OBSERVARE
Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
VOL. 17, Nº. 2
November 2026-April 2027

JANUS.NET
e-journal of International Relations

OPERATIONALISING DETERRENCE BY DENIAL: ALLIANCE NETWORKS, FORWARD POSTURE, AND THE MARITIME FOUNDATIONS OF U.S. STRATEGY IN THE INDO-PACIFIC

TALHA LATIEF TANTRAY
talhalatief@gmail.com
Assistant Professor, University School of Social Sciences, Bahra Research Innovation & Knowledge Cluster, Rayat Bahra University (India). https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-5628-4810

Abstract

This article examines how the United States operationalises deterrence by denial in the Indo-Pacific and argues that contemporary maritime power rests on systemic resilience, rather than platform concentration. As precision strike systems, pervasive surveillance, and anti-access capabilities erode the survivability of concentrated fleets, effective deterrence increasingly depends on distributed forward posture, dense alliance networks, and resilient maritime infrastructure. The study advances the concept of a maritime denial architecture to explain how alliance integration, spatial dispersion, and logistical depth collectively prevent rapid, low-cost coercive gains. Drawing on contemporary patterns of Indo-Pacific maritime competition, the analysis demonstrates that deterrence is becoming structural rather than episodic, embedded in enduring networks of access, sustainment, interoperability, and infrastructural connectivity. By bridging deterrence theory and maritime strategy, the article shows how equilibrium can be maintained under conditions of constrained escalation without reliance on escalation dominance.

Keywords

Deterrence by Denial, Maritime Strategy, Alliance Networks, Logistics Infrastructure, Strategic Competition.

Resumo

Este artigo analisa a forma como os Estados Unidos concretizam a dissuasão por negação na região do Indo-Pacífico e defende que o poder marítimo contemporâneo assenta na resiliência sistémica, em vez da concentração de plataformas. À medida que os sistemas de ataque de precisão, a vigilância generalizada e as capacidades anti-acesso minam a capacidade de sobrevivência das frotas concentradas, uma dissuasão eficaz depende cada vez mais de uma postura avançada e distribuída, de redes densas de alianças e de infraestruturas marítimas resilientes. O estudo propõe o conceito de uma arquitetura de negação marítima para explicar como a integração das alianças, a dispersão espacial e a profundidade logística impedem, em conjunto, ganhos coercivos rápidos e de baixo custo. Com base nos padrões contemporâneos de concorrência marítima no Indo-Pacífico, a análise demonstra que a dissuasão está a tornar-se estrutural, em vez de episódica, incorporada em redes duradouras de acesso, sustentação, interoperabilidade e conectividade infraestrutural. Ao estabelecer uma ponte entre a teoria da dissuasão e a estratégia marítima, o artigo mostra como o equilíbrio pode ser mantido em condições de escalada limitada, sem depender do domínio da escalada.

Palavras-chave

Dissuasão por Negação, Estratégia Marítima, Redes de Alianças, Infraestrutura Logística, Concorrência Estratégica.

How to cite this article
Tantray, Talha Latief (2026). Operationalising Deterrence by Denial: Alliance Networks, Forward Posture, and the Maritime Foundations of U.S. Strategy in the Indo-Pacific. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*. VOL. 17, Nº. 2, November 2026-April 2027, pp. 684-705. DOI https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.17.2.34

Article submitted on 6 February 2026 and accepted on 18 July 2026.

CC BY

OPERATIONALISING DETERRENCE BY DENIAL: ALLIANCE NETWORKS, FORWARD POSTURE, AND THE MARITIME FOUNDATIONS OF U.S. STRATEGY IN THE INDO-PACIFIC

TALHA LATIEF TANTRAY

Introduction

The character of maritime security competition in the Indo-Pacific is undergoing a structural transformation (Tsailas, 2025). For decades, U.S. Sea power strategy rested on the assumption that command of the sea achieved through superior fleets, concentrated strike power, and forward dominance was the central mechanism through which major powers deterred conflict and preserved order (Till, 2013). Today, this model is increasingly strained. Precision missile proliferation, long-range surveillance, cyber vulnerability, and anti-access systems have rendered concentrated naval superiority more exposed, costly, and politically escalatory. At the same time, revisionist challenges in contested maritime regions of the Indo-Pacific have grown more persistent yet remain deliberately calibrated below the threshold of open war. The strategic problem facing the United States, therefore, is not how to win a large-scale naval battle, but how to prevent incremental coercion and faits accomplish, in an environment where escalation dominance is uncertain and the political costs of major war are prohibitive (Li, 2009). This dilemma places deterrence by denial, rather than deterrence by punishment, at the centre of contemporary U.S. maritime strategy.

The puzzle is operational as well as theoretical. The United States seeks to deter aggression and preserve regional stability in the Indo-Pacific, without relying on immediate escalation or large-scale force concentration that could trigger rapid conflict expansion (Frederick et al., 2020). Traditional deterrence models emphasize the ability to impose overwhelming retaliatory costs. Yet maritime disputes today unfold in grey zones of coercion, limited clashes, and persistent presence operations where decisive punishment is either implausible or strategically counterproductive. The challenge, then, is to operationalize deterrence by denial to construct a posture that convinces potential challengers that objectives cannot be achieved in the first place. This is the logic of denial. But denial at sea is uniquely difficult. Oceans are vast, mobile, and porous; naval forces are episodic rather than permanently territorial (Vego, 2018); and maritime infrastructure is globally networked yet unevenly defended. How, then, can denial be made credible and sustainable across the Indo-Pacific's dispersed maritime geography?

This article argues that U.S. strategy in the Indo-Pacific has shifted from a paradigm of control toward a paradigm of denial built upon a distributed and networked maritime

architecture. Rather than concentrating power in a small number of high-value platforms designed to dominate sea space, emerging strategy disperses capabilities across alliance networks, forward posture arrangements, logistical nodes, surveillance systems, and rotational forces. Deterrence by denial, in this view, is not primarily a function of individual weapons systems, but of a resilient system of systems that complicates an adversary's operational planning and reduces the feasibility of limited, rapid gains. Denial becomes a property of strategic structure rather than of platform superiority. The ability to sustain presence, reinforce rapidly, maintain logistics under pressure, and operate across allied territories collectively forms what can be described as a maritime denial architecture (Conway et al., 2008).

