and extending capabilities. The United States would employ every tool at its disposal to achieve the national interests and a prosperous world. Fourth, the United States will strive to further American influence, the underlying logic behind that is prosperous America is an integral part of the coalition partner. The US would lead in multilateral framework arrangements to uplift the principles of liberty and suppress tyrannical rule. The US will lead an economic role that is indispensable for sustainable growth reflecting a fair model of congenial capitalism. The United States is proud of its history and destiny it holds dear to itself. On the other hand, it is also convinced that American values are not be imposed in a hegemonic way rather with our coalition partners and reciprocal relationships the future can be held optimistic.

3.3 Protecting Homeland and the American Way of Life

The American national security strategy under the Trump administration put America first which implies that the US has to protect its people, the American way of life, and American interests. The US believes in an interconnected world that advocates free market capitalism and institutionalized framework and collective security problems. The national security document outlines North Korea and Iran as potential threats since North Korea is stockpiling nuclear weapons and possesses the capability to kill Americans with Nuclear nukes. While Iran is overtly supporting terrorist groups that openly pose a threat to America. The United

⁵⁰ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

States would respond to the threats it confronts that adversaries pose to it.⁵¹ The adversaries in the past had been accused of intellectual theft from the United States. The maritime sector and critical infrastructure potentially fall prey to the attack, these acts directly attack the foundation of the American way of life and the US preserves the exclusive right to put in place a measure that determines the strength of American strength. Chemical, Nuclear, and radiological weapons should be made out of terrorists that directly threaten the homeland.²²

3.4 Pursuing threats to its source

The United States under the aegis of allies would opt for offensive ways to shun terrorism since there has been no perfect way of defense against the multitude of threats facing the United States. Thus a coordinated effort against the terrorists that opt to attack the United States and its allies. The predominant threat the US face is from transatlantic terrorist groups that are operating under failed state and have an encrypted system under which they evade checks and balance. They are more often operated under the patronage of the state that provides them with safe shelter to reside in.

3.5 Defeating jihadist networks

The formidable threat facing the US is terrorists and the US with the assistance of allies has been fighting a long war with them. They want to radicalize the world. The terrorists primarily target the free society. They are into the spreading totalitarian vision and want to instill slavery and murder into their doctrine of Caliphate. They are bent on causing harm to the American way of life. The targets of the terrorists are isolated individuals and vulnerabilities of the population are exploited, the plots are technically made for recruitment. Despite the fact that the defeat of ISIS and al-Qaeda in Syria and Iraq. The imminent threat from terrorists is yet prevalent. The probability of returning terrorists to their home countries is highly likely, which could pose a threat to the United States. The coordinated efforts with allies and the US are targeting the foreign terrorists' plot and disrupting the networks.

The United States would disrupt the plots of terrorists that could be potentially used against the homeland and its allies. The United States is committed to stimulating intelligence

⁵¹ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

gathering at domestic and international levels. The US will provide every necessary tool to its front-line defenders and resources to pursue the terrorists in order to avert any potential attacks against the homeland.⁵² The United States reserves the right to attack directly against the terrorists and their whereabouts regardless of the place where they are. The campaign that was spearheaded against ISIS and AL Qaeda and the networks associated with it and the befitting response by the US signifies the US resolve against them and the viability of partners for shrinking the place for terrorists. Furthermore, the safe haven of terrorists will be eliminated, the most important elements of terrorists' sanctuary are time and territory. Besides the terrorist network, the US would disrupt the supply chains of organizations that are affiliated with terrorists. We will make sure that through our led system terrorist financial transactions are made less likely to be carried out. Terrorist communication will be made dysfunctional and the recruitment of potential fighters that fight for the cause of evil ideology will be eradicated. This will be accompanied by presenting the real and Grim pictures of terrorists and dissemination of the right voices to bring the menace to an end. In addition, those countries that have been the target of terrorism have to share a burden that would cumulatively pile up pressure on the operating terrorist groups to operate freely. The United States would provide intelligence Support to curb the Spread of hatred Against the Western System that Ardently Supports the freedom not tyranny.

3.6 Promoting American Prosperity

"Economic security is a national security" President Trump.

A strong economy is an indispensable element to protect the American people and preserve the American-led way of life. For the American people to thrive in a free market and innovate to prevent the workers from unfair trade practices carried out by other countries, it is really important to have a strong and resilient US economy. It would ultimately be the decisive factor to retain the military prowess of the United States across the world and protect the homeland.⁵³ The United States economic model should be made viable and the doubt should replace the optimism over event of the 2008 financial crisis. The regulation helped build entrepreneurship and innovation culture in the US economy. The United States for the past 70

⁵² <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

⁵³ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

years incorporated the strategy that underlies the rationale that strength and strong leadership role is indispensable in the international economic system and that system primarily involves the American principles of Free trade, and reciprocal economic relations. The United States under the aegis of allies made institutions that advocated the free & fair equitable rule that stimulated the well-established international economic system that would remove the fallacies which had led to world wars. The congenial economic system serves US interests that are an integral element of our prosperity. The system should be stimulated to assist an American worker to prosper, protecting our innovation and the underlying principles under which our system was founded. The United States trading partners and institutions would assist in enforcing rules and regulations pertaining to the imbalance being made.

3.7 Promoting Fair, free, and reciprocal economic relations

The United States would put in place the measures that hinder the unfair practices being carried out. The US-Led economic system has been misused by other countries to gain an economic advantage by other countries, the force technology transfer has been practiced and subsidies were given to the state-owned enterprises, The United States would ensure that a free and transparent economic system should prevail. The US government will strive to remove trade barriers and imbalances. The US would increase its exports to support its workers and that would enable the US firms to compete with other businesses. The benefits of the free world will be conveyed to the other nations in order that an incentivized-based structure is promoted. The US would take Strick actions against the nation that seemingly violates the stipulated trade regulations to acquire advantages in economic spheres.⁵⁴

For the US to carry out free and open trade practices, it would sign bilateral trade agreements with those states that adhere to practices of free and open and the US would extend its efforts to further and modernize the existing trade practices. The agreement would primarily involve the standards in digital trade, intellectual property, Labor, environment, and agriculture.

