

Grand Strategy Alternatives 2019

Invited Perspective Series

Strategic Multilayer Assessment (SMA)

Future of Great Power Competition & Conflict Effort

MARCH 16

STRATEGIC MULTILAYER ASSESSMENT

Author: Dr. Peter Layton, Griffith University

Series Editor: Sarah Canna, NSI Inc.



This white paper represents the views and opinions of the contributing authors.
This white paper does not represent official USG policy or position.

Dr. Peter Layton, Griffith University

Dr. Peter Layton is a Visiting Fellow at the Griffith Asia Institute, Griffith University and a RAAF Reserve Group Captain. He has extensive aviation and defence experience and, for his work at the Pentagon on force structure matters was awarded the US Secretary of Defense's Exceptional Public Service Medal. He has a doctorate from the University of New South Wales on grand strategy and has taught on the topic at the Eisenhower College, US National Defense University. For his academic work, he was awarded a Fellowship to the European University Institute, Fiesole, Italy. He is the author of the book *Grand Strategy*.

Grand Strategy Alternatives

Dr. Peter Layton, Griffith University¹

The SMA Future of Great Power Competition & Conflict project is researching how the United States might strategize to defend its global interests. This paper supports the project in deriving some grand strategy alternatives specifically related to China (twelve) and Russia (ten). The development of the alternatives draws on a broader spectrum of international relations theories than the restricted neorealist set generally employ. The study's aims are to encourage the consideration of tangential approaches, suggest different framing mechanisms that could restructure our thinking about managing great power competition, and briefly outline a range of alternative ways to meet the challenges China and Russia pose.

Great power geopolitical competition is the defining strategic issue of our time.² Importantly, however, such competition is expected to remain below the level of great power armed conflict, instead ranging across diverse areas including economic, diplomatic, cyber, information campaigns, and irregular wars. Such diversity gives the great powers considerably more choice in the grand strategies they could potentially use to advance their interests than if the international system was locked in a Cold War type bi-polar confrontation.

Under this perspective, grand strategy is simply a problem-solving methodology that can be used to address specific challenges.³ Grand strategy is sometimes conflated with the US National Security Strategy, which is an example of a milieu type of grand strategy that takes a global outlook and seeks to manage the whole international system. In this paper, the application of the grand strategy methodology is much less ambitious being the positional type focused mainly on China and to a lesser extent, Russia.⁴

Using grand strategy as an instrumental policymaking tool means there are some differences in approach from that taken elsewhere. The most obvious difference is that national interests do not drive

¹ Author contact information: p.layton@griffith.edu.au

² National Security Strategy of the United States of America, Washington, The White House, December 2017, pp. 2-3. Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy of The United States of America: Sharpening the American Military's Competitive Edge, Washington, Department of Defense, 2018, pp. 1-4.

³ Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy*, Brisbane, 2018, pp. 1-8, <https://www.amazon.com/Grand-Strategy-Peter-Layton/dp/0648279308>

⁴ This draws on the distinction between milieu grand strategies and positional grand strategies made in: G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011, p.164.

the grand strategies examined here.⁵ National interest is a contested term mainly due to its vagueness and imprecision. Any societal group or individual can claim any objective is in the national interest.⁶ Moreover, knowing when the national interest has been achieved is difficult, as they are mostly open-ended, aspirational statements.⁷ 'National interest' is also somewhat astrategic. The term by definition encompasses only one nation whereas strategy involves at least a bi-lateral relationship between 'us' and 'them.' If strategy intrinsically involves interacting with others, deriving strategies with reference to only a single state is inherently problematic.

A less obvious but further difference is that this paper moves beyond the neorealist international relations theories—generally only 'balancing'—that inform most grand strategy proposals.⁸ Being able to use a diversity of means though suggests a diversity of theoretical perspectives could at least be considered. This issue is too consequential to allow theoretical myopia to unintentionally limit debate.

The paper aims to encourage consideration of tangential approaches, suggest different framing mechanisms when thinking about managing great power competition, and briefly outline alternative grand strategies to meet the challenges China and Russia pose (see Annex A). The paper initially discusses some methodological aspects before—in subsequent sections—developing three different grand strategy sets: denial, engagement, and reform. Annex B explains the methodology further.

Crucially, the paper does not choose any particular grand strategy but instead quickly sketches alternatives, hoping to provoke creative thinking and innovation. Moreover, this paper focuses more on agency than context; it does not delve deeply into structure. To translate any particular grand strategy alternative into action would require much deeper investigation.

⁵ National interests are the starting point in strategy development in both US and UK joint doctrine. Joint Doctrine Note 1-18, *Strategy*, Washington: Joint Force Development, 25 April 2018, pp. II-3 – II-4.

⁶ Arnold Wolfers, "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 4, December 1952, pp. 481-502, p. 481.

⁷ Alan S. Milward, *The Rise and Fall of a National Strategy 1945-1963: The United Kingdom and the European Community Volume 1*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2012, pp. 6-7.

⁸ Two recent examples of this predilection both published on 20 February are: Charles W. Boustany and Aaron L. Friedberg, *Answering China's Economic Challenge: Preserving Power, Enhancing Prosperity*, NBR Special Report no. 76, Seattle: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2019. And: Hal Brands and Zack Cooper, *After the Responsible Stakeholder, What? Debating America's China Strategy*, Texas National Security Review, Vol.2, Issue 2, February 2019, <https://tnsr.org/2019/02/after-the-responsible-stakeholder-what-debating-americas-china-strategy-2/> [Accessed 22 February 2019]

Methodology Aspects

Grand strategy differs from strategy in three dimensions: it includes diverse means (encapsulated in the Diplomacy, Information, Military and Economic [DIME] acronym); it adds 'building the means'⁹; and it has expansive 'ends.'

In terms of ends, a grand strategy tries to build a better future where our relationship with specific states or non-state actors is improved.¹⁰ This relationship can be conceived in terms of international order that for grand strategy formulation John Ikenberry useful defines as: "a political formation in which settled rules and arrangements exist between states to guide their interaction."¹¹ Types of international order possible include balancing, a concert of powers, democracy, economic interdependence, and hegemony.¹²

An order's appropriateness and application depends on the context. Orders have both form and content, as the rules-based (institutionalist) order illustrates. The form of a rules-based order is that of states agreeing that their actions will be in accordance with particular rules. The content of the rules is separate and generally relates to the national objectives the individual states involved in the order have.