This transformation reflects both technological and political realities. Advances in long-range strike and sensing capabilities have eroded the survivability of concentrated fleets and forward bases, making traditional sea control strategies more vulnerable. Simultaneously, alliance politics has become foundational to maritime stability in the Indo-Pacific. Regional partners increasingly provide access, basing, intelligence integration, and logistical depth that extend operational resilience (Tow, 2020). Infrastructure- ports, prepositioned stocks, repair facilities, fuel networks, and data systems, has emerged as a strategic variable equal in importance to combat power. The operational question is no longer simply how many ships can be deployed, but how long they can persist, how quickly they can disperse and recombine, and how effectively they can draw on distributed support under contested conditions (Mansouri et al., 2010). Denial, therefore, is sustained not by decisive battle but by endurance, redundancy, and alliance-enabled integration.

This reorientation raises three interrelated research questions that structure the analysis. First, how is deterrence by denial operationalized in U.S. maritime strategy in the Indo-Pacific? Second, what roles do alliance networks, forward posture, and maritime infrastructure play in enabling denial to function as a credible deterrent mechanism? Third, how does a distributed maritime architecture alter the dynamics of escalation and stability compared to traditional models of naval dominance? Addressing these questions requires bridging theoretical debates in deterrence studies with the practical evolution of maritime posture and alliance integration. Deterrence theory has long recognized denial as a distinct pathway to stability, yet it has often treated the problem in abstract terms of force ratios and defensive capabilities (Zagare, 1996). Maritime strategy, by contrast, has focused on operational art, sea control, and fleet employment, frequently without embedding these practices in broader deterrence frameworks (Vego, 2017). The intersection between these fields remains underdeveloped, particularly regarding how denial can be institutionalized across alliance networks and logistical systems rather than confined to tactical defence. The article's central claim is that deterrence by denial in the Indo-Pacific is not primarily a weapons problem but a networked strategic system. Weapons matter, but they function within a broader maritime foundation that integrates alliance cooperation, forward dispersion, and logistics infrastructure. This system distributes risk, multiplies operational dilemmas for potential aggressors, and lowers the likelihood that limited coercive actions can succeed quickly or cheaply. By embedding forces within allied territories and integrated support networks, maritime denial complicates targeting, enhances resilience, and signals long-term commitment without necessitating immediate escalation. Stability in the Indo-Pacific thus depends less on

visible dominance and more on the structural capacity to sustain contested presence and deny operational breakthroughs.

Conceptually, the article advances the idea of a "*maritime denial architecture*" to capture this transformation. This term refers to the integrated web of alliance networks, forward posture arrangements, logistics chains, sensing systems, and rotational deployments that collectively operationalize denial. It emphasizes structure over platform and system over sortie. By focusing on architecture, the analysis highlights how deterrence emerges from the interaction of political, operational, and infrastructural components rather than from any single capability. In an era when infrastructure can be as decisive as firepower, denial becomes a question of systemic design.

The contribution of this study is two-fold. Theoretically, it reconnects deterrence by denial with maritime strategy, demonstrating how abstract deterrence concepts are translated into operational and institutional forms in the Indo-Pacific. It extends deterrence theory by showing how denial can be constructed through alliance networks and distributed posture rather than static defence's alone (Mirkovic et al., 2003). Empirically and analytically, it provides a framework for understanding U.S. maritime strategy as a coherent denial architecture rather than a collection of isolated deployments. By foregrounding alliance integration, forward dispersion, and infrastructural depth as maritime foundations of strategy, the study offers a lens for assessing resilience, escalation control, and the long-term sustainability of deterrence in the Indo-Pacific.

Theory -The Logic of Deterrence by Denial

Deterrence by denial rests on a simple but demanding strategic logic: conflict is prevented not because an adversary fears punishment after the fact, but because it doubts it can achieve its objectives in the first place (Stein, 1991), especially through rapid, limited action designed to present others with a fait accompli. Classical deterrence scholarship often privileged punishment, yet a parallel lineage from analyses of conventional defence in Europe during the Cold War to contemporary studies of limited aims strategies has consistently shown that denial becomes decisive when revisionist actors seek quick, low-cost gains under the shadow of escalation constraints (Barrash & Nieman, 2025). In such settings, the credibility of retaliation is politically and militarily uncertain, but the feasibility of success can still be directly undermined. The strategic interaction turns not merely on material balances, but on expectations of operational friction, endurance, and the defender's capacity to prevent consolidation of initial gains. At sea particularly across the dispersed geography of the Indo-Pacific, where sovereignty is often ambiguous and presence episodic, this logic becomes both more difficult to operationalize and more strategically necessary.

The core claim of denial theory is psychological, but structurally grounded (Rathbun, 2007): deterrence succeeds when the challenger believes that even a well-planned, limited operation will become protracted, costly, and operationally uncertain. What matters is not the absolute balance of power, but the perceived likelihood that early advantages can be translated into durable control. This insight situates denial within broader bargaining and war termination theory. Limited coercive strategies rely on speed, ambiguity, and asymmetry (Sechser, 2010); they aim to alter facts before defenders can

mobilize political will or military capability. Denial erodes precisely these enabling conditions. By introducing delay, friction, and the prospect of stalemate, it transforms an apparently manageable probe into a risky and potentially self-defeating enterprise. In this sense, denial is less about static defence than about structuring the operational environment so that consolidation becomes improbable.

To operationalize this logic in maritime strategy requires translating psychological expectations into institutional and infrastructural form. Three interlocking mechanisms perform this function: resilience, redundancy, and sustainment. These are not discrete capabilities but systemic properties. Resilience refers to the capacity to absorb an initial blow without operational collapse (Kahan et al., 2009). In deterrence terms, resilience undermines the expectation that a surprise move can paralyze response (Wilkinson, 2020). Redundancy multiplies defensive nodes-bases, access points, logistics hubs complicating targeting and reducing the payoff from striking any single point. Sustainment ensures that a contest can be prolonged, converting a short-war gambit into a drawn-out struggle (Hepola, 2024). Together, these mechanisms reshape the cost–benefit calculus of aggression by attacking the temporal dimension of coercion: they deny the possibility of rapid consolidation.