3.8 The US strategy in the regional context

The United States has to strike the right balance in the regions of the world vis-a-vis influence and it is bound to protect its interests. Making the international structure viable for

⁵⁴ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

cooperation and the prevailing opportunities requires integrated political, social, and economic domains. Any change in regional power can have repercussions for the United States' vital interests, it could potentially hurt, the market, Raw materials, channels of communication, and human capital.⁵⁵ The potential imbalance from Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea to the US vital interests could tilt the strategic calculus. The US should strive to compete against any unfavorable tilt in the Indo-Pacific, Middle East, and Europe, thus it would require strong coordination among allies and commitment. The US power is augmented by the support of allies. Since they equally carry the burden of resisting authoritarian propensities and aggression. The stability of other nations is equally important in order that prowess of American prowess in military, Science & technology, influence the American way of life is prevalent. The weak governments across the world would lead to the emergence of terrorists that could pave the way for transatlantic terrorist networks to move freely and thus pose a threat to US vital interests. The afflicted regions of the world need a securitized framework and they are willing to improve the government structure. It is necessary to have stability in the regions to flourish the market economy and stability opens up a new door for opportunity to market economy.

3.8.1 Indo pacific

The geopolitics of the Indian Ocean is thriving and the brewing threat of repressive vision is prevalent that ought to be confronted. The region is extending from west coast of India to the western shore of America. The US stakes at this particular has had history since US republic era. The US has been seeking cooperation with China yet it uses economic tool for the purpose of inducement and penalties. In its pursuit of security and political agenda and that tools have been used to acquiesce other nations to achieve its desirable objectives. The trade strategies and infrastructure development are ostensibly to bring about development but the underlying rationale is to advance geopolitical ambitions to achieve its long term goals. The south China sea would be militarized and threat emanating from military. The free trade and stability of other nations would be disrupted that could potentially destabilize the region which is not vital to the interest of the United States. The other states by the China's dominance feel vulnerable to the Geo Strategic ambitions of China and call the US responsible role in order that their sustained sovereignty and smooth regional order.

⁵⁵ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

The North Korea in Northeast Asia has been intensifying its nuclear, Ballistic missile program and cyber program endanger the peace of the world and the United States with the assistance of allies would respond to threats in the pacific region and would forge ties and cooperation with the South Korea. The United States efforts would be further intensified with the Japan and Australia that is necessary for the for the reinforcement of our shared values and economic benefits that are mutually beneficial for US. In addition, New Zealand is a crucial partner of the United States in a peace and security affairs. The United States would strengthen its efforts to make quadrilateral alliance with Japan, Australia, South Korea and India more strengthened.. similarly Southeast Asia is crucial for is a major market and the best destination for the US market.⁵⁶

3.8.2 Primary actions

The US vision for this region has been of a crucial importance, the US would make an effort to augment partnership, alliance and further relations with the countries that adhere to respect for sovereignty, rule of law and free trade practice. The US would extend it's with allied partners for the denuclearization of Korean Peninsula. The US would make an effort to deepen the regional integration, unhindered trade and peaceful mean to resolve the conflicts. The economic viability of the New Zealand and Australia would be made sure in order that economic turmoil is averted. In addition, the military realm will be taken care of, the invincibility of military will be pursued. Defense cooperation will be enhanced in to counter the threat North Korea poses. The United States will consolidate its relations with Taiwan and stick to its commitment of security assurance in the time of aggression by China. The US commitments are premised on expanding cooperation with Vietnam, Thailand, Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia and India to augment its potential of cooperative maritime power.

3.8.3 Europe

The Europe strength is of spatial importance to the United States core interests. A free and prosperous Europe is the shared vision of the United States, where rule of law liberal values prevails, with US efforts being in place after world war 2. In the Western Europe, it's

⁵⁶<https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

institutions came as stronger and economic activity generated wealth across the Atlantic, The Europe has been the most prosperous region of the world and it's a key trading partner of the United States.⁵⁷ The communist threat went away after the US strong commitment and assurance during cold war. The Russia would disparage the United States commitment with its invasion of Ukraine and Georgia, not only has it been depicting the aggression that does hold sovereignty of least concern. The China is acquiring its strategic gains by pouring investment into some industries and technologies that are critical in nature and unfair trade practices are being carried out. The Islamic extremists group ISIS and Jihadist group's attacks in Belgium, France, The stability of the Europe is hinged on the prosperity of US and shared values that promote the rule of law, Governance and free trade. The NATO alliance is crucial in sustaining peace in Europe and the Edge over competitor is achieved through the Sovereign nations party to the treaty. The strategic reach of the US has increased over the European nation's cooperation. The shared threats by the US and Europe has been addressed rightly. The Europe's troops are contributing its part against counter terrorism activities. The instability and unrest in Middle-East and Africa are leading to the surge of migrants into Europe, that could potentially cause the unrest in the region. For the US to be prosperous, the stable and prosperous Europe is indispensable to the shared dreams of liberal aspirations.

3.8.4 Primary Action

The US would enhance cooperation with our ally to mitigate the threats from the aggressors to our common shared values. Further, the collaboration will be increased to offset the attempted subversion by Russia and on international forum the North Korea and Iran threats to the international political environment will be highlighted. Secondly, the US would deepen it's economic cooperation with European Union. The trade practices will be carried out in a reciprocal way and the bilateral trade with UK and countries adhered to the free and open trade would enjoy the benefits of free world. The European countries foreign direct investment will be brought into the US that would spur the creation of jobs in the United States. The energy insecurity of the Europe will be minimized in by diversifying the sources of energy. The check on China unfair trade practices will be looked after with strict measures being in place. Furthermore, the US would make sure that defense commitments it has in NATO and with European allies should be taken care of in the best possible way. The

⁵⁷ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

expectations from European partners are that they would bring their military spending to 2% of its GDP by 2024. With 20% of its spending to be meant primarily for enhancing the military capabilities. The deterrence and defense will be made invincible. The cruise and ballistic missile system will be enhanced, the counter terrorist and cyber security measures will be enhanced.

3.8.5 Middle East

The United States is highly in favor of stable and peaceful Middle East not a safe and breeding place for terrorists that bring instability to the world. Not by the Jihadist group or power that poses threat to the interests of US and its allies. The regional rivalries, Jihadist networks expansion and the socio-economic conditions are detrimental to the core interests of US and opposed to Modern Middle East vision. The region is a breeding ground for terrorists and notorious Jihadist network AL-Qaeda, ISIS and the worsening situation of the region allows Iran to expand its influence under the patronage of Terrorists. The Iran is expanding its proxies and networks for the regional influence.⁵⁸ The continuation of violence by Iran is persistent and the unstable environment of Middle East and governance collapse allows Iran to enhance its proxies. With challenges ahead of way, the US will allies are working to shun the Islamic extremism agenda and outrightly rejecting them with alliance is making an effort fruitful to the peaceful Middle East vision and favorable balance that are crucial to the interests of the US.⁵⁹

3.8.6 Priority action

The partnership with Middle East will be deepened and the security will be achieved through the existing and newer partner in a security arrangement. The counter violent ideology will be responded with a collective action and the US would enhance its measure through Gulf cooperation council. The US seek to end the Civil war in Syria that causes the surge of immigrants and instability. In addition, the efforts are being carried out to counter the Iranian proxies that are causing disruption in the region. A legal Framework should be adopted to resolve the conflict in an amicable way between Israel and Palestine. The attempts to modernize the economy of Middle East will be carried out. The United States will be keeping

⁵⁹ <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> (DC, 2017)

its presence in the Middle East to preserve the vital interests of her in the region. The favorable distribution of power will be ensured and the efforts to support to partner in strengthening its institutions and the required capabilities, counter terrorist activities. The missile defense system availability to the partners will be taken care of with all efforts and threats assessment being in place and from the Iran would be made sure.

