

THE INDO-PACIFIC AS A STRATEGIC ARENA: EVOLVING SECURITY ALLIANCES AND DEEPENING POWER RIVALRIES

Maryna Dei

Department of Constitutional and Administrative Law
National Aviation University
Kyiv, Ukraine

maryna.dei@npp.nau.edu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0626-8089>

Abstract. *This paper examines the transformation of the Indo-Pacific into the central arena for global strategic competition. It argues that the intensifying rivalry between the United States and the People's Republic of China is the primary driver reshaping the regional security architecture. This rivalry has catalyzed the formation and strengthening of countervailing coalitions, notably the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD) and the AUKUS pact, while simultaneously challenging the centrality of established ASEAN-led institutions. Through a qualitative analysis of strategic documents, academic literature, and policy reports from 2020-2025, this study dissects the interplay of military modernization, nuclear deterrence, and the weaponization of the economic-security nexus, particularly in critical technology supply chains. The findings indicate a shift towards a more fragmented and contested regional order, characterized by a complex web of overlapping bilateral and minilateral arrangements designed to balance against China's rise. While these alignments enhance deterrence, they also heighten the risks of miscalculation and escalation. The paper concludes with policy recommendations for strengthening cooperative security mechanisms, managing geoeconomic friction, and establishing robust crisis communication channels to ensure regional stability.*

Keywords: Indo-Pacific, Strategic Competition, Security Alliances, QUAD, AUKUS, US-China Rivalry, Balance of Power, Deterrence, Geoeconomics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The 21st century has witnessed a decisive shift in the world's geostrategic and geoeconomic center of gravity from the Euro-Atlantic to the Indo-Pacific (Abensour, 2025; Laksmana, 2024; Medeiros, 2025). Encompassing a vast maritime expanse from the eastern coast of Africa to the western shores of the Americas, the region is home to more than half the world's population, accounts for 60% of the global economy, and hosts seven of the world's largest militaries (Kritenbrink, 2023; European Parliament, 2023). Its strategic maritime routes, including the Strait of Malacca, are conduits for a significant portion of global trade and energy supplies, making regional stability a matter of paramount global concern (Medeiros, 2025).

The primary dynamic shaping this strategic arena is the intensifying competition between the United States, the region's long-standing security guarantor, and the People's Republic of China (PRC), a rising power with revisionist intentions (Cha, 2025; IISS, 2023; Izumikawa, 2020). This rivalry is a multi-dimensional contest for influence that spans the military, economic, technological, and ideological domains, prompting observers to suggest a potential "reset of the world order" (Medeiros, 2025, p. 2). China's military modernization, assertive actions in the South and East China Seas, and expansive Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) have been met with a concerted effort by the United States and its allies to uphold a "free and open" regional order.

This paper argues that the Indo-Pacific's security architecture is being fundamentally reshaped by the intensifying strategic competition between the United States and China, leading to the formation of new minilateral security groupings and the recalibration of existing alliances. This dynamic, while aimed at establishing a stable balance of power, simultaneously heightens the risk of conflict through a complex interplay of military modernization, economic interdependence, and technological rivalry.

To explore this thesis, this article proceeds in four parts, following the IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) structure. The following section details the qualitative methodology and theoretical framework employed. The third section presents the results of the analysis, mapping the evolving strategic landscape, the key actors' postures, the networked architecture of alliances, the instruments of deterrence, and the geoeconomic battlefield. The fourth section discusses the implications of these findings, analyzing the contested balance of power, the weaponization of interdependence, and the efficacy of regional institutions. The final section offers a conclusion and policy recommendations aimed at mitigating conflict and fostering a stable, rules-based order in this critical region.

2. METHODS

This study utilizes a qualitative, multi-method research design to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Indo-Pacific's security dynamics. The research is based on a systematic literature review of scholarly articles, peer-reviewed journals, official government strategy documents and white papers, and in-depth reports from leading international think tanks, with a publication date range of 2020 to 2025 to ensure contemporary relevance.

The analytical approach is guided by a hybrid theoretical framework that integrates neorealism and liberal institutionalism. Neorealism provides the conceptual tools to explain the structural pressures of the international system that drive the balance of power politics, the formation of countervailing alliances, and the persistent security dilemmas between the United States and China (Hanggarini & Perwita, 2024; Rehman & Asrar, 2024). Concurrently, liberal institutionalism is employed to assess the role, effectiveness, and limitations of multilateral cooperative frameworks, such as those led by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), in mitigating conflict, fostering shared norms, and promoting a rules-based international order (Sukma, 2010; Dominguez, 2021).

A comparative case study methodology is applied to examine the strategic postures and policies of five key regional actors: the United States, China, India, Japan, and Australia. These five nations were selected as they represent the principal architects and subjects of the Indo-Pacific's evolving security dynamics. The United States and China are the primary competitors whose rivalry defines the region's structural tensions (Cha, 2025). Japan and Australia are cornerstone U.S. allies and key drivers of the Indo-Pacific concept, actively shaping countervailing coalitions (German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2022). India is the region's pivotal rising power, whose policy of "strategic autonomy" makes it a critical swing state in the balance of power (Koga, 2024; Rajagopalan, as cited in Raska, 2023). This involves a close reading and analysis of their primary strategic documents, including the *U.S. Indo-Pacific Strategy* (The White House, 2022), Australia's *National Defence Strategy* (Australian Government Department of Defence, 2024), Japan's "Free and Open Indo-Pacific" (FOIP) plans (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2023), and China's white papers on security cooperation (State Council Information Office, 2025). This comparative analysis allows for the identification of critical convergences and divergences in threat perceptions, strategic objectives, and policy responses to the changing regional environment.