Maritime strategy provides a particularly revealing arena for observing how these mechanisms are embedded in forward posture and alliance networks. Unlike territory on land, the sea is not permanently held; control is episodic and contingent on presence, access, and logistics. Resilience in this environment extends beyond hardened defence; it requires the ability to maintain operations despite disruption to ships, bases, or communications networks. Distributed basing exemplifies this principle. When forces are spread across multiple locations rather than concentrated in a few large hubs, the operational system can absorb strikes or political denial of access without ceasing to function. The degradation of one node does not translate into systemic paralysis. From a deterrence perspective, this signals to a potential aggressor that even a well-executed opening move will not prevent sustained defensive response. Historical experience reinforces this logic: naval campaigns in both world wars demonstrated that fleets dependent on narrow forward facilities were vulnerable to operational shock, whereas dispersed networks of repair, resupply, and access enabled endurance under pressure (NSO, 2025).

Redundancy operates at the level of political geography as much as military deployment (shown in Table 1). Alliance access networks create multiple pathways for presence, reinforcement, and sustainment (Cranmer et al., 2012). While alliance theory often emphasizes signalling resolve, its structural contribution to denial is equally significant. By multiplying sites of access- ports, airfields, logistics hubs- alliances generate a web rather than a line of defence. This networked geography complicates adversary planning: no single strike or coercive action can decisively foreclose defender options (Reid, 2025). Coalition maritime operations over recent decades illustrate how access agreements, rotational deployments, and shared infrastructure create layered operational depth (Kaushal, 2019). In deterrence terms, alliance-enabled redundancy increases uncertainty about where, how, and through whom defenders will respond. It embeds commitment in institutional arrangements, thereby raising the threshold for successful limited aggression without relying exclusively on formal treaty triggers.

Table1. United States Strategic Military Presence in the Indo-Pacific, 2025

Facility / Command	Location	Type of Presence	Strategic Role
Camp H. M. Smith	Oahu, Hawaii (US)	Headquarters / Command	Headquarters of U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (INDOPACOM) (regional command & control)
Naval Base Guam	Guam (US Territory)	Naval Base	Key logistics and submarine support base; supports Pacific Fleet and 7th Fleet units
United States Fleet Activities Yokosuka	Yokosuka, Japan	Navy Base	Home port for U.S. 7th Fleet and regional naval operations
Naval Support Facility Diego Garcia	Diego Garcia (British Indian Ocean Territory)	Naval Support Base (leased)	Deep-water support facility; key for Indian Ocean operations
U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (INDOPACOM)	Oahu, Hawaii (US)	Geographic Combatant Command	Integrates U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines & Space Forces in region
U.S. Naval Forces Japan / Korea	Japan & South Korea	Subordinate Naval Commands	Support naval operations and alliance integration
Special Operations Command Pacific	Oahu, Hawaii (US)	Special Operations	Regional SOF coordination & rapid response
Naval Medical Research Unit Indo Pacific (NAMRU-2)	Multiple SE Asian countries	Research / Support	Biomedical research supporting Navy & regional health security)

Source: Council on Foreign Relations

Sustainment, the third mechanism, anchors denial in maritime foundations. Many contemporary coercive strategies assume that political and logistical constraints will limit the defender's ability to fight for long (Smetana & Ludvik, 2019). If operations can conclude quickly, external intervention may be deterred or delayed. Sustainment directly contests this premise. Robust maritime logistics fuel distribution, munitions stocks, repair capacity, protected supply chains enable forces to persist in contested environments (Fleming et al., 2024). Theoretical work on protracted conflict underscores that endurance can substitute for initial superiority; the side able to remain engaged shapes bargaining outcomes. At sea, underway replenishment, prepositioned supplies, and diversified port access transform presence from a symbolic gesture into a durable strategic condition. Denial thereby removes the attacker's confidence that time is on its side.

These mechanisms are mutually reinforcing and collectively constitute what may be termed a maritime denial architecture. Resilience without sustainment merely postpones erosion; redundancy without integration can be defeated sequentially; sustainment without dispersion remains vulnerable to disruption. Denial thus emerges not from isolated capabilities but from the interaction of alliance networks, distributed forward posture, and infrastructural depth. This reframes the central theoretical move: deterrence by denial should be understood as a structured system rather than a concentration of force. Traditional naval thought often equated deterrence with visible mass carrier groups, large formations, forward dominance (Speller, 2023). Yet in

environments characterized by precision strike and surveillance, concentration can invite targeting and accelerate escalation. A systemic denial posture distributes capability across space, institutions, and networks to ensure that no single loss becomes strategically decisive.

This perspective also refines debates on the offense–defence balance. Denial does not require impermeable defence; it requires sufficient systemic resilience that offensive gains cannot be consolidated (Demchak, 2021). The analytical focus therefore shifts from platform-centric metrics- numbers of ships, missile ranges to relational qualities: connectivity, interoperability, and depth. Exercises, shared command-and-control, logistics integration, and alliance coordination become central determinants of deterrent credibility. A state with fewer platforms but dense alliance networks and robust maritime infrastructure may present a more formidable denial problem than a numerically superior but brittle adversary.

Empirical patterns in recent maritime competitions illustrate this dynamic. Where defenders lack dispersed access or logistical depth, challengers have exploited local superiority and political hesitation to alter facts incrementally. Conversely, theatres characterized by layered access and persistent presence have proven more resistant to rapid change. Limited probes become entangled in broader systems of response, increasing uncertainty and raising the risk of protracted contestation. The strategic effect is not to eliminate rivalry but to bound it transforming sharp probes into managed competitions. This is precisely the equilibrium denial seeks to produce: a setting in which aggression appears unlikely to yield decisive advantage (Mazarr et al., 2021).

Understanding denial as systemic architecture also clarifies its relationship to escalation control (Collins, 2012). Because denial operates through prevention rather than retaliation, it allows states to signal resolve through enduring posture and integrated infrastructure rather than dramatic force surges. Distributed and networked arrangements embed commitment in everyday operations. At the same time, the visible density of alliances, access agreements, and logistics nodes communicates that coercion will encounter sustained and collective resistance. Deterrence is achieved not through threats of annihilation but through the steady demonstration that the strategic environment is structured against rapid success (Michaels, 2024).

The logic of deterrence by denial at sea therefore hinges on structuring expectations about time, feasibility, and endurance. Through resilience, redundancy, and sustainment, operationalized via alliance networks, distributed forward posture, and maritime infrastructure, defenders construct an environment in which limited aggression cannot remain limited in its strategic effects. The adversary confronts not a single defensive line but an interconnected system whose unravelling would require prolonged escalation. Denial thus becomes an emergent property of architecture rather than of mass. This systemic conception provides the theoretical foundation for analysing how U.S. strategy in the Indo-Pacific translates deterrence by denial from abstract principle into operational practice.