3.8.7 The south and central Asia

The South and Central Asia are the most crucial regions and pose some of the formidable challenge. The region extends from home to terrorists and the power competition unleashing in Europe and Indo-Pacific. The United States is confronted from the transnational terrorists threat which has been operating inside in Pakistan. The Indo-Pakistani conflict and nuclear war requires a pressing diplomatic attention. The US interest primarily in the region involves; counterterrorist's activities that ultimately hurt vital interests homeland and cross border terrorism that raises the alarm Nuclear tensions. The US has to ensure that nuclear weapons technology do not fall into the hand of terrorists that can bring instability.⁶⁰

3.9 The National security strategy under Biden administration, A Grand Strategy metric

The United States being a strong and prosperous ultimately determines the free and open world. The challenges are increasingly complex. The major power conflict over the competing governance structure that are authoritarian and democratic structures are underway. The competition over foundational technologies that would determine the security and economy is increasingly at the faster pace. Though the international environment has becoming more competitive yet the United States prowess in military, innovation, population and economy continues to be on the top and US as a leading power. The inherent strength of American people are the US values, innovation, diplomatic institutions, our technological and economical leadership, the military of the United States remains unparalleled. The US has been aptly employing it's power with strength alongside its partners and allies which account significantly to the United States strength. The notion that US should strive in a competition with autocratic states wins the bipartisanship. The US is the largest democracy and home to diverse groups of people around the world. It embodies the spirit of freedom and liberty. The

⁶⁰ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

US pursuit of democracy is a continuous process. The US democracy serves as the gold standard and reflects the leadership and strength abroad. The US has addressed the challenges in the history with a shared vision.

The US efforts to advocate the free open and prosperous world. The democratic allies in the Europe and all across the world make it happen to achieve the shared vision. The US would support democratic values all around the world and international system built for the peaceful world. The system includes rules based order where authoritarian states are outperformed with democratic states that embodies the universal rights to individuals. It is not about the spreading American values but to curb the revisionist's foreign policy tendencies of authoritarian states. The China and Russia are challenging the free world where rule based order prevails. The deadly war in Ukraine initiated by Russia demonstrates the revisionist tendencies of the Russia and the challenge posed to the free world. Similarly, the China despite being benefited heavily by the free market economy concludes the downside of international system dominated by the west. The People Republic of China's is using its economic muscle to advance its geopolitical ambitions across the world by directly opposing the western interests. The assertive behavior in foreign policy of China's led the other states to preserve their sovereignty¹. The United States completely understands the objectives of Russia and China but it does not want the world to be divided into Bloc which could cause an escalation in them.⁶¹

3.9.1 Strategic approach

The United States objectives have been clear, it wants the free and prosperous world where individuals universal rights are taken care of and the world peaceful to all nations and raising the standards of living all across the world. The goal would require the US to employ series of efforts: 1) we would invest in tools and sources of American power and influence to further the goal. 2) enhancement of collective security by building a strong alliance with nations to make strategic environment favorable to the US and it's allies. 3) the modernized and strengthened military that can withstand the strategic competition between major powers and to deter terrorists aggression. US will employ the best use of its capabilities to enhance its capabilities and chart the future with the enduring vision for the world. The US would

⁶¹ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

strive to retain the technological, Cybersecurity, Trade and economics edge. There has been a clear distinction between US domestic and foreign policy. The US understand that it has to invest in industrial strength, innovation and research at home to succeed abroad.

The partnership and alliances the United States yield strength to its dominance and contribute predominately to international peace and stability. NATO, a strong military alliance contributes a spatial role in Europe peace. The Indo-pacific and security partnership the US has traditionally contributed a smooth role in peace. It also incentivizes the cooperation that a mutually beneficial which results in a peaceful and stable international system. The cooperation transcends beyond security and paves for prosperity in the realm of trade and technology. The United States' resilience is hinged on the strong alliances and partnerships among democratic nations and dominance by any hostile power is detrimental to the United States' interests. Secondly, the national security strategy aptly recognizes the People's Republic of China as a serious threat and challenge In Geopolitical Realm. The Indo-Pacific is the region where the actual competition would eventually persist. Russia is posing a potential challenge to Europe. The understanding of threat is clear vis-a-vis Iran which proliferates missile technology and meddles in the affairs of other regions through proxies. The US would promote prosperity in the region which is a prerequisite for stability. The Middle East would be integrated and can play a crucial role in alliance and partnership. The US would make sure that Western Hemisphere stability and resilience remain intact which could directly affect the US states interests. Third, globalization has played a major role in the prosperity of nations and the US equally but the shift that seemingly the People's Republic of China has exploited by the unfair trade practices caused an imbalance, and not only has China gone against the rules and regulations set forth by the World trade organization but appears to be exploiting by pouring money into State-owned enterprises. The US holds an affirmative agenda for the global economy to tap the full potential in the 21st century while having a firm agenda to encourage the prosperity of American workers.⁶²

3.9.2 Strengthening America and Its Competitiveness

To surpass the rivals of the United States it requires investing domestically in an efficient way. The resilience of the United States ultimately brings prosperity around the world and home. The middle class has vested interests in the US and has an integral role in the engine of

⁶² <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

the US economy. The success at home would ultimately lead the US to engage strategically abroad. The open market and private sectors are the crucial elements of US innovation. The US has been modernizing key sectors that also include private sectors but has not yet mobilized its required expertise to protect the economic interests of the US. Investment in infrastructure and securing supply chains accounts for the stimulant factor in innovation. The US understands and recognizes the significance of the semiconductors supply chain to its strength and national security, the US aims at reinvigorating the industry to tap its potential. The Science and CHIP Act gives the US an advantage to pour money into research and development specifically in sectors of semiconductors, advanced computing, clean energy, Next-Generation communications, and biotechnology. Furthermore, the US would be focusing on reinvigorating the economy and that would be achieved from the bottom top up to the middle out. The pursuit of US strength will persist.⁶³