A strategy aims to create the desired ends by using the means in a particular way.¹³ The strategist's dilemma is that there are almost a limitless variety of 'ways' potentially applicable. Confusion results, often leading to resorting to cognitive shortcuts including using historical analogies albeit they have a very poor record of success.¹⁴

An alternative is to take a reductionist approach to 'ways' and through abstraction try to reduce cognitive overload. Considered generically, there are three fundamental ways of changing an existing relationship between two or more entities: stopping another doing something, working with another, or trying to change another's mind. Adding international relations theoretical perspectives then leads to a grand strategy typology of denial, engagement, and reform.¹⁵ Importantly, this typology is simply designed to help policymakers think about grand strategy. It is a structure that can be applied to a problem to better frame grand strategy debates and encourage broader consideration of alternatives.

The denial grand strategy type assumes that superior power determines outcomes; you can stop others achieving their objectives by being more powerful than them.¹⁶ Military and economic might is used to threaten others to induce them to stop behaving disagreeably or, if needs be, used to physically stop them undertaking unwanted actions. Denial grand strategies build balance of power, concert of power, or hegemonic stability orders.

An engagement grand strategy makes use of groups in the other state that have interests and desires that you share or, at least, that are useful to you.¹⁷ You can support these helpful groups so they prevail in the continual jostling between domestic interest groups rather than groups you disapprove of. The

aim is ensuring the ‘right’ people govern and that their state seeks the goals you desire. Engagement grand strategies can build complex interdependence, institutionalist, and liberal peace orders.

The reform grand strategy type changes the ideas people hold.¹⁸ The old ideas first need to collapse, with people convinced a new replacement idea is essential. Then particular members of a society who have a strong influence on the ideas people adopt need to be convinced that some new notion (of yours) is the answer. After this, these ideational advocates need supporting until their message convinces enough people that a tipping point is reached, a cascade occurs and most accept the new thinking. Reform grand strategies can build more favourable norms (understandings of appropriate actions) or identities (understanding of who you are).

Two points are worth noting. Firstly, the specific orders are only achievable using their directly related ways. For example, a denial grand strategy will not change a society’s norms. Secondly, in each grand strategy the individual DIME instruments are used in different ways to create the desired orders but they are all employed.

The three generic grand strategy types are made particular by applying context. In the next three sections—Denial, Engagement and Reform—brief outlines are sketched appropriate to thinking about alternative grand strategies for managing the relationship with China. Alternative grand strategies for managing the relationship with Russia are discussed in Annex A.

⁹ For brevity, this paper only outlines each grand strategy alternatives as relate to applying national power. The ‘building power’ half of grand strategy is not discussed. Germane issues in this other half include mobilising the requisite personnel, money, and material resources in a globalised world as well as gaining societal support through building legitimacy and crafting a strategic narrative.

¹⁰ B.H. Liddell-Hart, *Strategy*, 2nd Revised Edition, New York: Penguin, 1991, pp. 321-22.

¹¹ G. John Ikenberry, *op.cit.*, p. 36.

¹² John A. Hall, *International Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, pp. 8-24.

¹³ Arthur F. Lykke Jr., *Military Strategy: Theory and Application*, Carlisle: U.S. Army War College, 1989, pp. 3-9. Harry R. Yarger, ‘Toward a Theory of Strategy: Art Lykke and the Army War College Strategy Model’, pp. 45-52 in J. Boone Bartholomees Jr. (ed.), *U.S. Army War College Guide to National Security Policy and Strategy*, Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute, June 2006.

¹⁴ Yuen Foong Khong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992, p. 9.

¹⁵ This is explained and critiqued in: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 37-74. Particularly important is Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, ‘Power in International Politics’, *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Winter 2005), pp. 39-75.

¹⁶ Makes use of [amongst others]: John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001. Also see: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 46, 76-80.

¹⁷ Makes use of [amongst others]: Andrew Moravcsik, ‘Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics’, *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 4 Autumn 1997, Also see: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 47-48, 80-84.

¹⁸ Makes use of [amongst others]: Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, ‘International Norm Dynamics and Political Change’, *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Autumn 1998), Also see: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 48-49, 84-88.

DENIAL GRAND STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

Balance of Power Order Options

The balance of power order rests on the use or threat of violence. Accordingly, war can play a major role in the order, and is both acceptable behaviour and a legitimate means of statecraft. Seeking to create a balance of power order requires a deliberate acknowledgment that over time this could lead to major war. The key order determinant is relative material power and, in particular, relative military power. Having greater or at least similar relative power to an adversary should deter them from taking unwanted actions as expected gains now outweigh the costs. There are two different approaches to gain greater relative power: alone or with allies.

US Alone Grand Strategy. In this grand strategy, the United States would act to increase its own power while simultaneously constraining China's. Internally, the United States would focus on increasing national power by better exploiting domestic resources, accelerating economic growth, acquiring superior military power and striving to increase societal cohesion. Externally, the United States would try to constrain China successfully undertaking the type of internal activities the United States was focussed on. As part of this, there would be a major effort to sharply curtail China's access to foreign natural resources, technology, and direct investment.

A major US-China war would remain the ultimate way a balance of power grand strategy could constrain China's relative power; however, more likely would be exploiting proxy conflicts to drag China into prolonged and costly wars. This type of order intrinsically suggests encouraging a 'bait and bleed' war between China and its larger rivals.

Proxy wars are likely to be even more appealing in a US-China balance of power order given the United States is a maritime power and China a land power. Neither country can easily undertake a successful war against the other: an outcome that possessing nuclear weapons only accentuates.

US actions internally and externally under such an order would be expected to be reciprocated by China as both strive to maintain the desired balance. However, China has a much greater population and is expected to have a larger economic base in the medium future. These demographic and economic advantages make it problematic for the US to sustain a favourable relative power balance in material terms over the longer term. On the other hand, China's complicated geographic situation compared to the United States' undemanding environment suggests the United States has an intrinsic strength in being better able to gain from proxy conflicts.

US with Allies Grand Strategy. The alternative option is to have a limited internal mobilisation but complement this through forming extensive alliances. This inherently introduces issues of free-riding, entrapment, and alliance politics management. Alliances remain tantalising though in being perhaps

the only practical option to maintain a relative material power balance over the longer term with the gargantuan China in the conventional military force domain.

For such a grand strategy, the United States would need to bind allied military forces closer to it possibly through a quasi-NATO structure across the Indo-Pacific. In addition, intra-alliance trade would need to be supported to bring increased economies of scale, grow overall alliance total economic power, and sustain increased military strength. Such enlarged trade might be crucial for some allies as China could be expected to reduce imports from old and new US allies as the alliance structure intensified. China would have difficulties developing a counter-balancing matching alliance structure but through economic measures might be able to ensure some states remained neutral rather than become US allies.

