



A Review of the United States Pivot to Asia Policy from 2011 to 2024 (with an Emphasis on Security Objectives)

Bahadur Aminian Jezi ¹ | Mohammad Ali seddighi ²

Abstract

Introduction

The Pivot to Asia policy, introduced in 2011 by the United States Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, marks a significant strategic recalibration in American foreign policy. This reorientation responds to the growing geopolitical, economic, and security importance of the Indo-Pacific region. Central to this policy shift is the United States' recognition of China's rapid ascent as a regional and global power, which poses strategic challenges to the existing liberal international order traditionally upheld by U.S. dominance. The Indo-Pacific has emerged as the world's most dynamic economic region, accounting for a substantial portion of global trade and GDP. Simultaneously, it has become a flashpoint for rising security tensions, especially in the South China Sea and Taiwan Strait. The Pivot to Asia later referred to as the "Rebalance to Asia" aims to deepen U.S. engagement across diplomatic, military, and economic dimensions to ensure regional stability, safeguard U.S. interests, and sustain the balance of power. The present study examines the underlying motivations of the Pivot to Asia policy, its evolution across successive U.S. administrations, and its broader implications, including those for U.S. engagement in West Asia, particularly concerning Iran.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a descriptive-analytical research methodology to provide a nuanced understanding of the Pivot to Asia policy. The analysis draws on a combination of primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include U.S. government documents such as National Security Strategy (NSS) reports, Department of Defense briefings, speeches by senior policymakers, and congressional records. Secondary sources consist of peer-reviewed academic literature focusing on international relations theories particularly balance of power, hegemonic stability, and coercive diplomacy.

1. Associate Professor of International Relations, Department of International Relations, School of International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: bahaminian@hotmail.com
2. Corresponding Author, Graduate Student of International Relations, School of International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: mohammadaliseddighi@gmail.com

Comparative analysis is employed to examine how different U.S. administrations—namely Obama, Trump, and Biden have implemented and adapted the Pivot strategy. The study also evaluates the policy’s operationalization through military deployments, diplomatic engagements, and economic initiatives. Special attention is given to multilateral frameworks such as ASEAN, the Quad (U.S., India, Japan, Australia), and regional trade agreements.

Findings and Discussion

The study identifies several core motivations behind the Pivot to Asia policy. Chief among them is the strategic imperative to counterbalance China’s assertiveness in the Indo-Pacific. Beijing’s growing military capabilities, expanding naval presence, and increasing control over strategic maritime zones have raised alarms in Washington. In response, the U.S. has undertaken efforts to reposition its military forces, enhance interoperability with allies, and conduct freedom of navigation operations (FONOPs) in contested waters.

Diplomatic engagement has also been a key pillar of the policy. The United States has strengthened alliances with traditional partners such as Japan, South Korea, Australia, and the Philippines. Additionally, Washington has sought to deepen ties with emerging strategic partners like India and Vietnam, emphasizing shared democratic values and security interests. The Quad has emerged as a vital multilateral platform to coordinate Indo-Pacific strategy among key democratic powers, with growing emphasis on maritime security, infrastructure investment, and supply chain resilience.

On the economic front, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) represented a cornerstone of the Obama administration’s efforts to embed the U.S. more firmly in the region’s trade architecture. Though the Trump administration withdrew from the TPP in 2017, its underlying objective to offer a counterweight to China’s economic influence—remains relevant. The Biden administration has signaled interest in re-engaging with the region economically through initiatives such as the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF), though these efforts lack the comprehensive scope of TPP. Each administration has adapted the Pivot policy to reflect shifting geopolitical realities. The Obama administration emphasized diplomacy, multilateralism, and institutional engagement. The Trump administration, by contrast, adopted a more unilateral and transactional approach, focusing on economic competition and trade deficits. While this led to strained relations with some allies,

it also ushered in a more explicit identification of China as a strategic competitor.

The Biden administration has sought to restore alliances while addressing transnational challenges such as climate change and technological competition. The administration's Indo-Pacific strategy emphasizes strategic investments in infrastructure, critical technologies, and cyber capabilities, as well as renewed commitment to regional stability through deterrence and diplomacy.

Another important dimension explored in this study is the ripple effect of the Pivot to Asia on U.S. policy in West Asia, particularly Iran. As strategic focus and resources shift toward the Indo-Pacific, Washington has recalibrated its engagement in the Middle East. This has resulted in a more restrained military footprint and a greater reliance on regional partners. The reallocation of strategic assets, including naval deployments and surveillance capabilities, reflects the prioritization of China as the primary long-term challenge to U.S. global leadership.