3.9.3 Building the Strongest Coalition

The United States by far has the unrivaled alliance structure that is envied by its adversaries using the virtue of that allied strength the US would bring stability and a free market economy. The nations that share and cherish the same values for an open world will be accompanying the US. The cooperative framework would be put in place to confront the challenge facing the world. The United States' treaty alliance with other nations are with democratic nations and are the crucial elements of the strategy. The NATO and the bilateral treaty the US has with others should at no cost ever doubt the credibility of standing against aggression and intimidation. The means of modernization in capabilities should be carried out to withstand the challenges facing the free and open world. The alliance and partnership of the US have been crucial elements in the US national security policy for more than decades. NATO has been an effective organization to avert further Russian aggression in Europe. In the summit of Madrid 2022 NATO, demonstrated its willingness to challenges faced by the People's Republic of China and threats from the Cyber realm were key areas to confront challenges by the cooperative way of NATO. The US-EU Trade and Technology Council is a way of forged and comprehensive way to move forward with stipulated rules and regulations to enhance trade and technology that are held crucial by the democratic nations. The AUKUS partnership underlines the strong commitment of Australia, and Japan to promote

⁶³ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

stability in the Indo-Pacific while deepening integration at the forefront and defense & technological enhancement. The cooperation will be carried out with five Eyes including Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Canada. The cooperation will be aimed at revitalizing the existing relationship and to confront the challenge together. The intelligence and strong partnership will be enhanced and that are our crucial elements of strategy.

3.10 The United States' priorities across the Globe

3.10.1 China

The national security strategy as discussed previously put an emphasis on the strength of the US as a precursor to its preeminence and to form a strong coalition to wield its diplomatic power to spread free & open market and peaceful world. It also requires the powerful military of the United States to withstand any challenge in the future that spans globally and can surpass rival capabilities. The challenges posed by the rival are from multiple areas, thus they are to be dealt with through coordinated efforts ranging from cyber security, technology, trade, and economics.⁶⁴

The PRC and Russia are aimed to confront the United States and pose challenges together. China is seen as a potential competitor to the US that is destined to reshape the international order. It has the economic, military, diplomatic, and technological power to bend the circumstances in its favor. It has the broad vision to extend its sphere of influence in the Indo-Pacific. The free and open market economy has been misused by China. The economic power of China has been used to coerce other countries. The domestic market has been limited in the PRC and it increasingly relies on other countries to limit its dependence on the world. It is determined to spend more on the military and modernize the military to gain a strong foothold in the Indo-Pacific and advance it reach globally. The move is also inspired to weaken the alliance and partnership of the United States of America. The Strategy of the US vis-a-vis China embodies three dimensions; 1) to make an investment in our strength, competitiveness, innovation, resilience, and democracy. 2) to intensify our efforts with allies that share a common vision to cooperate with each other for a common cause. 3) taking into consideration the responsibility factor, compete with China to secure our interests for the

⁶⁴ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

foreseeable future.⁶⁵ The first and second dimensions underlie the major elements of national security strategy which is to surpass China in technology, Military, Intelligence, political, Economic, and governance domains. The coming decade will be crucial for the United States, the choices and priorities we set up today are going to the standing of the US.

Many of the US allies are against the China in Indo-Pacific and stand firm against the coercions of the PRC. The US strategy would require to partner with and cooperate with our allies to ensure their security and development, their dependence on China will be limited. The US will hold China accountable for genocide, Crime, and abuses against human rights in Xinjiang and Tibet. Ceding autonomy to Hong Kong continues to threaten the community and countries to stay mum on the issue. The US vision is to enhance combat military that can withstand an adversary aggression. The US has an enduring interest in the strait of Taiwan that has bearing on regional and global concerns for peace and stability. The US stands firm against the change of status quo by either China or Taiwan. The US under the Taiwan Act reserve a right to support Taiwan in time of aggression.

3.10.2 Europe

The shared values common interests and historic ties with Europe and the transatlantic alliance the crucial elements of the United States' foreign policy. Europe has been the foremost partner of the US in confronting the challenges that come from the diverse array. The US and Europe pursued a shared global agenda. The Transatlantic bond will be deepened further. The strengthened NATO built up a foundation for a strong EU-US relationship. The US standing behind Europe underpins the shared values, security, and prosperity. Europe stands at the forefront in its advocacy and fight for freedom and liberty. The non-aggression and sovereignty are an integral part of that broader agenda. The US is committed under Article 5 of NATO, to defend Europe against the threat and aggression by the other states. The measures have been put in place to ensure the readiness and strength of NATO invincible. The US would stand behind NATO in its resolve to modernization and enhancement to withstand any challenges posed by the countries. America's commitments in Europe underlie peace, prosperity, and stability. Russian invasions of Ukraine demonstrate the threats posed to the vision of peace and stability. Given the commitments of the US in Europe, it would provide its support to Ukraine to avert aggression and uphold its

⁶⁵ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

sovereignty. Russia has been sanctioned which costs her ramifications. The US supported Ukraine, financially, militarily, and on a humanitarian basis. The US with the assistance of allies imposed sanctions on Russia collectively to weaken its potential to wage a war. The US chalked out a plan with the EU Commission to reduce the dependency of Europe on Russian fossil fuel enhance European energy security and strengthen the shared climate security. The EU is home to 450 million people and indispensable partner of the United States. We would extend our effort to strengthen our relationship with the United Kingdom and the Good Friday agreement would be valued and respected. The transatlantic community's strength and stability have a shared vision of the United States and its agenda is to work with the EU to strengthen trade, investment, and technological enhancement. The promotion of free and open trade augments the global economy, ensures fair competition, and takes care of labor rights. By virtue of G-7, the US would work with France, Italy United Kingdom, and Germany to work under a shared vision and tackle the most pressing issues the world is facing. To preserve human rights be it Xinjiang or Belarus.⁶⁶

3.10.3 Middle East

The US foreign policy over the past few decades has been focused primarily on threats stemming from Middle East and Africa. The policy was defaulted that had been military oriented towards regime change. Now it is time to chalk out grand design that can pave way for future stability and prosperity for the people of US and Middle East. The US policy in the region involves a unrivalled advantage of the US that it has in partnerships, alliance and coalition.⁶⁷ The diplomacy will be used as an effective tool to de-escalate tensions, minimizing the risk that can lead to conflict. The US strategy will have five principles: 1) the US would support and strengthen partnerships with a country that support rule-based international order, it would have support from the US, in its resolve to deter any aggression. 2) the US would not allow any regional or foreign power to disrupt the navigation of waterways in the Middle East, protecting strait of Hormuz and the Bab al Mandab.⁶⁸ The US would not allow any power incursion into the Middle East through military power. 3) the US efforts are aimed at bringing regional stability and de-escalation will be made where the conflict is about to arise. 4) the US would amplify its efforts to promote regional integration