Concert of Power Order Options

In a concert of powers order, the great powers share power, acting together in the management of the system to ensure a stable political equilibrium.¹⁹ In such equilibrium, no great power seeks system dominance: all great powers feel reasonably secure, have a certain sense of equality, their status and systemic roles are recognized, and they have meaningful influence.²⁰ China could be within a concert of power or be excluded from it.

China Within Concert Grand Strategy. In this grand strategy, the United States would need to accept China as a functional equal and vice versa. Both states may find this be difficult to sustain long term given their different political systems and individual strengths and weaknesses. Such a concert would though play to China's perception of itself as historically the predominant power in its region.

The concert order implies allocating spheres of influence—and responsibility—to the various great powers involved. For China, establishing a regional sphere of influence would make nearby states more pliable. China could gain implicit veto power over any unfavourable actions they might take and they would become less willing to provide long term basing to American forces or short-term support for transiting US forces. The United States would be gradually pushed out of the region without resort by China to armed force.

In this China would expect the United States to support its building its sphere of influence. The United States would not only not challenge Chinese expansionism but might be obliged to physically or

¹⁹ John A. Hall, and T.V. Paul, "Introduction," pp. 1-15 in T. V. Paul and John A. Hall (eds.), *International Order and the Future of World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 8.

²⁰ The concert of power order may seem better placed to be part of an engagement grand strategy. A concert of power order though is built upon a view that interstate relations are primarily conflictual and feature zero-sum gains. Conversely, an engagement grand strategy assumes interstate relations are cooperative and feature absolute gains. A concert of power order is accordingly considered within a denial grand strategy.

rhetorically support it. US independence of action might need to be compromised for the greater good of keeping China within the concert. In this though, there is an obvious friction point in Central Asia where Chinese and Russian ambitions might collide.

China Outside Concert Grand Strategy. A grand strategy could create a concert without China although only with difficulty given its significance in the contemporary international system. China would be continually looking to destabilise such a concert but this in itself might helpfully draw its attention from the United States onto others. Managing China may be easier if undertaken with others but it would be difficult for such a concert to impose its power on China, although Chinese actions could be made to appear illegitimate.

Importantly, a concert is not an alliance structure by another name. In a concert of 'equal' great powers the United States would share power, not monopolise its application. In this example, the concert could potentially include all the great powers except China or some smaller set—say all the great power democracies. The former case implies bringing Russia onboard. In the latter case, most great power democracies are already within the US alliance system, so the principal benefits would be bringing India and Brazil within its purview.

A concert that included Russia but excluded China would be a way to foreclose a deep Russian-Chinese alliance. The cost of this might be supporting Russian claims to a regional sphere of influence. On this, a *modus operandi* would need to be worked out with Russia separately.

Hegemonic Order Options

A hegemonic stability order envisages an international system where there is a single very powerful, great power—the hegemon—that provides systemic leadership. The hegemon establishes and maintains its preferred norms and values across the entire international order through providing collective goods, preventing cheating and free riding, enforcing its rules, and encouraging others to help with burden-sharing.²¹ The sharply uneven distribution of power can make such an international system noticeably peaceful,²² and incline the behaviour of lesser states towards being generally cooperative towards the dominant power rather than balancing.²³

A Quasi-Hegemonic US Grand Strategy. Given the rise of China, the United States could not become the hegemon of the complete international system but could of a limited but potentially still extensive subset. This order in some respects would mimic the Cold War containment divide with severe

²¹ Robert Gilpin, *The Political Economy of International Relations*, Princeton: Princeton University Press International, 1987, pp. 72-80.

²² William C. Wohlforth, 'The Stability of a Unipolar World', *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1999, pp. 5-41, pp. 23-25.

²³ Michael Mastanduno and Ethan B. Kapstein, 'Realism and State Strategies after the Cold War', pp. 1-27 in Ethan B. Kapstein and Michael Mastanduno (eds.), *Unipolar Politics: Realism and State Strategies after the Cold War*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1999, pp. 15-16.

limitations on trade with China and the creation of NATO-like alliances across East Asia. To support the latter, an extensive US military build-up would be necessary and probably additional permanent US military bases in the region.

This grand strategy would see active support for Taiwan while—at least rhetorically—contesting China’s current (late Qing Dynasty 18-19th Century) territorial borders, including its claims to Tibet and Xinjiang. The Party’s legitimacy would also be actively debated. This order involving the creation of its own subset-international system would require a considerable long-term effort by the United States. Moreover, the economic and financial disruption globally would be significant. Unless there was a compelling rationale, there would be considerable pushback from many nations especially as constraining trade with China would lead to them becoming poorer.

A Quasi-Hegemonic China Grand Strategy. China could become the hegemon of a limited subset of the international system. This order could arise if the United States adopted a deeply isolationist grand strategy mimicking the 1930’s interwar period. With such a retreat and Chinese economic inducements, many states would find it prudent to cooperate in such a Chinese-led order.

This order is effectively hierarchical where states have assigned roles and responsibilities and is accordingly compatible with Chinese historical ‘middle kingdom’ tributary notions. China, however, would have problems dealing with a greater diversity of governmental types than in its earlier dynastic times. In this order, Russia would move closer to China, perhaps setting itself up in some enforcer role.

Overtime, the US militarily, economically, and financially would become generally limited to the North American continent. Such a progressive shutout would adversely impact US technological development and economic growth. However, conventional military force structures could be considerably trimmed with reliance instead principally on nuclear forces. The required US grand strategy would be relatively undemanding, at least in the near-medium term.

ENGAGEMENT GRAND STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

An engagement grand strategy assumes a state’s actions are the aggregate of the various preferences of domestic groups albeit mediated by the preferences of other states. In using this grand strategy, a state works with and through like-minded domestic groups within another to bring desired change to their state’s social purpose. These like-minded sub-state groups can be strengthened and opposing sub-state groups weakened to create a new, more-favoured aggregation.

The ultimate aim is that the state willingly cooperates in seeking the desired outcomes, as these are now perceived to be mutually beneficial. The social purposes of others can then help advance one’s own national preferences. This grand strategy requires that other states have, or can be made to have, supportive domestic sub-state groups.