Furthermore, a discourse analysis of joint statements, official communications, and expert critiques is used to evaluate the mandates, capabilities, and strategic functions of key regional security groupings. This includes an examination of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD), the AUKUS trilateral security pact, and ASEAN-led forums. The QUAD and AUKUS were chosen as the most prominent examples of the shift towards flexible, often exclusive 'minilateral' security arrangements designed to respond to specific strategic challenges, contrasting with the broad, inclusive nature of the established ASEAN-led forums (Nagy, 2023; Laksmana, 2021). The analysis of these groupings provides insight into the fragmentation and layering of the regional security architecture. This method helps to deconstruct the stated versus perceived purposes of these institutions, revealing the underlying strategic logics and tensions that shape their development and impact on the regional order (Anggarini & Khoirunnisa, 2024; Horowitz, 2025; Murray, 2022; Sukma, 2010).

3. RESULTS: THE SHIFTING CONTOURS OF POWER AND SECURITY

3.1 The Strategic Landscape: From "Asia-Pacific" to "Indo-Pacific"

The contemporary strategic discourse is increasingly dominated by the term "Indo-Pacific," a conceptual shift from the previously prevalent "Asia-Pacific." This is not merely a semantic change but reflects a fundamental rescaling of the region's strategic identity from a primarily economic construct to one driven by security imperatives (Sundararaman, 2022; Medeiros, 2025). The Indo-Pacific concept recognizes the fusion of the Indian and Pacific Oceans into a single, continuous strategic theater, underscored by the centrality of vital sea lines of communication (SLOCs) and maritime chokepoints like the Strait of Malacca (Medeiros, 2025; European Parliament, 2023).

This reconceptualization was propelled by the rise of India as a major regional power and the growing interconnectedness of security challenges across the two oceans (Panda, 2022; Lukash, 2024). The concept's intellectual origins can be traced to early 20th-century German geopoliticians and Indian historians, but its modern political currency was established by former Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's 2007 "Confluence of the Two Seas" speech to the Indian Parliament (Raska, 2023; Abensour, 2025; Pandalai, as cited in FRS, 2025; Sundararaman, 2022).

However, the geographical boundaries of the Indo-Pacific remain contested, with definitions varying among key actors in ways that reflect their distinct strategic priorities. The United States, particularly under the Trump and Biden administrations, defines the region as stretching "from the west coast of India to the western shores of the United States," a definition that conveniently aligns with the area of responsibility of the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (USINDOPACOM) (Haruko, 2020; Raska, 2023). In contrast, India promotes a more expansive and inclusive vision, extending "from the shores of Africa to that of the Americas," a formulation designed to assuage concerns that the concept is an exclusive, anti-China coalition (Haruko, 2020). ASEAN, seeking to maintain its central role, defines the Indo-Pacific in its *Outlook on the Indo-Pacific* (AOIP) as a closely integrated and interconnected region of which it is the fulcrum, emphasizing dialogue and cooperation over rivalry (Haruko, 2020; ASEAN, 2024). These divergent definitions carry significant policy implications, shaping the scope and nature of potential collaborations and creating zones of strategic overlap and divergence (Haruko, 2020).

This fluid strategic map is populated by major powers with distinct and often competing postures:

- **United States:** The cornerstone of U.S. policy is the "Free and Open Indo-Pacific" (FOIP) strategy, which aims not to change China but to "shape the strategic environment in which it operates" (The White House, 2022, p. 8). This is pursued by modernizing its bedrock bilateral alliances, fostering flexible minilateral partnerships like the QUAD and AUKUS, and promoting a rules-based order to build a balance of influence favorable to U.S. interests and values (The White House, 2022).
- **China:** Beijing officially rejects the Indo-Pacific construct, viewing it as a U.S.-led containment strategy designed to encircle China (He, 2020). It advances an alternative regional vision through its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), which it frames as a "21st Century Maritime Silk Road" (Luo, 2023), and promotes concepts like a "Community with a Shared Future for Mankind" (State Council Information Office, 2017). China's 2025 national security white paper articulates a doctrine of "comprehensive security," which prioritizes the political security of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and uses economic statecraft, military modernization, and assertive diplomacy to establish regional primacy (Agnihotri, 2025; State Council Information Office, 2025; Swedish Defence Research Agency, 2025).
- **Japan:** As a progenitor of the FOIP concept, Japan's strategy is articulated through three pillars: promoting the rule of law and freedom of navigation, pursuing economic prosperity via "quality infrastructure," and committing to regional peace and stability (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2023; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, n.d.). As a "secondary power," Japan seeks to leverage ideational and institutional tools to manage great power competition and uphold the existing order (Koga, 2024).
- **India:** India's approach is characterized by "strategic autonomy" and "multi-alignment," enabling it to participate in both the U.S.-led QUAD and the China-Russia-led Shanghai Cooperation

Organization (Abensour, 2025; Koga, 2024; Singh, 2025). New Delhi frames its Indo-Pacific engagement not as a reaction to China but as a natural evolution of its "Look East" and "Act East" policies, rooted in deep historical and civilizational connections to the region (Panda, 2022; Pandalai, as cited in FRS, 2025). It aspires to be a "leading power" that co-shapes the regional architecture (The White House, 2022).