⁶⁶ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

by making political, economic, and security connections among the partners. It will include maritime and air defense structures while having regard for territorial sovereignty.5) The US would intensify its efforts in the promotion of human rights that are stipulated in the UN charter. The US would not let Iran acquire nuclear weapons at any cost and diplomacy would be at the forefront to achieve that. We would combine diplomacy and economic assistance to the partners to alleviate the suffering in Syria, Libya, and Yemen. The US effort would reduce the uprising of terrorism in the region that lacks economic well-being. The measures would be carried out to normalize Israel's ties with its neighbors which also include Abraham Accord. The US would look forward to chalking out the possible solutions to Israel as a Jewish state and Palestine's demands for its own state⁶⁹

3.10.4 Terrorism

Terrorism is a global and diffused geographical threat that can cause a colossal loss to humanity. Al-Qaeda and ISIS and affiliation networks made an expansive network from the Middle East and Afghanistan into Africa and East Asia. Many terrorists are home in Syria, Libya, and Somalia. Their safe sanctuaries allowed them to expedite attacks and they are intended to render a loss to the United States. The US approach to combating terrorism is steadfast and counter terrorism activities by the US are effective. The US ended its long war in Afghanistan, the killing of Osama Bin Ladin and rendering justice was altogether achieved. The key leaders having associated with Osama bin Ladin were wiped out. The US would hold Taliban accountable and they will make sure that terrorists do not find safe sanctuary in Afghanistan. The US would extend its cooperation efforts with partners around the world to prevent their gathering, financing and curb the communication channels that give them advantage to carry out attacks. The US effort will also involve cooperation with faltering states where Governance is weak to strengthen checks and balances to avoid the emergence of terrorists on their soil. The US would employ the force when it is necessitated to attack terrorists given the consideration that civilian loss is altogether vanished.

⁶⁹ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (house)

CHAPTER 4

COMPETING PERSPECTIVES ON THE US GRAND STRATEGY

The United States has been dominating the world. It rose as a dominant state after the course of the Cold War leaving no other state as its geopolitical competitor. The US provided a security guarantee to Japan and Germany and made a NATO that would look after European security. The US bases would now span across the world. China adapted to adjust under the US dominance and Russia has a somewhat secure partnership with the US. The US is the superpower that is setting the world order. It has been distinctively crafting the rule-based order internationally. The prowess of the US military was demonstrated to the world, the Bush administration's war on terrorism, Afghanistan's invasion, and Iraq's invasion, and the increase in the US military budget signifies the unipolarity and tilt in the national security strategy. The US is facing the choices of world order that are premised on liberal aspirations; multilateralism, alliance partnership, institutional and rule-based relations, and strategic restraint which has the features of post war 2 in 1945 of the Western-led system. The US has been pursuing liberal and imperial logic in its cruise of unipolarity and it is deeply embedded in American political culture. The liberal logic underpinning the American unipolarity is the transatlantic community NATO and the economic institutional regimes that are in place. The imperial posture emanates from a neo-conservative grand strategy.

4.1 Anarchy and hierarchical structures

As per distinctive characteristics of international politics from neorealists vision. There is no central authority and the international structure is anarchic. States under those conditions are compelled to self-help. ⁷⁰The states tend to find a balancing position to retain their sovereignty. The fear of emerging a stronger state would ultimately endanger the security of a weaker state. States typically prefer to choose the stronger state to align and make itself stronger with them. The survival in international system is the most important factor and thus state determines the favorable outcomes that outweigh loss. In Hierarchical order, there exists centralized political authority. The units are integrated vertically with defined operations;

⁷⁰ Liberalism and Empire: Logics of Order in the American Unipolar Age Author(s): G. John Ikenberry
Source: Review of International Studies, Oct. 2004, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Oct. 2004), pp. 609- 630
Published by: Cambridge University Press (Ikenberry, 2004)

there exists a superordinate and subordinate structure. The hierarchy operates within anarchy and disparities of power exist and vary from state to state. The great powers possess the capabilities to articulate the order. The colonial era and the post-World War 2 era, describe the hierarchical order; the Soviet Union had control over Eastern Europe and institutionalized dominance existed. The negotiated rules are stipulated by the state party to the hierarchy. The United States' domination over Western Europe in the Cold War depicted the Hierarchical order.

The world order of the present encompasses the hierarchical order functions the question arises about whether the Unipolarity is hierarchical or not. Unipolarity refers to the power distribution and William Wohlforth contends that possession of power is tilted towards the United States and it erodes the conception of anarchy. The weaker states are not fully In a condition to opt for a realist posture in order to abstain from American preeminence and their insecurities of anarchy do fade away. The hierarchical order is demonstrated by the security and economic characteristics of the unipolar world. The US provides security to Japan and Germany (West Germany). Japan opted not to acquire nuclear weapons given the assurances of the US-led security alliance. Economic relations also signify that the hierarchical structure is more prevalent and the neo-realist claim of anarchy seems less relevant and it would be difficult for neo-realists to explain the hierarchical order of the US. The Western community made a hierarchical structure that shared common identities and security concerns. The economic interdependence and institutionalized framework make the shared values and security dilemma factor decrease.

The primary difference between the empire and hegemony is, that In empire state is a unilateral actor that acts unilaterally, on the other hand in hegemony the lead state stipulates the multilateral rules and institutions under which the lead itself operates.

4.2 The American system

The United States emerged as a leading power after World War 2 as an open, rule-based, and institutionalized lead state. ⁷¹The order brought by the US is premised on certain provisions that include economic, security public goods mutually accepted rules and institutions that

⁷¹ 53 For a discussion of empire as a 'rimless hub and spoke' system, see Alex Motyl, *Revolutions, Nations, Empires: Conceptual Limits and Theoretical Possibilities* (New York: Columbia University Press,

involve the political process, strategic bargains, and economic regime.⁷² The liberal political structure is premised on the Western security community that makes the war less likely and the order was acquired through the implementation of two grand strategies; one having the orientation with realist paradigm, revolving around deterrence, containment, and striking a balance of power in the cold war era.⁷³ The expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union were contained. The yardstick of the strategy was to contain the Soviet Union's sphere of influence. The United States had to fill the vacuum left by the British Empire and the containment brought about significant results in the United States' favor. The grand strategy of balance of power led to the emergence of many institutions after 1947. The crucial of them was the NATO and US-Japan alliance. The US presence in East Asia and Europe and its allies demonstrate the strength of security and partnership. The alliance structure has brought significant changes in the area of regional integration too. The economic integration of North America, Western Europe, and Northeast Asia are resulting from the broader alliance system.