Complex Interdependence Grand Strategy (China Focus)

A complex interdependence order has three defining characteristics: multiple channels connect the societies and states involved ensuring any actions taken have reciprocal effects, there is no hierarchy of issues between the states, and military force is not threatened or used.²⁴ These characteristics give rise to distinctive political processes that states can exploit to influence another state's preferences including establishing linkages between issues, controlling or manipulating the setting of the agenda to determine how the issues are framed, penetrating the domestic groups who shape state preferences by using the blurred boundaries between domestic and international politics, and making use of international institutions.²⁵

The highly globalised nature of the contemporary international system encourages complex interdependence with the current US-China relationship already having some of its characteristics. An engagement grand strategy focussing on China would double down on this but with a significant new emphasis on developing, reinforcing, and supporting useful groups within Chinese society and the Party. This grand strategy would concentrate on Chinese sub-state groups not principally deal with the Party-Government as a denial grand strategy with its state-centric focus would.

The Party's leadership group would strongly pushback, but some Party elements would be attracted to the seemingly improved mercantile trading relationship offered. Xi Jinping has been endeavouring to make the Party more monolithic; an engagement grand strategy would directly challenge this policy. In this regard, Xi Jinping's erasure of the private/state-owned company divide in requiring all companies to have activist Party cells has created a tension between company profitability and individual financial gain versus what is best for the Party. This tension might be able to be utilized, particularly as there are many thousands of companies.

The Huawei imbroglio both illustrates this tension but also suggests that 5G's hyper-connectivity offers a new way to deeply penetrate across Chinese society. In this, an engagement grand strategy would need to effectively contest the 'great firewall' the Party has put in place. Success in this penetration would allow the vast Chinese population to be leveraged off.

Complex Interdependence Grand Strategy (Competition Focus)

In this grand strategy, the focus would be on bringing others to America's side. The US relationship with China would be a secondary issue and conducted in a manner that supported the primary objective. Over time an increasing number of states and the general background international structure would become increasingly supportive of the United States. This grand strategy is effectively a competition between who can entice the most states to its side rather than some direct contest between the United States and China.

This would not be an easy grand strategy to implement as all states at the sub-state level are different, sometimes dramatically so. The grand strategy would need to be tailored to each individual state. It would be important to prioritise the quantum and quality of effort expended on each country. Moreover, China would be pulling in the opposite direction trying to bring others to its side.

Given China's economic strengths, the US appeal to the various sub-state groups would need to be broadly based across the full DIME range. Reliance on a single 'means' could be unwise and might play to China's strengths.

There is a technological dimension to this and again Huawei looms large. 5G's hyper-connectivity will to some extent lock manufacturers and industries into particular 'productive districts' if they wish to gain the maximum benefits of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Huawei, with Chinese state support, could potentially offer low cost, high quality products that could become the standard across much of South East Asia, Central Asia, the sub-continent, Africa, South America, and the Middle East. The comparable Western systems (mainly Nokia and Ericsson) might then be restricted principally to the developed nations.²⁶ This engagement grand strategy would need to act to prevent such a technology-driven bifurcation of the international system that in the long-term favoured China. Failure would effectively see most states fall within China's orbit.

Institutionalist Grand Strategy

An institutionalist order's major characteristics are: a shared agreement amongst states over the principles and rules of order, the agreed rules and institutions set binding and authoritative limits on the exercise of power, and these rules and institutions are enmeshed in a wider political system not easily altered.²⁷ Creating such an order may entail a grand bargain amongst the states involved. The agreed rules and institutions then build an international order through connecting state and societal sub-state groups in transnational linkages that directly benefit those involved. These individuals and groups are then obliged by rational self-interest to act to maintain this beneficial order.

Such a grand strategy has echoes of a rules-based order, but this later order is more state-to-state or, in the China case, US state-to-Chinese Communist Party. The grand strategy proposed differs from a rules-based order in trying to connect into sub-state groupings. The Helsinki Final Act suggests what

²⁴ Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 2nd edition, Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1989, pp. 24-25.

²⁵ Some examples of such practices are discussed in: Timothy J. McKeown, 'The Big Influence of Big Allies: Transgovernmental Relations as a Tool of Statecraft', pp. 204-22 in Helen V. Milner and Andrew Moravcsik (eds.), *Power, Interdependence, and Nonstate Actors in World Politics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009. Chung-In Moon, 'Complex Interdependence and Transnational Lobbying: South Korea in the United States', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, March 1988, pp. 67-89.

²⁶ Peter Layton, *Prototype Warfare, Innovation and the Fourth Industrial Age*, Canberra: Air Power Development Centre, 2018, pp 9-10, 18-20.

²⁷ Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001, pp. 30-31.

might be possible. The USSR formally agreed to human rights norms in exchange for Western nations agreeing to the Post-World War Two division of Europe. To achieve this, the USSR signed the Helsinki Final Act that, in enshrining human rights norms, ultimately significantly undermined the internal legitimacy of the Soviet one-party state, calling into question its actions and policies.²⁸

In the last several years, Xi Jinping has suppressed human rights, the rule of law, NGOs, and civil society in the quest for greater Party control over the Chinese people. The Party under Xi Jinping though has also made territorial claims along its borders as a way to gain popular support through nationalist mobilisation. A Helsinki 'Mark II' that endorsed these claims while getting the Party to formally sign up to optimised human rights could create and support dissenting Chinese groups who share liberal values. Even if the South China Sea 'facts on the ground' cannot realistically be changed, there may be ways to benefit from them.

Liberal Peace Grand Strategy

This grand strategy is the Kantian dream writ large and has been written off in recent years as the Party has grown more repressive and assertive. A "liberal peace" can be created by the combination of republican democratic representative governments, international institutions, and transnational economic interdependence.²⁹ The three factors working together can create a virtuous circle where each strengthens the other.³⁰

The three factors division suggests there could be a sequence across time of China grand strategies: a complex interdependence order (China focus), an intuitionist order, and then the liberal peace to bring them all together. The key issue then would be the sequence. Post-World War Two Europe economic interdependence seemed the most effective entry point while in 1990s Latin America democracy appeared key.³¹

In further considering a liberal peace order grand strategy it could include deeply engaging democrats within Chinese society, actively promoting the rule of law, and supporting an independent media

²⁸ Daniel C. Thomas, *The Helsinki Effect: International Norms, Human Rights, and the Demise of Communism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001, pp. 257-86.

²⁹ Bruce Russett and John Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 35-42.

³⁰ Leading democratic peace thinker Michael Doyle holds that the three factors are instead republican democratic representative governments, liberal norms, and transnational economic interdependence. The Russett and Oneal listing is preferred as their work empirically tested their propositions. Moreover, as Doyle notes, while Russett and Oneal's coding did not include liberal norms specifically, the presence of these norms are probably included within their coding for democratic representative governments. Michael W. Doyle, 'Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace', *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3, 2005, pp. 463-66, p. 466.