- **Australia:** Canberra has undergone a significant strategic shift from a policy of liberal engagement to a more ambitious neorealist stance (Hanggarini & Perwita, 2024). Its 2024 National Defence Strategy codifies a strategy of "deterrence by denial," which focuses on developing the capability to thwart aggression in its immediate region, particularly its northern maritime approaches (Dowse, 2024). This strategy is operationalized through the acquisition of long-range strike capabilities and a deepening of its alliance with the U.S., most notably through the AUKUS pact (Dowse, 2024; Marles, 2024; Congressional Research Service, 2025).

3.2 A Networked Architecture: Alliances and Alignments

The Indo-Pacific's security architecture is evolving into a complex, networked system that blends long-standing bilateral treaties with new, more flexible minilateral arrangements. This emerging structure is largely a response to China's growing power and assertiveness.

The *Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD)*, comprising the United States, Japan, India, and Australia, has been revitalized and elevated to the leaders' level since 2021 (He & Feng, 2023; German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2023). The QUAD's official mandate is deliberately framed around non-military cooperation to provide regional public goods. Key initiatives include the Quad Vaccine Partnership to combat the COVID-19 pandemic, the Quad Infrastructure Coordination Group to promote quality infrastructure standards, and working groups on critical and emerging technologies like AI and 5G/6G telecommunications (Anggarini & Khoirunnisa, 2024; F MPA, 2024; He & Feng, 2023). This focus on "soft balancing" is designed to offer Indo-Pacific nations attractive alternatives to economic and technological dependence on China (Anggarini & Khoirunnisa, 2024). Despite this public-facing agenda, the QUAD is widely perceived as a strategic coalition of "like-minded" maritime democracies aimed at preserving a rules-based order and balancing against China's influence (German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2023; He, 2021). This dual identity creates strategic ambiguity. It is this very ambiguity that allows India, with its deep-rooted policy of strategic autonomy, to participate without committing to a formal military alliance. However, this has led some analysts to label India the group's "weakest link," as it resists any move toward collective defense obligations (Grossman, 2018, as cited in He, 2021).

In contrast, *AUKUS* is an unambiguous "hard security" pact between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, announced in 2021 (Horowitz, 2025; Smith, 2024). Its primary purpose is to deepen defense-industrial integration and enhance military capabilities to bolster deterrence.

Pillar I, the pact's centerpiece, involves providing Australia with technology and support to acquire a fleet of conventionally-armed, nuclear-powered submarines (SSNs) (CSIS, 2025; Smith, 2024; U.S. Department of Defense, 2025). This represents a monumental strategic investment for Australia, aimed at projecting power and holding potential adversaries at risk over vast distances.

Pillar II is focused on accelerating the joint development and fielding of advanced capabilities in areas such as artificial intelligence, hypersonic missiles, quantum technologies, and electronic warfare (CSIS, 2025; Congressional Research Service, 2023). While AUKUS is seen by its members as a decisive step to counter China's military buildup, it has generated significant controversy. It has been criticized for potentially undermining nuclear non-proliferation norms, and its secretive formation alienated key allies, most notably France, whose own submarine contract with Australia was abruptly canceled (Murray, 2022; Panel, 2025). Furthermore, its exclusivity has raised concerns in Southeast Asia about the formation of an "Anglosphere" bloc that could sideline regional institutions (Horowitz, 2025).

This rise of minilateralism places the centrality of ASEAN under significant strain. For decades, ASEAN-led institutions like the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the East Asia Summit (EAS) have served as the region's primary platforms for inclusive security dialogue, operating on the principles of consensus, consultation, and non-interference known as the "ASEAN Way" (Sukma, 2010; Anwar, 2024). However,

the intensifying US-China rivalry has exposed deep fissures within ASEAN, with member states adopting divergent positions based on their economic and security relationships with the two great powers (Putri, 2025; Laksmana, 2020; Sim, 2025). The emergence of groupings like the QUAD and AUKUS, which address regional security challenges outside of ASEAN-led frameworks, is perceived by many as a direct challenge to ASEAN's relevance and convening power (Chong, 2024; Laksmana, 2021). Persistent critiques that ASEAN forums are merely "talk shops," incapable of enforcing decisions or resolving hard security disputes like the South China Sea conflicts or the crisis in Myanmar, have further fueled this perception (German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2022; Laksmana, 2020; IISS, 2025).

Underpinning this entire networked structure is the enduring U.S. "hub-and-spokes" system of bilateral alliances, which remains the bedrock of the regional security order (Cha, 2025; Rapp-Hooper, 2020, as cited in Park & Savell, 2025; German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2022). The U.S.-Japan Security Treaty stands as the cornerstone of this system, committing the U.S. to the defense of Japan and granting it access to forward-deployed bases that are indispensable for regional deterrence and power projection (United States Department of State, 1960; Ministry of Defense of Japan, n.d.). Recent alliance developments have focused on upgrading command-and-control frameworks and enhancing military interoperability to more effectively counter shared threats (The White House, 2025). Similarly, the ANZUS treaty forms the legal basis of the U.S.-Australia alliance, a partnership that has been profoundly strengthened and operationally deepened by the AUKUS agreement (EPRS, 2022).