74

The other grand strategy which was consolidated during World War 2, the realist in orientation was meant to contain the Soviet Union and the liberal grand strategy was focused on averting strategic rivalries, trade conflicts, and regional blocs.⁷⁵ Democracy, free trade, and multilateral framework went hand in hand. Under this strategy duress the United States and employ its political might to promote a congenial system. Low Politics was carried out in this strategy, The Bretton Wood system, GATT WTO, APEC, NAFTA, and, OECD were brought into place. The promotion of democracy was encouraged in South America, Eastern Europe, and East Asia. The grand strategy worked really well over the course of the United States' history, a realist grand strategy under the rationale of security concerns, led the US to make security commitments across the world. It has worked effectively in reducing the traditional balance of power among smaller states and the role of the United States as a responsible leader has emerged effectively. The bargain under which the US system from the Cold War was built on the realist bargain and the grand strategy. The US would fulfill the

⁷² Columbia University Press, 1999).

⁷³ These failings of neo-conservative thinking are discussed in G. John Ikenberry, 'The End of the Neo Conservative Moment', *Survival* (March 2004).

⁷⁴ These failings of neo-conservative thinking are discussed in G. John Ikenberry, 'The End of the Neo Conservative Moment', *Survival* (March 2004).

⁷⁵ 53 For a discussion of empire as a 'rimless hub and spoke' system, see Alex Motyl, *Revolutions, Nations, Empires: Conceptual Limits and Theoretical Possibilities* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

security needs of Europe and Asia and provide access to the US market, and sharing of technology and they would cooperate in an open trade system. In turn, these countries would extend their diplomatic, logistical, and economic support as the need necessitated since the US has been the leading power after post-war period. The other bargain is built upon the liberal orientation, the US allies of Europe and Asia would have to accept the United States' leading role under the stipulated Political and economic rules. The US would reinforce stability and cooperation mutually beneficial with all-out efforts being in place.

4.3 Grand Strategy in Imperial Context

September 11, marked the shift in the neo-imperial grand strategy, the imminent fear of terrorism that would drive the United States to unilaterally use the military to confront the rogue states that proved to be safe heaven for the terrorists. The sovereignty under this strategy would be more conditional for the countries that would not acquiesce to the standard set forth by Washington. It underpins four visions; the United States would stay aloof from the world. The approach that was opted for after the post-war war included the multilateral approach, and alliance structure and the bargain that is made with other states is likely to stay intact. The alliance and security partnership are not discouraged under this neo- neo-imperialist grand strategy but priorities will be given to the willing states that adhere to the United States' unilateral approach, which was demonstrated by the October 2002, national security strategy's new doctrine that would embrace the pre-emption and it gives the right to the United States to use the force against the imminent threat that the United States could potentially face. Second, the US would adopt military use and strength as a central element of its foreign policy. Thirdly, neo-imperial thinkers are of the view that the US should withdraw from multilateral agreements that put the United States in jeopardy.

Charles Krauthammer argue that the United States could employ its unilateral force instead of entangling the international agreements that are aimed at rising power, it could be fulfilled using American self-sufficiency and strength. Neo-conservatives embody the Wilsonian idealism that ardently advocates the spread of democracy, in addition, the notion is held that it is one of the good elements of national security strategy.⁷⁶The new grand strategy has been confronted with a multitude of challenges, the Bush administration's resolve to the post-war era in Iraq and the US failure to find the weapon of mass destruction raised the doubts about

⁷⁶ These failings of neo-conservative thinking are discussed in G. John Ikenberry, 'The End of the Neo-Conservative Moment', *Survival* (March 2004).

grand strategy elsewhere in the world that its viability has. The war proved more costly and as a result of poor intelligence, it was misadventure. The strategy gives the United States military power to influence across the world to wield its influence. The strategy did extraordinarily in the Cold War era when the United States had to focus on Europe, Asia, and North America but now threats have evolved and are least fixed geographically and terrorism is among them.

4.4 Multilateral and Interdependence

There is still another way for the United States can opt for a unipolar world if the neo-conservative grand strategy ceases to bring extraordinary results the way it brought during the Cold War era. The strategy is a multilateral framework that has agreed-upon principles.⁷⁷ The other strategy was hub and spoke bilateralism and this strategy was pursued by the United States after post post-war era but it rendered a huge cost to the United States to wield a global order based on hub and spoke. In this order, sovereignty is pooled and mutually agreed-upon principles are laid out for the states to work under this system. The United States brought in the institution NATO that would oversee security matters, European nations were willing to agreed-upon principles, and other European nations including France, and Britain endorsed the US-led economic and Security system. The multilateral agreement under the regulations of the United States would incorporate Western Europe into the US-led regularized institutional arrangement. Not only security arrangement but Europe was later integrated into the economic community that would later become integrated into a loose multilateral framework arrangement.ⁱⁱ

4.5 Multilateralism endures

The United States has multiple incentives and dependence on the United States increases and the power calculation and management. The identity of politics that belongs to the US way, the economic interdependence keeps increasing even after the challenges to multilateralism. The realization of other states' actions and objectives associated with cooperation increases under the complex interdependence structure. The calculation of objectives tied to the international system increases the stakes instead of decreasing. The United States would support a multilateral system due to the grand strategic interests: one being to sustain the

⁷⁷ These failings of neo-conservative thinking are discussed in G. John Ikenberry, 'The End of the Neo-Conservative Moment', *Survival* (March 2004).

power and the other being a stable and peaceful international system.⁷⁸ The restraint and commitment have been practiced altogether. The internationalist order is evolving and the United States is the polity that governs the rule-based order to sustain the unipolarity and incentivize the other states to align with the US in order to have the reciprocal benefits and the power management system that the US brought. The contemporary world is more hierarchical than it was before and the US is a centralized and political dynamic that revolves around the political and institutional identity of the West. The attributes of the United States exhibit the imperial tendencies that the empire shares. The neo-conservative stresses the use of the United States' unilateral muscle to stabilize the international system. Their approach is somehow limited to multi-faced challenges that the world is confronted. The debate of empire will continue with a competing perspective of internationalism.⁷⁹

John J Mearsheimer examines the post-Cold War era of American foreign policy and what it takes for a powerful state to pursue liberal hegemony. There have been several recommendations by John J Mearsheimer to the US for the conduct of its foreign policy. It is argued that the US should abstain from pursuing liberal hegemony, citing the reason that it would entangle the US in costly wars that would result in a loss for the US. It should rather opt for a more restrained foreign policy, that are backed by the realist tendencies that base fundamental factor at play, and though is it is not the panacea for all failures rather it would put the United States at comparative advantage and more diplomatic success than that of liberalism. The likelihood of the US foreign policy, in liberal and realist orientation is dependent on several factors; the international system and the distribution of power globally. The factors of how convenient for the liberal states would be for the state to opt for liberalism.