³¹ Russett and Oneal, *Triangulating Peace*, pp. 40-41.

possibly from beyond mainland China. For the later, the long-term success of the free ‘radio’ broadcasts into the USSR suggests what might be possible if the great firewall can be breached.³²

Such activities would considerably annoy the Party, making gaining cooperation on other matters difficult unless such matters directly supported Party goals. Indeed, in recent years without any such provocations, the Party has become greatly concerned about the possibility of ‘colour revolutions’ and taken costly countering actions. The Party at least seems to consider a liberal peace grand strategy might succeed.

A possible side benefit of such a grand strategy is that more resources will be devoted to internal security, possibly at the expense of investing in its large conventional forces. In seemingly reinforcing what appears to be the Party’s greatest fear, it could divert the Party’s attention inwards away from external issues.

REFORM GRAND STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

A reform grand strategy aims to change another’s social rules. The transformation sought could be as fundamental as establishing a new political culture, or much less consequential in simply altering some specific social rules concerning a single issue. Reformed social rules may not necessarily change a state’s capabilities or social purpose, but the state’s actions and behaviour will be different. Some argue an example is the way the Cold War ended after Mikhail Gorbachev and other elites in the USSR as part of perestroika embraced new norms and identities.³³

In a reform grand strategy, states use their instruments of national power to advance and support those social rules deemed attractive or to replace those considered objectionable. The focus of these instruments is the ideational elite—the promoters of new ideas—who shape and influence their societies’ social rules. In the initial stages, the intention is to convince the ideational elites and then, as the new social rules near the tipping point, supporting these elites in advancing rule cascade and consolidation.

Under this approach, the message concerning the ‘goodness’ of the particular social rule targeted becomes the centrepiece, instead of the material effects of any military forces or economic measures employed. This is a crucial distinction. In the earlier material grand strategies ‘the words’ support the actions; in a reform grand strategy the actions support ‘the words.’

³² Michael Nelson, *War of the Black Heavens: The Battles of Western Broadcasting in the Cold War*, London: Brassey's, 1997.

³³ Rey Koslowski and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, 'Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System', *International Organization*, Vol. 48, No. 2, Spring 1994, pp. 215-47.

Reform grand strategies require a carefully structured approach and may take some time to deliver the desired order. Nevertheless, they can bring a finality other grand strategies cannot match.

Reform Norm Grand Strategy

In modern China, three political values compete: Marxism, economic pragmatism, and Chinese traditional values, with the latter two most influential beyond the Party.³⁴ These values with their interlocking sets of social rules may provide an entry point for encouraging the reconsideration of some existing norms. A specific norm to support might be to make threatening others a rare, not common, feature of Chinese political discourse and activities. Today, such threats include rhetorical ones like those made by Chinese elites against Taiwan and other democracies, and the seeming war-on-everyone by extreme party media outlets like The Global Times, to the more tangible threatening activities like deliberately aggravating territorial disputes and purposefully conducting ongoing, extensive cyber incursions. The intent would be to make a Chinese norm that did not think bellicose threats or gray zone warfare were appropriate actions.

Reform Identity Grand Strategy

China has a somewhat conflicted view about its identity. The Party wishes to emphasize the country's great strength and power while at the same time stressing it is an undeveloped country needing external support.³⁵ A reform grand strategy could endeavour to reinforce the strand that China is now a major power. In so doing, the nation may shed its victimhood mentality that unhelpfully shapes much public and political discourse. In adopting a mature national identity, notions of revisionism such as over Taiwan would become less important to the national identity, encouraging China to become a status quo power working within the international system.

CONCLUSION

The grand strategy alternatives outlined could each create a different future, but these are more than simply possibilities. The various ends and ways sketched are not products of the imagination but rather derived from international relations theoretical perspectives that have been developed, assessed, and critiqued in academia over an extended period. In being so devised, the alternatives are given a structure useful in assessing these and other options.

The grand strategies discussed aim to achieve specific orders, but each comprises both form and content. International relations academic research suggests there are only a limited number of forms

³⁴ Yan Xuetong, 'Chinese Values vs. Liberalism: What Ideology Will Shape the International Normative Order?', *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 2018, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 1-22, pp. 7-10

³⁵ Pu Xiaoyu, 'Controversial Identity of a Rising China', *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 2017, Vol.10, No.2, pp. 131-149, pp. 136-141.

possible but that the content may vary greatly. The form of the orders here could be fleshed out with other contents depending on the context and the understanding of the circumstances that policymakers hold.

The alternatives given are very much a high-level outline. Determinations on which are preferred would require deeper investigation. Some may impose a resource burden some consider imprudent while others may clash with strategic culture. Importantly, it is problematic blending different grand strategy types; history suggests doing so may lead to incoherence and failure.³⁶

The methodology used to devise the range of alternatives differs from more traditional approaches that build from notions of specific national interests. In so doing, the utility to strategizing of adopting tangential approaches and different framing mechanisms can be gauged. Moreover, outlining a range of alternative ways to meet the challenges China and Russia pose can further advance creative thinking and innovation. These challenges are of a type and scale that embracing new strategizing methodologies appears essential.

Annexes:

A. Russian Grand Strategy Alternatives

B. Grand Strategy Methodology

³⁶ Peter Layton, 'To Engage China, Or Balance It? Lessons From A Failed Grand Strategic Exercise', *War on the Rocks*, 20 July 2018, <https://warontherocks.com/2018/07/to-engage-china-or-balance-it-lessons-from-a-failed-grand-strategic-exercise/> [Accessed 16 February 2019]

ANNEX A

RUSSIA GRAND STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

Russia and China are very different. US relationships with either should reflect this; they cannot be simply treated as the same when strategizing. This reality further reveals the difference when strategizing between basing strategies on national interests or instead on changing the future relationship with countries of concern. The same national interests are seen as holding irrespective of whichever other country is the object of a strategy. This is inherently problematic.

Accepting Russia and China are different, this paper assumes that China is the more important challenge. Given this, there are some high-level options:

1. A grand strategy could be devised for each country. Each grand strategy would be tailored to aim to achieve particular orders albeit each should be developed and implemented cognisant of the other.
2. An alternative would be to have a China grand strategy that aims to realize particular outcomes. The US-Russia relationship would be managed principally to support achieving the China objectives. The intent would be to have the US-Russian relationship help advance US-China relations, or at least not hinder them.
3. A further alternative is having a China grand strategy while managing US-Russia relations using a risk management approach (i.e., not a 'strategy' approach). The intent would be to simply limit the costs of any damage Russia could do to US global interests rather than move US-Russian relations in any particular direction. Under this option, Russia would be left to its own devices with 'insurance' taken out by the United States to keep any costs suffered from any Russian adventures to an acceptable level.