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Indo-Pacific Security Groupings

Feature	Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (QUAD)	AUKUS	ASEAN-led Forums (ARF, EAS)
Core Membership	United States, Japan, India, Australia (Congressional Research Service, 2023)	Australia, United Kingdom, United States (Horowitz, 2025)	10 ASEAN Member States + Dialogue Partners (including US, China, Japan, India, Australia, Russia, EU, etc.) (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d.)
Primary Mandate	Strategic dialogue; "soft balancing"; provision of regional public goods (German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2023; Anggarini & Khoirunnisa, 2024). Explicitly non-military alliance (He, 2021; He & Feng, 2023).	Hard security pact; military-technological cooperation; enhancing deterrence capabilities (Horowitz, 2025; Smith, 2024).	Dialogue and confidence-building; norm-setting; conflict prevention (not resolution) (Sukma, 2010; Anwar, 2024).
Key Initiatives	Vaccine Partnership, Critical & Emerging Technology Working Group, Infrastructure Coordination, Maritime Domain Awareness Partnership (Anggarini & Khoirunnisa, 2024; F MPA, 2024).	Pillar I: Nuclear-powered submarines for Australia. Pillar II: Joint development of AI, hypersonics, cyber, quantum, and undersea capabilities (CSIS, 2025; Congressional Research Service, 2023).	ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific (AOIP); Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC); ongoing negotiations for a South China Sea Code of Conduct (Sukma, 2010; IISS, 2025).
Strengths	Flexible, non-binding format; broad agenda appeals to diverse interests; includes key democratic powers (F MPA, 2024).	Deep military-technological integration among trusted allies; provides high-end, credible deterrence capabilities; clear focus and purpose (Horowitz, 2025).	Inclusive membership (includes China); established diplomatic channels; high degree of regional legitimacy and convening power ("ASEAN Centrality") (Sukma, 2010; Anwar, 2024).

Perceived Limitations	Ambiguous strategic purpose (soft vs. hard security); constrained by India's non-alignment policy ("weakest link" critique) (He, 2021); viewed with suspicion by China and some ASEAN states (He & Feng, 2023; Laksmana, 2021).	Exclusive "Anglosphere" grouping; alienates key allies (e.g., France); raises nuclear proliferation concerns; long delivery timelines for capabilities; challenges ASEAN centrality (Murray, 2022; Panel, 2025; Laksmana, 2021).	Consensus-based decision-making leads to slow progress and lowest-common-denominator outcomes; ineffective at addressing hard security crises ("talk shop" critique) (German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2022; Laksmana, 2020; IISS, 2025).
------------------------------	---	--	---

3.3 Instruments of Deterrence: Military Modernization and Signaling

The strategic competition in the Indo-Pacific is being operationalized through extensive military modernization programs and deliberate strategic signaling, creating a complex and increasingly tense deterrence environment.

A naval arms race is accelerating across the region. China's industrial might, with a shipbuilding capacity reportedly 230 times that of the United States, has enabled the People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) to become the world's largest naval force by number of vessels (Congressional Research Service, 2025; Peace and International Security Council, 2025; The Economic Times, 2025). The PLAN is rapidly expanding its fleet of aircraft carriers, advanced destroyers, and submarines, with the stated goal of becoming a global blue-water navy capable of operating far from its shores by 2050 (The Economic Times, 2025; U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 2020; IISS, 2023). This naval buildup is a direct challenge to the long-standing maritime dominance of the U.S. Navy. In response, the United States and its allies are undertaking significant naval expansion and modernization efforts of their own (IISS, 2023). Australia, through AUKUS, is set to acquire a fleet of SSNs and is also procuring long-range anti-ship missiles (Dowse, 2024; Congressional Research Service, 2025). Japan is retrofitting its *Izumo*-class helicopter carriers to operate F-35B stealth fighters, effectively giving it light aircraft carriers for the first time since World War II, and is acquiring Tomahawk land-attack cruise missiles to bolster its counterstrike capabilities (IISS, 2023; Newsweek, 2025). India is actively pursuing its vision of a 200-ship navy by 2035, which includes commissioning its second aircraft carrier, the indigenously built *INS Vikrant*, and planning for a third, potentially nuclear-powered, carrier (The Economic Times, 2025; Suci, 2025; Indian Ministry of Defence, 2025).