Alliance Networks as Denial Multipliers

Alliances have re-emerged as central instruments of maritime strategy not merely as diplomatic alignments or signalling devices, but as structural multipliers of deterrence by denial (Çubukçuoğlu, 2016). In an era defined by precision strike, surveillance saturation, and the diffusion of anti-access capabilities, the strategic value of geography depends less on physical distance alone than on how political relationships convert space into operational depth (Krepinevich et al., 2003). Denial understood as the ability to prevent an adversary from achieving rapid, low-cost gains becomes credible when maritime defenders operate within dense alliance networks that disperse forces, sustain continuity under pressure, and embed commitment across multiple states. Alliances do not merely aggregate capabilities; they restructure the strategic environment by thickening it transforming maritime space from open maneuver terrain into a layered, interconnected defensive system.

The first mechanism through which alliances multiply denial is base access, which translates political alignment into spatial dispersion. Traditional basing models concentrated forces in a limited number of large facilities optimizing efficiency but creating vulnerability (Silva et al., 2019). Contemporary precision-strike environments render such concentration increasingly risky. In the Indo-Pacific, U.S. access arrangements across Japan (Yokosuka, Sasebo, Kadena), South Korea (Busan), Australia (Darwin rotational presence), the Philippines (expanded EDCA sites), Singapore (Changi Naval Base), and Diego Garcia collectively create a distributed basing lattice rather than a linear chain. This network reduces the probability that an opening strike kinetic or political, can neutralize forward presence. From a deterrence perspective, dispersion undermines adversary confidence in achieving paralysis through decapitation or pre-emption. The strategic map becomes elastic rather than fixed (Glaser, 1992). Even if one node is degraded, access elsewhere preserves operational continuity. Geography, in this configuration, is no longer a static constraint but a dynamic product of alliance relationships.

This dispersion is reinforced through multinational exercises (given in Table2) that institutionalize access and demonstrate interoperability. Exercises such as RIMPAC (biennial), Malabar (annual), Talisman Sabre (biennial), Balikatan (annual), and Super Garuda Shield (annual) routinely integrate naval, air, and amphibious forces across allied territories. In RIMPAC 2024, for example, more than two dozen navies participated in complex maritime warfare drills spanning the Central Pacific, illustrating both scale and coordination depth. Such repeated, institutionalized interaction converts nominal access into operationalized readiness. The deterrent signal lies not merely in participation but in routinized coordination across dispersed theatres. A challenger must account not only for U.S. forces but for a coalition accustomed to joint operations across multiple maritime subregions.

Table2. Major U.S.-Led and U.S.-Participating Naval Exercises in the Indo-Pacific Region

Exercise Name	**Primary Participants**	**Frequency / Schedule**	**Most Recent Instance (Year)**	**Region / Notes**
RIMPAC (Rim of the Pacific)	USA + Pacific allies	Biennial (even years)	2024	Largest multilateral maritime warfare exercise; Pacific waters.
Malabar	USA, India, Japan, Australia	Annual	2025	Quad naval exercise covering Indo-Pacific waters.
Talisman Sabre	USA + Australia + others	Biennial	2025	Large multi-domain warfighting exercise in/around Australia, significant naval component.
Super Garuda Shield	USA + Indonesia + multiple partners	Annual	2025	Major U.S.–Indonesia multinational land/naval exercise (Indo-Pacific focus).
Pacific Vanguard	USA + Allied navies	Annual	2025	Cooperative maritime operations including ASW and surface drills.
Balikatan	USA + Philippines (+ other partners)	Annual	2025	Combined USA-Philippines joint drills including maritime scenarios.
Resolute Force Pacific / REFORPAC	USA + Allies	Annual	2025	Large Pacific contingency response exercise with maritime air & strike aspects.

Source: Compiled by the author from official releases of the U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (USINDOPACOM), U.S. Navy press briefings, and exercise fact sheets (RIMPAC, Malabar, Talisman Sabre, Balikatan, Pacific Vanguard, Super Garuda Shield).

The second mechanism is interoperability, which converts dispersed presence into coherent capability. Contemporary alliance cooperation extends beyond symbolic exercises toward integration of command-and-control systems, data-sharing architectures, logistics procedures, and operational doctrines (Toroi, 2024). Interoperability reduces friction in coalition operations, allowing allied units to function as components of a unified maritime system (Pope, 2001). In the Indo-Pacific context, U.S.–Japan integrated air and missile defence coordination, shared maritime domain awareness initiatives in Southeast Asia, and coordinated anti-submarine warfare drills among Quad partners illustrate how distributed forces are knitted together into functional cohesion. Without such integration, dispersion risks fragmentation. With it, redundancy becomes resilience.

The theoretical significance is straightforward: interoperability lowers the threshold for collective action. A distributed denial posture must operate under conditions of disruption; if one partner's infrastructure is degraded, others must be able to compensate. Shared communications standards, cross-servicing agreements, and logistics interoperability ensure that coalition forces can plug into one another's supply chains and sensor networks. In deterrence terms, this complicates segmentation

strategies, efforts by an adversary to isolate a single actor or theatre. A coercive move against one state risks activating an integrated response system. Denial therefore emerges not solely from treaty commitments, but from embedded operational connectivity.

The third function is political commitment, which anchors the material components of alliance-based denial. Classical alliance theory highlights credibility dilemmas and free-riding concerns (Morrow, 1994). Yet the contemporary Indo-Pacific environment demonstrates increasing institutional thickening: expanded defence cooperation agreements, rotational deployments, joint infrastructure investments, and long-term basing arrangements. The 2023 expansion of U.S.–Philippines access under EDCA, the permanent stationing of U.S. naval assets in Yokosuka, and sustained rotational Marine deployments to Australia reflect embedded commitment rather than episodic signalling. From a deterrence perspective, such entanglement raises both reputational and operational exit costs. Disengagement would require dismantling shared infrastructure, undoing interoperability arrangements, and reversing visible deployments steps that are politically costly and strategically conspicuous.

Political commitment also internationalizes risk. When multiple states host facilities, participate in patrols, or contribute to maritime domain awareness, aggression against one node reverberates across the network (Durham, 1998). The presence of allied forces in contested waters, whether through joint patrols in the South China Sea or coordinated freedom of navigation operations diffuses stakes and complicates escalation management. A challenger contemplating limited coercion cannot confidently assume localization. Even calibrated probes risk triggering broader operational entanglement. This uncertainty strengthens denial by expanding the perceived scope of response without requiring automatic escalation.