The remainder of this annex looks at grand strategy alternatives. Again, it is important to stress that grand strategies try to build international orders that themselves comprise both form and content. There are only a limited number of forms possible but the content may vary greatly. The form of the orders here – that is their structure – could be fleshed out with other contents depending on the context and the understanding of the circumstances that policymakers hold.

This annex assumes that the earlier section on China grand strategy alternatives has been read as that provides the essential foundation information necessary to best understand the choices discussed here.

DENIAL GRAND STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

Balance of Power Options

US Alone Grand Strategy. The United States could readily balance Russia alone given the marked disparity in population. Under this grand strategy, the United States would strengthen its military forces across Europe on a bi-lateral basis. NATO would not be taken into account in terms of the balance of forces. A significant disadvantage is that Russia is principally a European rather than Eurasia country. European-based conventional forces balancing Russia would contribute only modestly to balancing against China. Swinging forces from Europe to East Asia in times of crisis or conflict would be awkward, especially in terms of encouraging opportunistic Russian adventurism.

United States with Allies Grand Strategy. This grand strategy in broad terms follows the historical tradition of a variety of NATO and non-NATO nations combining forces directly or indirectly with the United States to balance against Russia. In this, there are the well-known issues about entrapment, abandonment, NATO enlargement, and burden sharing but none seem insolvable. Slow alliance decision-making though provides opportunities for Russia to undertake gray zone operations ostensibly to improve its overall strategic situation.

Recent Russian operations in the Ukraine and Syria have not been complete successes. These operations remain ongoing, draining Russian resources which, given the nation's economic travails, is distinctly unhelpful. This type of order suggests encouraging 'bait and bleed' proxy wars between Russia and wherever it intervenes. Threats of horizontal escalation may also serve to divert Russian political attention and resources inwards and away from distant involvements. In addition, economic and financial sanctions can also slow and make much harder a Russian military build-up. Balancing implies acting to reduce others relative power not just building up your own.

Concert of Power Options

Russia Within Concert Grand Strategy. A geographically limited concert could be created that focused on Europe. This would perhaps play to Russia's desire to be considered a great power but would come at the price of allowing Russia specific spheres of influence. Granting such spheres would not only cause angst in Central and Eastern Europe but also ease current Russian strategic problems. Russia may then be free to undertake more distant interventions. Even so, if Russia could be split off from China there may be advantages in trying to appease Russia in this way.

Russia Outside Concert Grand Strategy. While a European concert could be created without Russia, it might add little to existing security arrangements. Moreover, in such a concert of 'equal' powers the United States would need to share power, not monopolise it, as it effectively does now in Europe. The United States would move from being 'first amongst equals' to being 'equal.' Lastly, such a grand strategy might encourage Russia to move closer to China.

More broadly though, a focussed grand strategy could build a concert comprising European and North America states into a very cohesive grouping. Such an Atlantic concert would form a democratic redoubt against troubles elsewhere in particular if an organized Chinese-led order of some kind emerges in East Asia. While much of the security dimension is in place for such a concert, this grand strategy would need to make the economic intertwining much deeper and consequential. Without this, over time such a concert might become relatively less economically powerful as East Asia grew. A Russia Outside Concert grand strategy might be more about the rest of the international system than simply Europe.

Hegemonic Order

A Quasi-Hegemonic US Grand Strategy. The United States could significantly strengthen its power and position to become a quasi-hegemonic power in Europe with Russia the only holdout. However, while this might be technically doable, it would draw even more resources away from East Asia than a balance of power order. The possible benefits gained versus the practical implications seem to militate against this kind of order. The grand strategy might be considered though as creating an Atlantic concert (discussed earlier) on steroids and so possibly having value as a fallback position in the event East Asia is lost.

Engagement Grand Strategy Alternatives

Complex Interdependence Grand Strategy

The highly globalised nature of the contemporary international system encourages complex interdependence. Russia in recent years has taken steps to reduce its sensitivity and vulnerability to asymmetric interdependence influence but there is only so much Russia can do and remain part of the global trading system. This grand strategy would attempt to greatly expand on the current linkages with Russia. This would be problematic given Russia's military, political, and cyber assertiveness in recent years; being able to expand linkages may require a new Russian leader, a withdrawal from the Donbas (at least), and some public contriteness.

The aim of such a grand strategy would be developing, reinforcing, and supporting useful sub-state groups within Russian government, business, and society. President Putin's oligarchic regime has gone to some trouble to protect itself from its greatest concern: a colour revolution. Deepening linkages into sub-state groups would attract pushback albeit some oligarchs might see opportunity.

In this Russia has a long-term dilemma given its lack of allies, partners, and friends and seeming growing reliance on China. The fourth industrial revolution will be increasingly rolled out over the next couple of decades bringing with it a hyper-connected user-industry-academia ecosystem. Beyond resource exploitation, Russia's only major manufacturing sector is defence and in that its exports have been relatively successful. However, if Russia chooses to join the Chinese-standard fourth industrial

revolution, its intellectual property in the defence sector (and others) will quickly bleed out to China. With that, Russia's influence on, and importance to, China will progressively diminish.

Set against its well-known demographic decline, it is possible Russian power might be about to peak. Overtime, Russia's relationship with China may end up not replicating the 'Greeks to the Romans' but rather the 'Ghurkhas to the British Empire.' In rational choice terms, deepening complex interdependence with the United States—and its European allies—may appear increasingly attractive compared to slipping into being a Chinese mendicant state.

Institutionalist Grand Strategy

An institutionalist grand strategy would try to agree to rules that would better connect a broad range of state and societal sub-state groups in prudent transnational linkages that directly benefit those involved. Such linkages would provide a route to be able to shape the social purpose of the Russian state. The grand strategy would aim to limit the Russian state's ability to limit and interfere with these linkages as it is now doing. This might be achieved by a rehash of the Helsinki negotiation approach in agreeing to borders (and thus limiting future Russian revanchism), agreeing to end Russian cyber interference, gaining improved and guaranteed access across Russian society, and imposing new limits on governmental constraints on human rights. There are doubtless a range of other options possible.

Liberal Peace Grand Strategy

As noted in the earlier discussion on China, this grand strategy may appear an unrealistic Kantian dream. A liberal peace grand strategy though may follow in sequence after other grand strategies have achieved successively better international orders with Russia. A liberal peace grand strategy could include deeply engaging democrats within Russian society and actively promoting the rule of law and supporting an independent media possibly from beyond Russia. For the latter, reliable internet access would be necessary albeit in the face of new efforts to control such access to the Russian people.