This conventional arms race is shadowed by a nuclear overhang. The Indo-Pacific is a crowded nuclear arena, featuring established nuclear-weapon states (United States, China, Russia, India, North Korea, Pakistan) as well as key U.S. allies—Japan, South Korea, and Australia—sheltered under the U.S. extended deterrence umbrella (IISS, 2023). A major destabilizing factor is China's rapid and opaque expansion of its nuclear arsenal. U.S. defense intelligence projects that China's nuclear warhead stockpile could reach 1,500 by 2035, a dramatic increase that signals a potential shift from its long-held doctrine of "minimum deterrence" toward a posture of nuclear parity with the United States and Russia (The Economic Times, 2025; Perry World House, 2025). While Beijing officially maintains its No-First-Use (NFU) policy, its growing and diversifying triad of delivery systems (land-based ICBMs, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and strategic bombers) provides it with a more credible and survivable second-strike capability (Zhang, 2021; Boyd & Barrie, 2025; NIDS, 2018; European Parliament, 2023). India, whose nuclear program is primarily oriented toward deterring China and Pakistan, also adheres to an NFU pledge and a doctrine of "credible minimum deterrence" (NIDS, 2018). The United States, in turn, is modernizing its own nuclear triad and developing more flexible, lower-yield options to strengthen the credibility of its extended deterrence commitments to allies, who harbor growing anxieties about the reliability of the U.S. nuclear umbrella in a more complex threat environment (Perry World House, 2025).

In this charged atmosphere, joint military exercises have become a primary instrument for enhancing interoperability and sending potent signals of collective resolve and capability. Exercise Malabar, once a bilateral U.S.-India naval drill, has evolved to permanently include Japan and Australia, effectively

becoming the premier military exercise of the QUAD nations (Project Statecraft, 2020; Australian Institute of International Affairs, 2023; He & Feng, 2023; PIB Delhi, 2021). The exercise has grown in complexity and geographical scope, now encompassing high-end maritime warfare scenarios, including advanced anti-submarine warfare (ASW), air defense, and carrier strike group operations across the Indian and Pacific Oceans (Project Statecraft, 2020; Defence, 2023; Naval Technology, 2024).

Similarly, Exercise Talisman Sabre, the largest bilateral military exercise between the U.S. and Australia, has expanded to include a host of other partner nations (Australian Army, 2024). It serves as a laboratory for testing and validating complex, multi-domain warfighting concepts, involving amphibious landings, long-range precision strikes, and integrated air and missile defense, thereby demonstrating the collective capacity of the allies to respond to a major security crisis (U.S. Army Pacific, 2025; Defence, 2025; MRF-D, 2025).

3.4 The Geoeconomic Battlefield: Trade, Technology, and Infrastructure

The strategic competition in the Indo-Pacific is being waged as intensely in the economic and technological domains as it is in the military sphere. Infrastructure development, critical supply chains, and emerging technologies have become central arenas for a new era of geoeconomic rivalry.

This rivalry is most visible in the competing visions for regional infrastructure development. China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is a colossal geoeconomic project that aims to reshape global connectivity by financing and building infrastructure—ports, railways, pipelines, and digital networks—across Eurasia and Africa (IISS, 2021; Hong Kong Trade Development Council, n.d.; Camba, 2025). While promoted by Beijing as a vehicle for shared prosperity, the BRI has been widely criticized by the U.S. and its partners for its lack of transparency, unsustainable lending practices that create "debt traps" for developing nations, and its underlying strategic goal of expanding China's political and economic leverage (Council on Foreign Relations, 2023). In response, the U.S. and its allies have launched alternative initiatives. The Blue Dot Network (BDN), a joint effort by the U.S., Japan, and Australia, is not a financing mechanism but a certification system designed to promote "quality, high-standard" infrastructure projects that are transparent, sustainable, and financially viable, thereby helping to attract private sector investment (Wilson, 2021; Anam, 2022; U.S. Department of State, n.d.). Building on this concept, the G7 launched the Partnership for Global Infrastructure and Investment (PGII), which aims to mobilize \$600 billion in public and private capital by 2027 for "values-driven" infrastructure projects in low- and middle-income countries, offering a direct alternative to China's state-led model (G7 Italy, 2024; The White House, 2022; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2023; Goto & Hughes, 2022).

At the heart of this geoeconomic contest lies the battle for technological supremacy, with the semiconductor supply chain emerging as a critical chokepoint (Corrado, 2022; CSIS, 2023; Brill, 2024). The global production of semiconductors is extraordinarily complex and geographically concentrated, especially within the Indo-Pacific. Taiwan, through its foundry giant TSMC, holds a near-monopoly on the manufacturing of the most advanced logic chips (below 10 nanometers) (Corrado, 2022). South Korea is dominant in memory chips, while Japan is a key supplier of specialized materials and manufacturing equipment (Corrado, 2022; CSIS, 2023). This concentration creates profound strategic vulnerabilities; a disruption in Taiwan, for instance, would have catastrophic consequences for the global economy (Corrado, 2022; Journal of Global Business and Competitiveness, 2024).