These three mechanisms- spatial dispersion, operational integration, and embedded commitment interact to produce what can be conceptualized as alliance integration density. This refers not merely to the number of allied states, but to the thickness of institutional, logistical, and operational connections linking them. In the Indo-Pacific, alliance density is visible in the concentration of access agreements, multinational exercises, intelligence-sharing frameworks, and logistics cross-servicing arrangements. The denser the network, the more difficult it becomes for an adversary to identify decisive targets, sever coordination, or exploit political hesitation. Complexity itself becomes a defensive asset. Instead of confronting a singular defensive line, an aggressor encounters a mesh that must be penetrated simultaneously at multiple points an operationally and politically demanding task.

Empirical patterns reinforce this logic. Where maritime actors lack alliance-backed access or logistics depth, coercive probes have altered facts incrementally. Conversely, areas characterized by layered access and persistent multinational presence have proven resistant to rapid strategic shifts. Multinational patrols, maritime domain awareness cooperation, and shared logistics infrastructure such as fuel storage and maintenance facilities across allied ports extend operational endurance (Campion, 2008). Infrastructure cooperation transforms geography into collective strategic depth. The result is not elimination of competition, but bounding of it precisely the equilibrium denial seeks to establish.

At the theoretical level, alliance-based denial challenges the dichotomy between national and collective defence. The system operates through distributed contributions that may appear individually modest but collectively generate systemic deterrent effect. This aligns with broader arguments in security studies regarding networked power and the declining utility of singular dominance (Denmark, 2010). Alliances transform maritime space into a shared strategic commons in which defensive capacity is pooled and diffused. Such diffusion enhances resilience under shock and strengthens endurance under pressure.

Ultimately, alliances multiply denial because they reshape the geometry of conflict. They stretch defensive depth across thousands of nautical miles, weave operational capabilities through interoperable systems, and embed political resolve across multiple sovereign actors. An adversary contemplating limited maritime aggression must therefore reckon not with a single opponent, but with an integrated architecture whose response pathways are numerous and whose logistical foundations sustain persistence. As alliance integration density increases, so too does the uncertainty surrounding rapid coercion. Denial becomes credible not through concentrated force alone, but through the layered, networked structure of alliance cooperation that converts geography, infrastructure, and political alignment into a coherent strategic barrier.

Forward Posture - From Concentration to Distribution

The evolution of forward military posture in maritime strategy reflects a deeper transformation in how security, survivability, and deterrence are conceptualized in an era of precision warfare and persistent competition (Raska, 2019). For much of the twentieth century, naval power projection relied on concentration. Large formations centred on high-value platforms- aircraft carriers, major surface combatants, and fixed forward bases symbolized both capability and resolve. Command of the sea was demonstrated through visible dominance, and deterrence rested on the capacity to bring overwhelming force to bear at decisive points (Work, 2005). This model was grounded in technological and operational conditions that favoured mass: detection was imperfect, strike ranges were limited, and concentrated firepower provided mutual protection. Under such assumptions, centralized fleet dominance appeared both efficient and strategically persuasive.

Contemporary maritime environments, particularly in the Indo-Pacific, have eroded the foundations of this paradigm. Advances in long-range precision missiles, space-based surveillance, unmanned systems, and cyber-enabled targeting have increased the vulnerability of concentrated forces and fixed installations (Patil et al., 2024). Anti-access/area-denial systems are specifically designed to hold large platforms and major bases at risk. A limited number of forward hubs, however formidable now present identifiable and lucrative targets. As a result, forward posture has begun shifting from concentration to distribution a transformation not merely in deployment patterns but in strategic logic. Survivability, persistence, and adaptability increasingly outweigh sheer mass at a single point. This transformation is also a response to the increasingly sophisticated Chinese counter-denial challenge. China's development of long-range precision-strike capabilities, particularly the DF-26, has expanded the geographic reach of its ability to hold U.S. and allied maritime forces at risk, including through its reported

anti-ship ballistic-missile role. At the same time, the continued expansion and modernization of the People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) is increasing China's capacity for sustained maritime presence, long-range operations, and contested-access missions. Recent PLA activities, including carrier operations and exercises oriented toward blockade, area denial, and joint maritime operations, indicate that the challenge is no longer confined to defending China's immediate coastal approaches. The implication for U.S. forward posture is therefore not simply that individual platforms require greater protection, but that the architecture supporting them must remain functional under sustained attack and disruption. Distributed basing, mobile capabilities, alternative access points, and redundant logistics consequently serve not only as measures of survivability but as mechanisms for preventing Chinese counter-denial capabilities from converting localized operational advantages into systemic paralysis.

In the Indo-Pacific, this shift is empirically visible. Rather than relying solely on a few dominant bases such as Yokosuka or Guam, U.S. and allied forces now operate through rotational deployments in Darwin, expanded access sites in the Philippines, distributed facilities across Japan's southwest islands, and diversified logistics nodes stretching from Singapore to Diego Garcia. These arrangements do not replace high-end platforms; they embed them within a broader network designed to absorb disruption. Distribution thus transforms geography into strategic depth.

At its core, distribution seeks to complicate an adversary's targeting calculus. Modern targeting depends on integrated kill chains linking sensors, communications, and precision strike systems. Concentrated forces simplify this process by presenting clear, high-payoff objectives (Tan et al., 2025). Distributed forces, by contrast, multiply nodes across space. Smaller units operating from diverse locations introduce ambiguity, saturate surveillance systems, and increase the coordination burden required for simultaneous strikes. The attacker must search, discriminate, track, and allocate resources across a dispersed battlespace. This increases operational friction and the probability of incomplete suppression.

From a deterrence perspective, such targeting complexity generates structural uncertainty. If an aggressor cannot confidently neutralize forward elements in a single disabling blow, the attractiveness of rapid escalation diminishes. Distributed posture denies clarity. It does not seek invisibility; it seeks survivability through multiplicity. Even partial survival of dispersed elements preserves the capacity to reinforce and contest space, undermining expectations of swift consolidation (Zagare & Kilgour, 1995). In this sense, distribution operationalizes deterrence by denial through architecture rather than intimidation.