It is easy for the powerful state to pursue liberal hegemony in a unipolar world, the fear of other great power is no longer valid. However, the chances are bleak in a bipolar and multipolar world. The great power competition persists in a multipolar world and states act in accordance with the realist dictations. It is worth considering the rise of China in an impressive way, the US would have to cede its liberal hegemony.⁸⁰ The US would have to

⁷⁸ These failings of neo-conservative thinking are discussed in G. John Ikenberry, 'The End of the Neo Conservative Moment', *Survival* (March 2004).

⁷⁹ These failings of neo-conservative thinking are discussed in G. John Ikenberry, 'The End of the Neo Conservative Moment', *Survival* (March 2004).

⁸⁰ (MEARSHEIMER, *Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*, 2018)

compete with its potential peers. The restraint would be the primary factor for the US to disentangle from the costly war.

4.6 Liberalism abroad; A fallacy

Liberal democracy is the best system nevertheless, in international politics, liberalists have a notion that human beings have inalienable rights, and preserving them is the foremost prerequisite for a free life. These conceptions usually create a strong pretext for the liberal states to intervene while other states violate their rights.⁸¹ The rationale pushes the liberal state to intervention that would turn autocracy into a liberal democracy. It further encourages institution-building and open markets that are considered conducive to peace. One could argue that this fundamental reasoning should also be applicable to the realm of international politics, leading liberal nations to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of other states. According to this perspective, liberal powers should even show little respect for the sovereignty of illiberal states. However, they do not do so primarily because liberals genuinely believe they possess extensive knowledge about what defines a fulfilling life, even if they fail to acknowledge or perhaps even recognize this fact. Liberalism effectively mandates the establishment and preservation of liberal states worldwide, as individual rights cannot attain the prominence and protection ascribed to them by liberalism within an illiberal state. Essentially, liberals assert that they possess universally valid and enduring insights into what constitutes a fulfilling life: the presence of a liberal state that guarantees the unalienable rights of all its citizens. Given this conviction, it is unsurprising that influential liberal states adopt highly interventionist policies in foreign affairs.⁸²

4.7 Restraint factor of realism

The realism has often been associated with conflicts and rivalry that reason being the rational for unpopularity in liberal societies. The hatred realism attracts underlies many factors. The realist considered war as a legitimate tool in statecraft to strike a balance of power or a shift in beneficial way. The underlying assumption of realpolitik leaves no way for cooperation, states have to rely on self help and thrive under anarchy. The survival is the most crucial element in international environment and power is the sole guardian of the survival. The realists were against the invasion of Iraq, while the just war theorists view that positively.

⁸¹ (MEARSHEIMER, 8 The Case for Restraint, 2018)

⁸² JOHN J. MEARSHEIMER

According to realist thinkers if state acts in traditional balance of power way the war would be less likely to take place. These defensive realist tends to emphasize that international system would punish the aggressors.

Mearsheimer as a offensive realist does not advocate war, he is of the view that great powers under realist dictations thrive for the power maximization in a global share and have a limited regions of the world that are important and for the United States. Some of the regions have a great significance outside the western hemisphere that are Europe and East Asia due to the fact that great powers are situated here and the Persian Gulf that is home to oil and resources.⁸³ It further implies that the US should not fight a war in Africa, Central Asia and the area of Middle East that are not included in Persian Gulf. Realist contend that the US policy makers should not engage in war in third world countries since the minor power are dominating the region and has no strategic significance, even the realists were not in favor of the Vietnam War. On the contrary, liberals perceive the potential battlefield across the spanning area of the world and the underlying rationale for doing so is to spread liberal democracy and human rights. The liberal justifies the military intervention if necessary. To put things in perspective, realists set the limits to employ military force within constrained limits, on the contrary, there are no transparent limits for liberal interests everywhere. In addition, realists are cautious about the use of force because they are convinced that a balance of power would lead to containing the aggression.⁸⁴

4.8 Where is the US being led?

The US foreign policy thinkers would be considering the option of abandoning the pursuit of liberal hegemony and incorporating realism in its foreign policy. Republicans and Democrats both exhibit liberal hegemonic pursuits and as per Mearsheimer, it turns out to be a failure American people's tendencies are more inclined to restrain but the least attention is given to it by the governing elite. It also appears that the situation is likely to change in the foreign policy course and out of the governing elite's control, it emanates from the rise of China and the resurgence of Russian power that can lead the international system to a multipolar world, it would be hard for the United States to pursue liberal hegemony under thriving great power politics. The phase of unipolarity appears to come to an end. The US has to reconsider the emergence of other powers the Trump administration made it crystal clear that national

⁸³ (MEARSHEIMER, 8 The Case for Restraint, 2018)

⁸⁴ (MEARSHEIMER, 8 The Case for Restraint, 2018)

defense secretary James Mattis “ great power competition between nations is a reality once again,” and “Great power competition, not terrorism, is now the primary focus of U.S. national security strategy”. The United States would be compelled to incorporate realism into its foreign policy, specifically to counter China if the rise is kept in the same way. It has to dissuade China from becoming a regional hegemon. Nevertheless, the pursuit of liberation hegemony is likely to be pursued not relinquished altogether accompanied by the realization of great power competition. The American economy's fast pace of growth allows it to make itself even stronger and it would still make itself relatively stronger than China as lessons learned from twentieth-century Germany, Japan, and Russia. China has the potential to challenge the US dominance but if it does not have realization then the US will be the sole power unparalleled.⁸⁵ The US can pursue liberal hegemony if the competition is not present at the international level and the US can think of incorporating realist strands in foreign policy if the competitors are present. In the presidential campaign of 2008, Barack Obama’s campaign signified the importance of disengagement of the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq entangling the U.S. in further conflicts and focusing primarily on nation-building at home instead of abroad. Barack Obama oversaw the regime change operation in Egypt, Syria, and Libya. He directed the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq in 2011. The Washington strategy was flawed he was quoted as saying in an interview to Atlantic. Furthermore, the presidential election of 2016 demonstrated the challenge to liberal hegemony, after Trump vowed to have friendlier relations with authoritarian leaders including Vladimir Putin, and will not entangle herself in the spread of democracy around the world. Trump was skeptical of institutions and even contended that NATO is obsolete. He promised to advocate a protectionist policy which is diametrically opposed to an open trade system. The Washington playbook does not allow for the abandonment of liberal hegemony and the rhetoric will not be fully entertained by the foreign policy elites⁸⁶

The US has to consolidate democracy at home which the other nations can imitate and restraint should be practiced. The war in Iraq and Afghanistan cost the United States a whopping \$5 trillion dollars, that money could have been expended on Education, infrastructure Public health, and Research. It could have consolidated the US preeminence more viable and strong. The argument in favor of a foreign policy grounded in realism is clear and impactful, and it should resonate with a significant majority of Americans.