Recognizing this vulnerability and China's ambition to dominate the industry, the United States has initiated a "tech cold war." The centerpiece of U.S. strategy is a "small yard, high fence" approach, implementing sweeping export controls to deny China access to advanced semiconductor technology, chip-design software (EDA), and manufacturing equipment (FPRI, 2024; Institute of New Europe, 2025; IDSA, 2025; Foreign Policy Research Institute, 2024). The goal is to slow China's military modernization, which is heavily dependent on these advanced chips for capabilities like artificial intelligence (Institute of New Europe, 2025). These controls have significantly disrupted China's tech sector but have also inflicted revenue losses on U.S. and allied firms, which rely heavily on the Chinese market (ITIF, 2023; CSIS, 2024). In response, Beijing has accelerated its massive state-led drive for technological self-sufficiency, pouring billions into its domestic semiconductor industry under policies like "Made in China 2025" and a "Delete

America" campaign to replace foreign technology (CSET, 2022; China US Focus, 2025; The Alan Turing Institute, 2024; UCIGCC, 2024; MERICS, 2024). The competition extends deeply into AI, where the U.S. currently leads in developing the most advanced models, but China is rapidly catching up by leveraging its vast data resources and state-directed investment, creating a fundamental contest between open, democratic models of technological development and a state-controlled, techno-authoritarian model (CSET, 2021; U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 2024; RSIS, 2025; Hass, 2025).

4.DISCUSSION: ANALYZING THE DYNAMICS OF A NEW ERA

The findings reveal an Indo-Pacific undergoing a profound and rapid strategic transformation. The region is not simply reacting to US-China competition but is being fundamentally reordered by it, creating a new and complex set of security dynamics. This discussion synthesizes these findings to analyze the contested balance of power, the weaponization of economic interdependence, and the evolving role of regional institutions.

4.1 The Contested Balance of Power

The security architecture of the Indo-Pacific is shifting from the post-Cold War unipolar structure, dominated by the United States and its hub-and-spokes alliance system, toward a more contested and multipolar balance. The emerging order is not a singular, coherent system like NATO but a complex, multi-layered network of overlapping bilateral, minilateral, and multilateral arrangements. This can be conceptualized as a "tiered" or "latticed" security architecture.

At the highest tier of military integration and capability—focused on deterring and, if necessary, fighting a high-intensity conflict—are the core U.S. bilateral alliances with Japan and Australia, powerfully augmented by the AUKUS pact (Horowitz, 2025). This tier is exclusive, technology-intensive, and represents the "hard edge" of the U.S.-led coalition. A second tier is occupied by more flexible, politically-oriented groupings like the QUAD, which serves as a vehicle for strategic coordination among major democracies and for competing with China in non-military domains through the provision of public goods (Anggarini & Khoirunnisa, 2024). This tier allows for broader participation, notably from India, which shies away from formal alliance commitments (He, 2021). The third and most inclusive tier consists of the ASEAN-led forums, such as the ARF and EAS, which provide an essential, albeit limited, platform for dialogue and confidence-building that includes all major powers, including China (Sukma, 2010). This tiered structure allows regional states to engage at different levels of commitment, reflecting their varied threat perceptions and strategic hedging behaviors. The critical challenge for regional stability lies in managing the interactions and potential frictions between these tiers.

Within this dynamic, middle powers are playing an increasingly active role in shaping the regional order. Australia's adoption of a "deterrence by denial" strategy and its deep investment in AUKUS demonstrate a shift toward a more proactive and forward-leaning defense posture (Dowse, 2024). India's pursuit of "multi-alignment" allows it to engage with competing blocs, maximizing its strategic autonomy while positioning itself as a crucial swing state in the regional balance (Singh, 2025; Abensour, 2025). This active agency challenges a simplistic bipolar view of the region, highlighting a more complex multipolar dynamic nested within the overarching U.S.-China rivalry. However, this diffusion of power also complicates deterrence and crisis management. From a critical perspective, U.S. strategy can be interpreted as envisioning the Indo-Pacific as a "strategic frontier" or "sacrifice zone," a theater where great power competition can be waged far from the American homeland, thereby placing a disproportionate risk and burden on its forward-deployed allies and partners (Jackson, 2025).

4.2 The Weaponization of Interdependence

The strategic competition in the Indo-Pacific has fundamentally altered the nature of globalization, challenging the liberal institutionalist premise that economic integration inherently fosters peace. Instead, the region is a prime example of the "weaponization of interdependence," where economic and

technological linkages are no longer just sources of mutual prosperity but are actively leveraged as instruments of state power (Sundararaman, 2022; Corrado, 2022; Farrell & Newman, 2025, as cited in TNSR, 2025).

China's Belt and Road Initiative exemplifies this trend. Beyond its stated economic goals, the BRI functions as a tool to create economic dependencies, secure access to strategic resources and infrastructure, and build political loyalties, thereby translating economic influence into geopolitical leverage (IISS, 2021; Council on Foreign Relations, 2023). The United States and its allies have responded in kind, though with a different model. U.S. export controls on semiconductors are a clear attempt to exploit China's dependence on foreign technology to create a strategic "chokepoint," aiming to slow its military and technological advancement (Corrado, 2022; Farrell & Newman, 2025, as cited in TNSR, 2025). Initiatives like the PGII and the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity (IPEF) are designed to offer an alternative, rules-based model of economic engagement that strengthens supply chain resilience among like-minded partners—a strategy often referred to as "friend-shoring" (Goto & Hughes, 2022). This geoeconomic contestation is forcing a structural realignment of global supply chains, creating bifurcated systems in critical technology sectors and compelling nations and multinational corporations to navigate an increasingly politicized economic landscape.