Distribution also mitigates systemic fragility by avoiding single points of failure. Centralized basing models co-located logistics, maintenance, command functions, and operational assets, generating efficiency but also vulnerability. The degradation of a major hub risked cascading operational paralysis. Distributed posture fragments these functions across multiple facilities and mobile platforms. Smaller austere sites, rotational forces, expeditionary logistics, and prepositioned stocks reduce dependence on singular nodes (Vollmer, 2021). The system becomes modular rather than monolithic. Degradation at one location does not equal systemic collapse.

This modularity reflects broader theories of resilience in complex systems. A resilient system absorbs disruption and reconfigures without catastrophic breakdown. Applied to maritime posture, resilience entails the capacity to continue operating despite missile strikes, cyber interference, or temporary denial of access. Alternative ports, airfields, and logistics pathways provide flexibility under stress. The strategic signal is one of endurance. An adversary contemplating limited aggression confronts not a brittle structure vulnerable to decisive early defeat, but a flexible network capable of regeneration.

Sustained presence under contested conditions constitutes the third pillar of distributed forward posture. Contemporary maritime competition rarely begins with large-scale fleet engagements; it unfolds through persistent pressure, grey-zone tactics, and incremental moves (Grey & Sadoff, 2007). Presence operations- patrols, joint exercises, maritime domain awareness missions shape perceptions of control and commitment. Concentrated posture risks withdrawal under localized threat, creating political and operational vacuums. Distributed posture, by contrast, enables continued engagement across sectors even if individual elements face pressure. Smaller, dispersed unit's complicate attempts to expel defender's wholesale.

This persistence directly counters the strategic logic of the fait accompli (Tarar, 2016). If defenders remain operational in contested waters despite coercive action, aggressors cannot easily transform temporary disruption into political finality. Distributed posture therefore extends the temporal horizon of competition. It buys time for reinforcement, coalition coordination, and diplomatic signalling, thereby denying rapid strategic closure. Presence becomes not symbolic demonstration, but sustained operational continuity.

The shift from concentration to distribution also affects escalation dynamics. Concentrated high-value assets create incentives for pre-emption; delay increases vulnerability, generating "use-it-or-lose-it" pressures. Distributed forces reduce the decisiveness of any single loss. This diffusion of vulnerability can enhance crisis stability by lowering the perceived need for immediate escalation. At the same time, routine dispersed deployments communicate commitment without dramatic surges that may appear escalatory. Distribution embeds resolve in steady posture rather than episodic mobilization.

Critics contend that distribution risks diluting combat power and sacrificing efficiency. Yet such critiques presume decisive battle as the dominant scenario. Contemporary Indo-Pacific competition is more likely to involve limited probes, maritime militia activity, or coercive demonstrations. Under such conditions, survivability and endurance may matter more than concentrated firepower. Distribution does not abandon high-end capability; it integrates major platforms, submarines, unmanned systems, and expeditionary assets within a layered framework. The result is not dispersion for its own sake, but structured flexibility.

Technological change further reinforces this model. Advances in networked command-and-control, data fusion, and integrated fires enable dispersed units to mass effects without massing physically (Arthur et al., 1999). Distributed maritime operations rely on connectivity to synchronize sensing, strike, and logistics across distance. Connectivity transforms spatial separation into operational synergy. Distribution without integration

would fragment capability; integration without distribution would invite targeting. Together, they produce survivable coherence.

Ultimately, the move from concentration to distribution represents adaptation to an environment characterized by persistent vulnerability and continuous rivalry. Forward posture in the Indo-Pacific is no longer primarily about showcasing dominance through visible mass, but about constructing a force capable of enduring, manoeuvring, and operating across contested maritime spaces. By complicating targeting, reducing systemic fragility, and sustaining presence under pressure, distributed posture strengthens deterrence by denial. It signals that attempts at rapid coercion will encounter a system too resilient to suppress and too persistent to dislodge quickly. In this way, distribution transforms forward presence from a potential liability into a foundational element of a maritime denial architecture.

Maritime Infrastructure, System Integration, and the Strategic Logic of Denial

The effectiveness of deterrence by denial at sea ultimately rests on foundations less visible than fleets and platforms (Wu, 2017). Maritime infrastructure- the network of ports, logistics hubs, repair facilities, supply chains, fuel depots, and communication systems constitutes the material backbone that enables forces to endure, regenerate, and persist in contested environments. Platforms project power; infrastructure sustains it (Alessandro & Secchi, 2023). Without resilient logistical architecture, even the most advanced naval assets become transient instruments capable of demonstration but not prolonged contestation (Reed, 2025). Because denial hinges on convincing an adversary that rapid victory is unattainable, endurance becomes decisive. Endurance, in turn, is an infrastructural function.

In the Indo-Pacific, the scale of maritime space intensifies this requirement. Operating distances routinely exceed several thousand nautical miles; supply chains span from Hawaii to Japan, Southeast Asia, Australia, and the Indian Ocean. Sustained naval presence across such expanse depends on diversified access agreements and distributed logistics nodes. Port access therefore constitutes the first pillar of denial infrastructure. Access is not merely diplomatic accommodation; it converts sovereignty into operational depth. Ports enable refuelling, replenishment, crew rotation, maintenance staging, and logistics throughput (Klopott et al., 2023). When access is diversified across Japan's multiple naval facilities, Singapore's Changi Naval Base, rotational Marine deployments in Darwin, expanded access sites in the Philippines, and Indian Ocean facilities such as Diego Garcia, the operational map becomes elastic rather than fixed.

This elasticity directly shapes deterrence calculations. An adversary seeking to exclude forward forces must now contemplate multiple dispersed nodes rather than a singular hub. Coercion against one port does not expel forces from theatre; operations shift laterally across the network. From a deterrence perspective, such redundancy undermines confidence in achieving exclusion through early pressure. Infrastructure thus transforms maritime geography into shared strategic space, complicating attempts at rapid consolidation.

Repair and resupply networks deepen this logic by enabling regeneration under attrition. Naval operations impose constant mechanical strain; high-tempo deployments and contested conditions accelerate wear, battle damage, and system degradation (Ray et al., 2001). The availability of regional maintenance facilities, spare parts distribution chains, munitions storage, and forward-deployed logistics vessels determines whether a fleet remains persistent or must withdraw for reconstitution. In the Indo-Pacific context, submarine support facilities in Guam, maintenance infrastructure in Japan, afloat logistics platforms, and prepositioned stocks in allied territories collectively reduce turnaround times. This shortens the cycle between disruption and restoration.