However, the study also finds that this reorientation has generated unintended consequences. Reduced attention to the Middle East has created perceived power vacuums, encouraging regional powers like Iran, Turkey, and Russia to assert themselves. The changing U.S. posture has complicated efforts to manage crises such as Iran's nuclear ambitions and the security of key maritime chokepoints like the Strait of Hormuz.

Conclusion

The Pivot to Asia policy represents a fundamental shift in American grand strategy, reflecting the growing importance of the Indo-Pacific in shaping global order. While the policy has undergone modifications across different administrations, its central objective strategically balancing China's rise—has remained consistent. Through military repositioning, alliance strengthening, and economic engagement, the United States seeks to preserve its influence in a region that will define the contours of 21st-century geopolitics.

Despite notable successes, the policy faces persistent challenges. Regional flashpoints including tensions over Taiwan, North Korea's nuclear program, and disputes in the South China Sea—continue to threaten stability. Furthermore, the absence of a comprehensive economic strategy post-TPP limits the U.S.'s ability to fully engage regional partners and compete with China's economic initiatives such as the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI).

The shifting United States focus toward the Indo-Pacific has also reconfigured its approach to West Asia, with implications for relations with Iran and broader regional security architectures. While the reallocation of resources aims to enhance strategic effectiveness, it necessitates careful calibration to prevent instability in other critical regions.

In sum, the Pivot to Asia underscores the United States' enduring commitment to a rules-based international order and its readiness to confront the challenges of great power competition. Going forward, the success of this strategy will depend on Washington's ability to sustain multilateral partnerships, adapt military and economic tools to emerging realities, and integrate its regional strategies into a coherent global framework. Future research should delve deeper into the inter-regional implications of this policy, particularly its effects on United States diplomacy and security cooperation in West Asia.

Keywords: United States; Security; China; Balance of Power

References

1. Amidi, A. (2009). *Regionalism in Asia: A look at ASEAN, SAARC, and ECO organizations*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Center for Political and International Studies. Tehran: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (In Persian).
2. AP News. (2024). *South Korea and US will start summer military drills next week to counter North Korean threats*. <https://apnews.com/article/south-korea-us-military-drills-north-korea-nuclear-d51ada6ac429757378322f8dcd209b15>
3. Asia Unbound. (2012). *The U.S. pivot to Asia: Much more than a military rebalance*. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/blog/us-pivot-asia-much-more-military-rebalance>
4. Baghi, M. H. (2019). *The China puzzle: Geopolitical rivalries in the 21st century and the shifting balance of power in East Asia*. Tehran: Amin Al-Zarb Publishing. (In Persian).
5. Campbell, K. (2016a). *The pivot: The future of American statecraft in Asia*. Hachette Book Group.
6. Carothers, T. (2012, January 11). *Democracy policy under Obama: Revitalization or retreat?* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2012/01/democracy-policy-under-obama-revitalization-or-retreat?lang=en>

7. Center for Energy and Security Studies (CENESS) & International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). (2019). *DPRK strategic capabilities and security on the Korean Peninsula: Looking ahead*.
8. Clinton, H. (2011). *The Hillary Clinton doctrine*. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved [Insert retrieval date if required], from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/united-states/hillary-clinton-doctrine>
9. Cohen, A. (2024, July 9). Russia is a strategic spoiler in the Indo-Pacific. *RAND Corporation*. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/commentary/2024/07/russia-is-a-strategic-spoiler-in-the-indo-pacific.html>
10. Council on Foreign Relations. (2024). *The U.S. pivot to Asia, with Robert D. Blackwill and Richard Fontaine* [Audio podcast]. <https://www.cfr.org/podcasts/us-pivot-asia-robert-d-blackwill-and-richard-fontaine>
11. Dehghani Firouzabadi, S. J. (2015). *Principles and fundamentals of international relations (Vol. 1)*. Tehran: SAMT. (In Persian).
12. Dehshiar, H. (2021). *U.S. foreign policy in theory and practice*. Tehran: Mizan. (In Persian).
13. Dehshiri, M. R., Jozani Kahan, Sh., & Jozani Kahan, Sh. (2019). *The evolution of U.S. foreign policy in East Asia in the 21st century*. Tehran: Sarv Andisheh. (In Persian).
14. Ghavvam, S. A. (2021). *Principles of foreign policy and international politics*. Tehran: SAMT. (In Persian).
15. Haass, R. N. (2021). *U.S. policy toward the Indo-Pacific: The case for a comprehensive approach* [Prepared statement]. Council on Foreign Relations.
16. Hosseini, H., Mousavi, M., & Khoush Heikal, M. (2018). Obama's pivot to Asia policy (2011–2016): The case of China. *Journal of Sociopolitical Studies*, 2(4), 633–674.
17. Jamshidi, M., & Yazdanshenas, Z. (2023). *The U.S. Asian strategy shift and containing China*. Center for Political and International Studies. Tehran: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (In Persian).
18. Khan, Z., & Amin, F. (2015). 'Pivot' and 'rebalancing': Implications for Asia-Pacific region. *Policy Perspectives*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.13169/polipers.12.2.000>
19. Kim, Y. J., & Pasha, A. K. (2022). The U.S. military-security strategy in the pivot to East Asia. Iranian Institute for European and American Studies. <https://ruoz.ir/ldbdaq>. (In Persian).
20. Kurlantzick, J. (2015, January 7). *The pivot in Southeast Asia: Balancing interests and values*. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/report/pivot-southeast-asia>.
21. McBride, J., Chatzky, A., & Siripurapu, A. (2020, November 19). *What's next for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)?* Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/background/what-trans-pacific-partnership-tp>
22. Nye, J. (2012, October 8). Declinist pundits: America may not actually be declining, but those predicting it are ascending. *Foreign Policy*. <https://foreignpolicy.com/category/argument/>