4.3 The Efficacy and Limits of Regional Institutions

The current institutional landscape of the Indo-Pacific is a patchwork of arrangements with varying degrees of effectiveness in managing regional security. The proliferation of minilateral groupings like the QUAD and AUKUS is a direct consequence of the perceived limitations of ASEAN-led multilateralism. ASEAN's consensus-based, non-binding, and dialogue-focused approach, while valuable for fostering a sense of regional community, has proven inadequate for addressing hard security challenges, from China's gray-zone coercion in the South China Sea to the internal collapse of Myanmar (German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2022; Laksmana, 2020; IISS, 2025). This has created a demand for more agile, capable, and like-minded coalitions that can generate credible deterrence.

However, this trend toward minilateralism creates its own paradox. In seeking to build more effective security coalitions, the U.S. and its allies risk undermining the very principle of an "inclusive" regional architecture they claim to support. By operating outside of and often bypassing ASEAN, these exclusive groupings challenge ASEAN's centrality, potentially leading to a more fragmented and polarized region where smaller states feel pressured to choose sides (Laksmana, 2021; Chong, 2024). This highlights a central tension in the region's security architecture: the trade-off between the inclusivity and legitimacy of broad multilateral forums and the effectiveness and decisiveness of smaller, capability-focused minilaterals. The current "messy" architecture, with its overlapping and sometimes competing institutions, may be an adaptive response to this dilemma, but it also creates risks of strategic incoherence and duplication of effort, making the management of regional flashpoints in the Taiwan Strait, the South China Sea, and along the Sino-Indian border more complex and perilous (Hanggarini & Perwita, 2024; Singh, 2025).

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This analysis confirms that the Indo-Pacific has become the central theater of 21st-century great power competition. The strategic rivalry between the United States and China is the principal organizing force, driving a fundamental restructuring of the regional security architecture. This has resulted in a complex, multi-layered system where traditional U.S.-led bilateral alliances are now augmented by flexible, often exclusive, minilateral groupings like the QUAD and AUKUS.

These new formations are designed to create a more robust balance of power against China's military modernization and geoeconomic expansion. The findings demonstrate that this competition is being waged across multiple domains: a naval and nuclear arms race is accelerating, economic interdependence is being weaponized through infrastructure competition and a "tech cold war" centered on semiconductors, and established regional institutions like ASEAN are facing profound challenges to their

centrality and effectiveness. While the emerging networked security architecture enhances deterrence, it also creates a more fragmented and contested environment, increasing the risks of miscalculation and unintended escalation.

The strategic developments outlined in this paper offer a compelling validation of neorealist theory, which posits that states in an anarchic international system will seek to balance against a rising power. The revitalization of the QUAD and the formation of AUKUS are clear manifestations of countervailing coalitions forming to check China's growing military and economic might (Mearsheimer, 2014). Concurrently, these trends highlight a crisis for liberal institutionalism. The struggles of ASEAN-led forums to manage hard security disputes and the pivot by key actors toward smaller, exclusive minilaterals suggest that broad, consensus-based institutions are proving insufficient in an era of intensified great power competition, challenging the liberal premise that such institutions are the primary guarantors of regional stability (Nagy, 2023; Beeson, 2022).

Based on the analysis, the following policy recommendations are proposed to mitigate risks and promote a more stable and cooperative regional order:

1. **Strengthen Crisis Management and De-escalation Mechanisms:** The high density of military forces and the frequency of encounters in contested areas like the South China Sea and the Taiwan Strait create a significant risk of accidental escalation (Mastro, 2024; Cooke et al., 2025). It is imperative for the United States, China, and other key regional powers to establish and, crucially, utilize robust crisis communication channels. This includes reactivating and professionalizing military-to-military hotlines to ensure they are reliable in a crisis, unlike in past instances where they have gone unanswered (USIP, 2024; Cooke et al., 2025). These mechanisms should be expanded to include protocols for managing encounters between coast guard and maritime militia vessels, which are often involved in gray-zone incidents.

2. **Foster a Hybrid and Interoperable Security Architecture:** Rather than treating minilateral groupings and ASEAN-led forums as mutually exclusive, policymakers should actively seek to build bridges between them. The QUAD, for instance, should institutionalize its engagement with ASEAN, acting as a "strategic filler" that provides public goods and capacity-building in areas where ASEAN is constrained, thereby amplifying rather than supplanting ASEAN's role (Laksmana, 2021). This requires a concerted diplomatic effort to ensure the various tiers of the regional architecture—from AUKUS to the EAS—are complementary and interoperable, creating a resilient network that can manage diverse security challenges without forcing smaller nations into binary strategic choices (Cha, 2025; Wilson Center, 2023).

3. **Govern Goeconomic Competition through Multilateral Standards:** To prevent the weaponization of interdependence from leading to a costly and destabilizing global economic fracture, like-minded nations should collaborate to establish clear, transparent, and enforceable rules for goeconomic conduct (Institut Montaigne, 2024; Dadabaev et al., 2025). This involves moving beyond competing infrastructure initiatives to create a unified multilateral framework for quality infrastructure investment, building on the principles of the PGII and BDN (Goto & Hughes, 2022). In the technology sphere, the focus should be on building resilient and diversified supply chains ("friend-shoring" or "ally-shoring") for critical components like semiconductors, rather than pursuing unattainable and inefficient national self-sufficiency. This requires deep coordination on investment screening, export controls, and joint R&D to maintain a collective technological edge while mitigating the risks of chokepoint vulnerability (Corrado, 2022; CSIS, 2023).