The theoretical implication is significant. Attritional strategies rely on cumulative erosion-degrading presence gradually until withdrawal becomes unavoidable. If damaged platforms can be repaired and resupplied in theatre, cumulative pressure loses strategic momentum. Regeneration stabilizes effective strength over time, undermining expectations that incremental coercion will yield decisive advantage (Van et al., 2020). Infrastructure therefore converts losses into manageable setbacks rather than irreversible decline. The adversary's task shifts from defeating platforms to dismantling an integrated logistics ecosystem a far more demanding undertaking.

Undersea communication systems represent a third, less visible but increasingly critical component of denial infrastructure. Submarine fiber-optic cables carry the data flows that underpin command-and-control, intelligence fusion, financial transactions, and logistics coordination (Tantray, 2025). In the Indo-Pacific, where allied coordination depends on real-time data integration across vast distances, communications resilience is as strategically consequential as fuel supply. Disruption of undersea cables or satellite links can fracture coalition coordination, degrade situational awareness, and introduce decision latency. Contemporary debates over critical seabed infrastructure underscore the vulnerability of this domain. Protecting, redundantly routing, and diversifying communications networks therefore becomes integral to operational continuity. Secure data pathways ensure that distributed forces remain synchronized across space (Dittmer, 2018). Maritime domain awareness initiatives linking Southeast Asian partners, integrated missile defence data-sharing arrangements with Japan, and multilateral intelligence cooperation all depend on infrastructural connectivity. If dispersion is the spatial dimension of denial, connectivity is its informational dimension. Infrastructure in the digital domain thus reinforces the capacity to absorb shocks without systemic fragmentation. Taken together, these elements reveal a central proposition: deterrence by denial collapses if logistics networks fail. Numerical superiority in platforms is insufficient without fuel, munitions, maintenance, and communications. When supply chains falter, attrition translates directly into strategic erosion. Conversely, robust infrastructure transforms vulnerability into resilience. The adversary confronts not a fleet alone, but a layered support architecture that sustains operational continuity. Infrastructure thus functions as latent power, shaping outcomes through endurance rather than spectacle.

This infrastructural logic integrates directly with alliance networks and distributed posture, forming what may be conceptualized as a maritime denial architecture. Alliance density provides access points, shared facilities, and institutional commitments (Starr & Siverson, 1990). Distributed posture disperses forces across this political geography,

complicating targeting. Infrastructure resilience sustains those forces over time, ensuring that dispersion translates into persistent presence rather than temporary scattering. The interaction is multiplicative. Alliances without logistics cannot support endurance; dispersed forces without repair capacity cannot regenerate; infrastructure without political access remains unusable. Weakness in any dimension undermines systemic coherence.

Reframed in architectural terms, deterrence becomes a stress test of integration rather than a measure of mass. The critical question is not how many ships are deployed, but whether the system can function under degradation. Can supply chains reroute if a hub is struck? Can maintenance be conducted forward? Can communications remain intact under cyber or physical disruption? Maritime denial architecture is therefore a dynamic network designed to prevent rapid consolidation of gains. Its strength lies in cohesion and redundancy across political, operational, and logistical layers (Tsailas, 2025).

The strategic implications are substantial. First, infrastructuralized denial can dampen escalation incentives. Because the posture aims to prevent success rather than threaten overwhelming retaliation, resolve is signalled through durability rather than surge. Routine, distributed presence supported by resilient logistics reduces the pressure for pre-emptive escalation. Stability derives from visible endurance. Second, infrastructure-centered denial favours protracted competition. It is calibrated not for swift decisive victory, but for sustained contestation in which rapid breakthroughs are denied. This aligns with contemporary Indo-Pacific maritime rivalry, characterized by grey-zone pressure, maritime militia activity, incremental territorial assertions, and legal contestation rather than fleet engagements. Infrastructure ensures that such incremental moves encounter persistent resistance rather than episodic responses.

Finally, this logic shifts maritime strategy from dominance to equilibrium maintenance. Absolute command of the sea may be unattainable or politically escalatory in contested regions. Denial architectures accept this constraint. They seek instead to preserve a balance in which no actor can alter the status quo quickly or cheaply. Stability emerges from mutual recognition that rapid consolidation is structurally improbable. Maritime denial thus represents adaptation to an era of constrained escalation and dense interdependence, where the objective is not exclusion but prevention of destabilizing advantage. By foregrounding infrastructure and system integration, the concept of maritime denial architecture captures the contemporary reality that endurance, connectivity, and alliance-enabled logistics underpin effective deterrence at sea. Platforms remain visible symbols of power, but their strategic significance depends on the less visible architecture that sustains them. When allied access, distributed posture, and resilient infrastructure operate in concert, maritime space becomes structurally resistant to rapid conquest. Denial, in this sense, is not a moment of strength but a condition of systemic design.

Conclusion

This study has examined how deterrence by denial is operationalized in U.S. maritime strategy in the Indo-Pacific through the interaction of alliance networks, distributed forward posture, and resilient maritime infrastructure. The analysis demonstrates that

contemporary maritime deterrence increasingly depends not on the concentration of platforms alone, but on the ability of a wider strategic system to remain operational, connected, and sustainable under pressure. The study conceptualizes this system as a maritime denial architecture, in which resilience, redundancy, and sustainment collectively reduce an adversary's ability to achieve rapid and low-cost strategic gains.

The findings provide three principal conclusions. First, deterrence by denial is operationalized by making the achievement and consolidation of an adversary's objectives increasingly difficult rather than relying primarily on the threat of punishment. Distributed capabilities, resilient logistics, and sustained presence increase operational friction and reduce the prospects of a successful fait accompli. Second, alliance networks, forward posture, and infrastructure are mutually reinforcing components of denial. Alliances provide access and political depth, distributed posture reduces vulnerability and complicates targeting, while infrastructure enables forces to persist, regenerate, and operate across the Indo-Pacific. Third, this distributed architecture can contribute to escalation management by reducing dependence on vulnerable concentrations of force and by allowing deterrence to be expressed through persistent presence and resilience rather than episodic escalation.

The study therefore suggests that the strategic value of maritime power should be assessed not simply through the number or sophistication of platforms, but also through the connectivity, redundancy, and endurance of the system that supports them. In this sense, the maritime balance is increasingly shaped by access agreements, logistics networks, repair capacity, communications infrastructure, interoperability, and alliance cohesion. The objective is not necessarily to establish absolute command of maritime space, but to create conditions in which rapid and inexpensive coercive success becomes increasingly improbable.