23. Nye, J. S. (2016). *Is the American century over?* (G. Alibabayi, Trans.). Tehran: Akhtaran. (Original work published 2015)
24. Obama, B. (2011, November 17). *Remarks by President Obama to the Australian Parliament*. Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/...press...>
25. Office of the Spokesperson. (2024, February 9). *The United States' enduring commitment to the Indo-Pacific: Marking two years since the release of the administration's Indo-Pacific strategy*.
26. Rudd, K. (2019). *The future of U.S.-China relations*. Brookings Institution.
27. Saunders, P. C. (2013). *The rebalance to Asia: U.S.-China relations and regional security* (No. 281). Institute for National Strategic Studies.
28. Sazmand, B., Azimi, A., & Nazari, A. A. (2010). Waltz's balance of power theory: A critique and assessment of its effectiveness in the contemporary era. *Foreign Relations*, 2(8), 251–274. <https://sid.ir/paper/167003/fa>. (In Persian).
29. Statista. (2024). *United States direct investments in the Asia Pacific region from 2000 to 2019*. Retrieved September 23, 2021, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/188604/united-states-direct-investments-in-the-asia-pacific-region-since-2000/>
30. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). (2024, April). *The trends in world military expenditure in 2022* [Fact sheet]. <https://doi.org/10.55163/PNVP2622>
31. Taim, A. (2024, July). Deciphering consistency and coherence in U.S. foreign policy: North Korea under Trump and Biden. *Journal of International Relations*, 4(3), 35–56.
32. The Diplomat. (2018, September). *Xi Jinping and China-North Korea relations*. Retrieved from <https://thediplomat.com/2018/09/xi-jinping-and-china-north-korea-relations/>
33. The White House. (2017). *National security strategy*. U.S. Government Printing Office. <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>
34. The White House. (2021). *Remarks by President Biden to a joint session of Congress*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/04/28/remarks-by-president-biden-to-a-joint-session-of-congress/>
35. U.S. Department of State. (2021). *Human rights reports*. U.S. Department of State. <https://www.state.gov/reports-bureau-of-democracy-human-rights-and-labor/>
36. U.S.-China Joint Glasgow Declaration on Enhancing Climate Action. (2021). *U.S.-China joint Glasgow declaration on enhancing climate action*. <https://www.state.gov/u-s-china-joint-glasgow-declaration-on-enhancing-climate-action/>
37. Vine, D. (2021). *Lists of U.S. military bases abroad, 1776–2021*. American University. <https://hdl.handle.net/1961/auislandora:94927>
38. Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.
39. Wong, S. C. H. (2021). The Quad: A new strategic framework for the Indo-Pacific. *Journal of Indo-Pacific Affairs*.

40. Zarei, B., & Piltan, F. (2020). The strategic shift of the U.S. from the Persian Gulf to the Asia-Pacific region. *Siyasat (Political Science Journal of the Faculty of Law and Political Science)*, 50(1), 111–131. <https://sid.ir/paper/950872/fa>. (In Persian).

Publisher: Imam Hussein University

© **Authors**

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