⁸⁵ (MEARSHEIMER, *Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*, 2018)

⁸⁶ JOHN J. MEARSHEIMER

However, it remains a challenging proposition due to the strong commitment of many foreign policy experts to liberal hegemony, leading them to vigorously defend it. Ideally, the emergence of China as a major global power would naturally bring an end to unipolarity, rendering the debate obsolete. Nevertheless, this would entail the United States having to contend with a potential rival, a scenario that no dominant nation desires. It would be preferable to maintain a unipolar world, despite the temptation it poses for American policymakers to continue pursuing liberal hegemony. To prevent this, it is crucial for Americans to recognize the risks associated with a liberal foreign policy and the merits of exercising restraint.

CONCLUSION

The United States' grand strategy has long been practiced dating back to the aftermath of World War 2. The contours of the grand strategy that has been discussed in the paper are multifaceted; to retain prowess in military, Technology, Economics, cyber security innovation, and sphere of influence. The predominant factor of this strategy is to retain the preeminence in the international standing. The process of institution building, Partnerships, and alliances was in the aftermath of World War 2. The foreign policy from containments to the victory of the US after the demise of the Soviet Union. The military, economic, and political means the state uses to achieve security. This grand strategy has been perfectly aligned with the US's long-term objectives across the world. The US emerged as a leading economy after World War 2 and it started dominating the world in setting rules and regulations, the way of governance, the economic system, and the pursuit of Wilsonian idealism. The United States strove for the institutions building and bringing settlement in the war-torn Europe, with the help of Marshal's plan, the US spent considerably in the ailing economy of Western Europe. The US specified the standard for Global trade and governing standards that are associated with prosperity. The US pursued a containment policy against the Soviet Union and stopped the spread of communism in Eastern Europe and around the world. The US did not want an authoritarian state to set the governing principles for the world rather its resolve was to have a world where freedom prevails and inalienable rights for individuals' freedom, free of tyranny, and major inspiration of trade that can bring prosperity in nations well-being. The US foreign policy exhibits the strands of liberalism and realism, which come under the umbrella of grand strategy. The US, desire for unrivaled military, economic, political, technological, and innovation has generally been inspired by realism where the great power has no potential rival and enjoys unipolarity with no existing potential rivals.

The preeminence of the US and its sphere of influence is aligned with grand strategy pursuit, the ultimate objective of the grand strategy is to retain the preeminence where the United States can exercise absolute authority and enjoy a unipolar position in international standing. There has been debate as to what exactly should the US adopt in foreign policy whether its orientation should be liberal orientation or realist but the primary goal has always been to retain the dominating rule. Liberal Internationalism or offensive realism seems dominant to retain a competitive edge in an era of US foreign policy. These phenomena go hand in hand

with each other. Furthermore, collective security, institution building, and collective problem-solving approaches are seen in the NATO, WTO, and Nuclear nonproliferation regimes are the result of the internationalist approach. The establishment of the European steel and coal community led to the creation of the European Union where the arch-rivals France and Germany gathered around to carve out the way for economic prosperity. Internationalism yielded great results in Europe and other countries inclined to the West. The institutions and nations building and regime change are some of the imperialist postures the US exhibits. There have been recommendations by scholars on whether the United States should pursue selective or deep engagement but it is up to the strategic environment and challenges of the 21st century that would be required to respond in accordance with possible outcomes and good reasons associated with it

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1994. *Interlocking Institution*. June.

2021. *White house*. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/abraham-accords-one-year-later-assessing-impact-and-what-lies-ahead> .

2022. "Biden-Harris national security strategy." *White House*.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf>.

Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Soviet invasion of Afghanistan." Encyclopedia Britannica, July 4, 2023. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Soviet-invasion-of-Afghanistan>.

Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Soviet invasion of Afghanistan." Encyclopedia Britannica, July 4, 2023.

DC, T. W. (2017). *National Security Strategy of the United States of America DECEMBER 2017*. Retrieved December 2017, from Whitehouse.archives.gov:

Encyclopaedia. (2023, 2023). *Britanica*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Soviet-invasion-of-Afghanistan>

HISTORIAN, O. O. (MILESTONES: 1945–1952). *The Truman Doctrine, 1947*. Retrieved from history.state.gov: <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine>

HISTORIANS, O. O. (1961–1968). *The Cuban Missile Crisis, October 1962*. Retrieved from history.state.gov: <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/cuban-missile-crisis>

Ikenberry, G John. 1998. "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order." *The MIT Press*.

Ikenberry, G John. 2002. "America's Imperial Ambition." *Foreign Affairs*.

Ikenberry, G john. 2004. "The End Of Neo-conservative moment."

- Ikenberry, G John. 2014. "The Illusion of Geopolitics: The Enduring Power of the Liberal Order." *Council on Foreign Affairs*.
- Ikenberry, G. (2004). *Liberalism and empire: logics of order in the American unipolar age*. Cambridge University Press, 22.
- Ikenberry, G. (2004). *Liberalism and empire: logics of order in the American unipolar age*. Cambridge University Press, 22.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2005. "Power and liberal order: America's postwar world order in transition." : *Oxford University Press*.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2009. "Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order." *American Political Science Association*.
- Knott, S. (N/A). *GEORGE H. W. BUSH: FOREIGN AFFAIRS*. Retrieved from millercenter.org: <https://millercenter.org/president/bush/foreign-affairs>
- Kunz, Diane B. 1997. "The Marshall Plan Reconsidered: A Complex of Motives ." *Foreign Affairs*.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. The United States: W. W. Norton & Company.
- MEARSHEIMER, J. J. (2018). 2 Human Nature and Politics. In J. J. MEARSHEIMER. Yale University Press.
- MEARSHEIMER, J. J. (2018). 8 The Case for Restraint. In J. J. MEARSHEIMER, *Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*. Yale University Press.
- MEARSHEIMER, J. J. (2018). *Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*. Yale University Press.
- MEARSHEIMER, JOHN J. (2018). "Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities." In 8 *The Case for Restraint (pp. 217-234)*. YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 1994-1995. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *The MIT press*.

Mearsheimer, John J. 1994-1995. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *The MIT Press*.

Nations, U. (2021.). *Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*. Retrieved 2021
United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, from n.d.

Schmidt, Brian C. 2004. "Review: Realism as Tragedy." *Cambridge University press*.

Sloan, Elinor. 2003. "Elinor Sloan." *Beyond primacy American Grand strategy in the post September 11 era*.

STATE, U. D. (2017-2021). Retrieved from United States Department of State:
<https://www.state.gov/the-abraham-accords/>

UNIVERSITY, G. W. (2011, May 2). *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book*
No. 343. Retrieved from
<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB343/index.htm>:
<https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/node/2707>