The ruling oligarchic regime would be unimpressed by such a broad fronted, comprehensive battering, even if it would confirm their existing suspicions about the West fomenting colour revolutions. Like in China, the ruling regime has a deep fear that a liberal peace grand strategy might succeed and so extensive precautions and preparations have and are being taken. In some respects, the concern over colour revolutions is so entrenched—and the belief in its effectiveness so strong—that Russia's recent interference in the West may be defensive in the long-standing Russian logic of the best defence is a good offensive.

As with China, a possible secondary benefit of such a grand strategy is that scarce Russian resources may be diverted to internal security and away from conventional and nuclear force modernisation. In

seemingly reinforcing existing fears, a liberal peace grand strategy could divert the Russian government's attention from other issues.

REFORM GRAND STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

Norm Reform Grand Strategy

The Russian state and the people are becoming disconnected. The state has grand global ambitions and is used by oligarchs to further their business interests, but the people have gradually become focused on personal financial issues including property rights. A norm reform grand strategy could aim to reinforce the social rules that the state should be principally responsive to the people and their concerns. Adopting such a norm might see the Russian state shifting towards mainly focussing on improving the life of individual citizens. Such a shift would make domestic issues more important than international adventures and help facilitate the development of a more representative form of democracy within Russia.

In that regard, the Ukrainian and Syrian interventions are now several years old, the sense of emergency is passing and the public's enthusiasm for guns over butter is waning. The recent complaints over old-age pension changes suggest the public is now becoming more worried about the state's impact on an individual's financial matters.³⁷ Supporting this new norm while in its formative stages now might be more efficacious than choosing another norm and then waiting for the appropriate ideational environment to develop.

Identity Reform Grand Strategy

Russia is searching for a new identity. To modify Dean Acheson's famous 1962 quote: "[Russia] has lost an Empire and has not yet found a role." Since the disintegration of the USSR there have been several alternatives explored including becoming Western, being a distinct civilization, or adopting a Eurasian outlook.³⁸ However, the issue remains fluid, providing an opening for persuasion and arguments. It is not an issue that needs to wait until the specific ideas collapse, they already have. A carefully structured grand strategy focussed on persuading ideational élites and then supporting a social rule cascade may be able to encourage the choice of a new identity. Such a new identity should preferably avoid having an imperialist dimension and a bellicose character.

³⁷ Andrei Kolesnikov, 'Five Years After Crimea, Russia Has Come Full Circle at Great Cost', *Moscow Times*, 5 February 2019, <https://carnegie.ru/2019/02/05/five-years-after-crimea-russia-has-come-full-circle-at-great-cost-pub-78301> [Accessed 20 February 2019]

³⁸ Andrei P. Tsygankov, *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity*, 3rd Edn, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2013, pp 207-230.

ANNEX B

GRAND STRATEGY METHODOLOGY

Grand strategy is a term that confuses many and accordingly it can be usefully unpacked to aid understanding. Importantly, the term as used in this paper relates to its use by strategists contemplating grand strategic options.

The 'strategy' noun of the 'grand strategy' term can be gainfully examined first. The crucial issue that defines a 'strategy' is that it involves interacting with intelligent and adaptive others, whether friends, neutrals, or adversaries. This social interaction though is of a particular kind. Each party involved continuously modifies their position, intent, and actions based on the perceptions and actions of the others participating. In operation, a strategy constantly evolves in response to the other actors implementing their own countervailing or supportive strategies. This is the "the paradoxical logic of strategy" where successful actions cannot be repeated as the other party adapts in response to ensure the same outcome cannot be gained in this way again.³⁹

If this is what strategy is, its scope is encompassed in a simple oft-used model. Art Lykke deconstructed the art of strategy into ends, ways, and means where the 'ends' are the objectives, the 'ways' are the courses of actions, and the 'means' are the instruments of national power.⁴⁰ The 'means' are used in certain 'ways' to achieve specific 'ends.'

Sir Lawrence Freedman incorporates this viewpoint in observing that strategy is "about getting more out of a situation than the starting balance of power would suggest."⁴¹ Good strategy involves an astute course of action, a shrewd 'way,' that is additive to the available power; the impact of the means is magnified. In contrast, poor strategy subtracts from the available means; it destroys the power you have.

This can be simplified into $\text{Ends} = \text{Ways} + \text{Means}$ albeit noting the inherent impossibility of actually summing unlike objects. Nevertheless, the formula highlights that if a strategy fails, it may not be solely due to inadequate means; there could be shortcomings in the way the means are used as well. If the means are meagre, the ends may still be achievable through using the means in more clever ways without needing to adjust the ends downwards to be bought into balance.

Adding the adjective 'grand' enlarges strategy in both means and ends. The means are now diverse—encapsulated in the Diplomacy, Information, Military and Economic (DIME) acronym—and the building

³⁹ Edward N. Luttwak, *Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace*, Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1987, pp. 7-65.

⁴⁰ Lykke, *op.cit.* Yarger *op.cit.*

⁴¹ Lawrence Freedman, *Strategy: A History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, p. xii.

of the means is now included. As Fuller observed, “While strategy is more particularly concerned with the movement of armed masses, grand strategy...embraces the motive forces which lie behind...”⁴²

Grand strategy’s expansive ‘ends’ are particularly important in this paper’s discussion. Liddell-Hart discerned an important issue: “while the horizon of strategy is bounded by the war, grand strategy looks beyond the war to the subsequent peace.”⁴³ A grand strategy tries to take us to a better future where our relationship with specific states or non-state actors is improved—even if only from our perspective.

This better future may be expressed in terms of international politics. Clausewitz would have understood as “the political object is the goal, war is the means of reaching it”.⁴⁴ The field of politics between states has long been examined in the International Relations academic discipline. Its language, concepts, and theories can assist defining the desired ends and, for this purpose, the arcane term ‘international order’ becomes useful.⁴⁵

International order is a somewhat vexed term, sometimes conceived very expansively. For the practical business of grand strategy making though, it can be used precisely. John Ikenberry in examining potential American grand strategies defined international order as “a political formation in which settled rules and arrangements exist between states to guide their interaction.”⁴⁶ These ‘rules and arrangements’ provide the common political space states can use to solve problems and address issues of concern.