4. **Reinforce the Rules-Based Order through Collective Resilience:** Upholding a "rules-based order" requires more than military deterrence; it demands a credible, collective response to coercive actions. Regional partners should develop a "collective resilience" framework, wherein an act of economic coercion or gray-zone aggression against one member triggers a coordinated diplomatic and economic support package from the others (Cha, 2025). This strategy, similar to the EU's anti-coercion instrument, would raise the costs and diminish the benefits of such behavior for any potential aggressor, thereby strengthening deterrence across both the economic and security domains without resorting to direct military confrontation (Singh, 2025; USIP, 2024).

5. Broaden the Coalition by Engaging Middle Powers and European Partners: To create a more resilient and broad-based coalition for a rules-based order, the United States and its core allies should deepen engagement with key regional middle powers—such as South Korea, Indonesia, and Vietnam—and extra-regional actors like the European Union (Congressional Research Service, 2023). This involves aligning respective Indo-Pacific strategies and creating flexible pathways for participation in specific initiatives, such as inviting South Korea to collaborate on AUKUS Pillar II advanced capabilities or integrating the EU's Global Gateway initiative with the PGII to amplify geoeconomic competition (Lee, 2023; Laksmana, 2021; Trinh & Nguyen, 2024). By fostering a wider network of cooperation, this approach can distribute the burden of maintaining regional stability and present a more unified front against coercive behavior.

5.1 Future Research Directions

The strategic dynamics of the Indo-Pacific are evolving rapidly, presenting numerous avenues for future research. A critical area for inquiry is the long-term impact of artificial intelligence and autonomous weapons systems on deterrence stability in a region with multiple nuclear powers, a domain where the risk of rapid, unintended escalation is particularly acute (RAND Corporation, 2025; Horowitz, 2022). Further research is also needed to assess the long-term viability of middle-power hedging and "multi-alignment" strategies as US-China competition hardens, and to explore the potential pathways for building a more cooperative security order that can manage great power rivalry while addressing shared transnational threats like climate change and pandemics.

REFERENCES

- Banasiak, J. (2020). Historic-legal aspect of military order as a special institution of criminal law against the background of international law and Polish legislation. *Studies in the Field of Juridical Sciences. Miscellanea*, 10, 9–32.
- Czyżak, M. (2012). Military penal law of the period of the Kingdom of Poland 1815–1831. *Military Legal Review*, 3, 11.
- Dunaj, K. (2015). Military courts as organs of justice. *Studia Iuridica Lublinensia*, 24(4), 9.
- Frąckowiak, K. (2023). Some remarks on the limits of the countertype of ultimate military necessity in the context of deprivation of a soldier's life (Art. 319 of the Criminal Code). *Military Legal Review*, 3, 5–18.
- Gensikowski, P. (2007). Problematics of the legal basis for requesting the competent commander to impose a disciplinary penalty in cases of offences and fiscal offences. *Military Legal Review*, 2, 21.
- Hoc, S. (2016). Commentary on Article 323 of the Criminal Code. In M. Filar (Ed.), *Penal Code. Commentary*. Wolters Kluwer S.A., LEX/el.
- Justification of the military part of the government's draft Penal Code. (1997). In *New Penal Code of 1997 with justifications* (p. 213). Ministry of Justice.
- Kutzmann, W. (2025). Commentary to Article 332 of the Penal Code. In R. A. Stefański (Ed.), *Penal Code. Commentary*. C. H. Beck, Legalis/el.
- Kutzmann, W. (2025). Commentary to Article 337 of the Penal Code. In R. A. Stefański (Ed.), *Penal Code. Commentary*. C. H. Beck, Legalis/el.

- Majewski, J. (2023). Mutual relationship of the provisions of Articles 329–330 and 58 § 3 and 4 of the Penal Code. *State and Law*, 3, 64–70.
- Majewski, J. (2024). Commentary to Article 323 of the Penal Code. In J. Majewski (Ed.), *Penal Code. Commentary*. Wolters Kluwer S.A., LEX/el.
- Przyjemski, M., & Kmieciak, H. (2014). Military part of the substantive criminal law. In A. Marek (Ed.), *System prawa karnego, Vol. XI*. In M. Bojarski (Ed.), *Special areas of criminal law: Military, fiscal and extra-code criminal law* (p. 202). C. H. Beck.
- Sieracki, W. (1983). Some problems of evolution of military criminal (substantive) law in the period 1963–83. *Military Legal Review*, 3, 235.
- Szeleszczuk, D. (2024). Commentary to Article 317 of the Penal Code. In A. Grześkowiak & K. Wiak (Eds.), *Penal Code. Commentary* (p. 1856). C. H. Beck.
- Zgoliński, I. (2020). Limitation of punishment in the light of the Constitution of the RP. In A. Grześkowiak & I. Zgoliński (Eds.), *Polskie prawo karne na tle wartości Konstytucji RP* (p. 79). KPSW.
- Ziółkowska, A. (2023). Commentary to Article 337 of the Penal Code. In V. Konarska-Wrzosek (Ed.), *Penal Code. Commentary*. Wolters Kluwer S.A., LEX/el.