Grand strategy’s primary purpose then is to attempt to change the extant international order—the current ‘political formation’—existing between two or more states into a more desirable one, even if only from the activist state’s perspective. There are several different kinds of international order ranging from deeply conflictual orders to more cooperative ones and including balancing, a concert of powers, liberal democracy, economic interdependence, and hegemony.⁴⁷

Ikenberry’s use of ‘settled’ indicates that a grand strategy succeeds when the rules and arrangements are at least tacitly agreed to between the parties involved and have some degree of durability. If the new order created is both acknowledged by those involved and becomes the basis on which their future actions are undertaken, then the original grand strategy may be considered successful. This measure of success, while usefully generic, has some shortcomings in that a ‘settled’ order might still be actively

⁴² Col. J.F.C. Fuller, *The Reformation of War*, 2nd Edition, London: Hutchinson and Co, 1923, p. 219.

⁴³ B.H. Liddell-Hart, *Strategy*, 2nd Revised Edition, New York: Penguin, 1991, pp. 321-22.

⁴⁴ Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War*, Edited and Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984, p. 87.

⁴⁵ This is done in: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 74-93.

⁴⁶ Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan, op.cit.*, p. 36.

⁴⁷ John A. Hall, *International Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, pp. 8-24.

revised at some indeterminate time.⁴⁸ This problem is inherent as policymaking involves future actions and what these may be is ultimately unknowable.

This highlights that in itself the adjective ‘settled’ does not mean that international orders are fixed, peaceful or even stable. An order’s subjects can choose to comply with, change, or defy “the settled rules and arrangements.”⁴⁹ Indeed, the operation of an international order is better considered as involving an agreed socialized instability rather than the maintenance of some permanent solidity. This socialized instability allows change in the international system to be purposefully managed in a way that meets the self-interest of most of the states involved.⁵⁰ For this, however, the particular international order constructed needs to be able to accommodate change, be open to it, and be able to withstand it.⁵¹

While there are several different generic types of international order, their appropriateness and specific application depends on the context. In this, international orders can be viewed as having both form and content, as the rules-based order construct illustrates. The form of a rules-based order is that of states agreeing that their actions will be in accordance with particular rules. The content of the rules is, though, a separate issue and generally relates to the national objectives the individual states involved in the order have. There is no widely agreed understanding of what the content of a generic rules-based order should be.

It was earlier noted that a strategy aims to create the desired end by using the means in a particular way.⁵² The ‘ways’ are thus central to achieving the desired international orders, but there is almost a limitless variety of ‘ways’ potentially applicable. Policymaking confusion unsurprisingly often leads them to resort to cognitive shortcuts including relying on historical analogies as a guide. While these are mentally compelling, they have a very poor record of success.⁵³

An alternative is to take a deliberate reductionist approach to ‘ways’ and through abstraction try to reduce cognitive overload. Considered generically, there are three fundamental ways of changing an existing relationship between two or more entities: stopping another doing something, working with another, or trying to change another’s mind. Extending this, and incorporating International Relations

⁴⁸ Brian Bond, *The Pursuit of Victory: From Napoleon to Saddam Hussein*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 199-204. Russell F. Weigley, *The Age of Battles: The Quest for Decisive Warfare from Breitenfeld to Waterloo*, London: Pimlico, 1991, pp. 537-40.

⁴⁹ Shiping Tang, ‘Order: A Conceptual Analysis’, *Chinese Political Science Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (February 2016), pp. 30-46.

⁵⁰ Jean-Marc Coicaud, ‘Legitimacy, Socialization and International Change’, pp. 68-100, in Emanuel Adler Charles A. Kupchan, Jean-Marc Coicaud and Yuen Foong Khong, eds., *Power in Transition: The Peaceful Change of International Order*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2001, p. 70.

⁵¹ Charles A. Kupchan, “Introduction: Explaining Peaceful Power Transition”, pp. 1-17, in Emanuel Adler et al, *ibid.*, pp. 7-14.

⁵² Lykke, *op.cit.* Yarger *op.cit.*

⁵³ Yuen Foong Khong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992, p. 9.

theoretical thinking and in particular Barnett's and Duvall's seminal work on power,⁵⁴ can then lead to a typology comprising three rather broad types of grand strategy: denial, engagement, and reform.⁵⁵

Importantly, this typology while incorporating theoretically perspectives, is simply designed to help policymakers think about grand strategy. It is a structure that can be applied to a problem to better frame grand strategy debates and encourage broader consideration of alternatives.

The denial grand strategy type assumes superior power determines outcomes; you can stop others achieving their objectives by being more powerful than them.⁵⁶ In such a grand strategy military and economic might is used in ways that means that others will in fear avoid disagreeable behaviours or, if needs be, can be physically stopped through using force. The types of international order a denial grand strategy can be used to build are a balance of power, a concert of powers, or a hegemonic stability order.

The engagement grand strategy type makes use of groups in the other state that have interests and desires that you share, or at least that are useful to you.⁵⁷ You can support these helpful groups, so they prevail in the continual jostling between domestic interest groups rather than groups you disapprove of. The aim is to ensure that the 'right' people govern. Ensuring what the other state wants is what you want is the goal. Engagement grand strategies can build complex interdependence, institutionalist, and liberal peace orders.

The reform grand strategy type changes the ideas people hold.⁵⁸ The old ideas first need to collapse with people convinced a new replacement idea is essential. Then those particular members of a society who have a strong influence on the ideas people adopt need to be convinced that some new notion (of yours) is the answer. After this, these idea advocates need supporting until their message convinces enough people that a tipping point is reached, a cascade occurs, and most accept the new thinking. Reform grand strategies can build international orders built around the deliberate creation of like-minded states that share similar norms (understandings of appropriate actions) or identities (understanding of who they are).

The three grand strategy types can be used to build some eight different generic international orders. In this, it's important to note that the ends and the ways are directly related. Specific ends are only

⁵⁴ Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, 'Power in International Politics', *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 1, Winter 2005, pp. 39-75.

⁵⁵ This is explained and critiqued in: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 37-74.

⁵⁶ Makes use of [amongst others]: John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001. Also see: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 46, 76-80.

⁵⁷ Makes use of [amongst others]: Andrew Moravcsik, 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics', *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 4 Autumn 1997, Also see: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 47-48, 80-84.

⁵⁸ Makes use of [amongst others]: Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Autumn 1998), Also see: Peter Layton, *Grand Strategy, op.cit.*, pp. 48-49, 84-88.

achievable with particular appropriate ways. For example, a denial grand strategy will not change people's deeply held norms and identities. Furthermore, all three grand strategy types make use of the full range of the instruments of national power. The individual DIME instruments are used in different ways in each grand strategy to create the desired orders, but they are all employed.

The three grand strategy types though are nonspecific. They need to be made particular by applying context.