At the same time, the study recognizes important limitations. Its analysis is primarily conceptual and analytical and does not quantitatively measure the causal relationship between particular elements of maritime denial architecture and deterrence outcomes. It also focuses principally on the U.S. strategic posture in the Indo-Pacific. Future research could therefore develop measurable indicators of alliance integration, infrastructural resilience, logistical depth, and distributed operational capacity, while comparative case studies could examine how such architectures perform across different maritime theatres and against different forms of coercion. Further research should also consider the vulnerabilities created by dependence on interconnected infrastructure, including cyber disruption, attacks on critical maritime networks, contested logistics, and pressures on alliance cohesion.

Overall, the study argues that the future effectiveness of maritime deterrence will depend increasingly on the capacity to distribute, connect, sustain, and regenerate rather than simply to concentrate force. Deterrence by denial is consequently best understood as a continuing condition of strategic resilience: a maritime architecture designed to prevent rapid strategic breakthroughs while maintaining stability amid persistent competition and constrained escalation.

References

Alessandro, G., & C. Secchi. (2023). *Enhancing Resilience in a Chaotic World. The Role of Infrastructure*.

Arthur, M., Money, L., Alberts, D., Stephen, D., Garstka, J., & Stein, F. (1999). *DoD C4ISR Cooperative Research Program Assistant Secretary of Defense (C3I) Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data Network centric warfare: developing and leveraging information superiority*. http://dodccrp.org/files/Alberts_NCW.pdf

Barrash, I., & Nieman, M. (2025). *Coercion and Cooperation: A Balancing Act Between Status Quo and Revisionist Powers*. https://marknieman.net/materials/Coercion%20and%20Cooperation.pdf

Campion, F. J. (2008, January 29). *Strategic Maritime Domain Awareness: Supporting the National Strategy for Maritime Security*. Dtic.mil. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/tr/ADA478411/

Collins, R. (2012). C-Escalation and D-Escalation: A Theory of the Time-Dynamics of Conflict. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411428221

Conway, J. T., Roughead, G., & Allen, T. W. (2008). A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Sea power. *Naval War College Review*, *61*(1), 7–19. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26396894

Cranmer, S. J., Desmarais, B. A., & Kirkland, J. H. (2012). Toward a Network Theory of Alliance Formation. *International Interactions*, *38*(3), 295–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2012.677741

Çubukçuoğlu, S. (2016). *Evolving Geopolitics of the Global Commons in Turkey: Maritime Policy, Energy Security, and Regional Diplomacy*. https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/1774.2/67002/1/CUBUKCUOGLU-DOCTORALTHESIS-2022.pdf

Demchak, C. (2021). Achieving Systemic Resilience in a Great Systems Conflict Era: Coalescing against Cyber, Pandemic, and Adversary Threats. *The Cyber Defense Review*, *6*(2), 51–70. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27021376

Denmark, A. M. (2010). Managing the Global Commons. *The Washington Quarterly*, *33*(3), 165–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660x.2010.492347

Dittmer, J. (2018). The state, all at sea: Interoperability and the Global Network of Navies. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 239965441881246. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654418812469

Durham, R. W. (1998, March 11). *Operational Art in the Conduct of Naval Operations,* Dtic.mil. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/tr/ADA340139/

Fleming, J., Martin, B., Villalobos, F., & Yoder, E. (2024, March). *Naval Logistics in Contested Environments: Examination of Stockpiles and Industrial Base Issues*. Dtic.mil. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/trecms/AD1223214/

Frederick, B., Watts, S., Doll, A., Rhoades, A. L., & Smith, M. L. (2020). *Understanding the Deterrent Impact of U.S. Overseas Forces*. Dtic.mil. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/trecms/AD1096339/

George-Ion Toroi. (2024). Rethinking military command and control systems. *Bulletin of "Carol I" National Defence University (EN)*, *04*(04), 88–112. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1306879

Glaser, C. L. (1992). Political Consequences of Military Strategy: Expanding and Refining the Spiral and Deterrence Models. *World Politics*, *44*(4), 497–538. https://doi.org/10.2307/2010486

Grey, D., & Sadoff, C. W. (2007). Sink or Swim? Water security for growth and development. *Water Policy*, *9*(6), 545–571.

Hepola, C. L. (2024). *Navigating the Future of Global Challenges: Analyzing U.S. Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*. Bear Works. https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses/4003/

Kahan, J. H., Allen, A. C., & George, J. K. (2009). An Operational Framework for Resilience. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.2202/1547-7355.1675

Kaushal, S. (2019). III. Maritime Forces: Between Access and Influence. *Whitehall Papers*, *96*(1), 38–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/02681307.2019.1812239

Klopott, M., Popek, M., & Urbanyi-Popiołek, I. (2023). Seaports' Role in Ensuring the Availability of Alternative Marine Fuels—A Multi-Faceted Analysis. *Energies*, *16*(7), 3055. https://doi.org/10.3390/en16073055

Krepinevich, A., Watts, B., & Work, R. (2003). *Meeting the Anti-Access and Area-Denial Challenge*. http://csbaonline.org/uploads/documents/2003.05.20-Anti-Access-Area-Denial-A2-AD.pdf

Li, N. (2009). The Evolution of China's Naval Strategy and Capabilities: From "Near Coast" and "Near Seas" to "Far Seas." *Asian Security*, *5*(2), 144–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/14799850902886567

Mansouri, M., Nilchiani, R., & Mostashari, A. (2010). A policy making framework for resilient port infrastructure systems. *Marine Policy*, *34*(6), 1125–1134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.03.012

Mazarr, M., Charap, S., Casey, A., Chindea, I., Curriden, C., Demus, A., Frederick, B., Chan, A., Godges, J., Han, E., Heath, T., Ma, L., Treyger, E., Ulin, T., & Wyne, A. (2021). *Stabilizing Great- Power Rivalries Research Report*. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RRA400/RRA456-1/RAND_RRA456-1.pdf

Michaels, J. H. (2024). Deterrence Studies: A field still in progress. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2024.2417388

Mirkovic, J., Robinson, M., & Reiher, P. (2003). *Alliance formation for DDoS defense*. https://doi.org/10.1145/986655.986658

Morrow, J. D. (1994). Alliances, Credibility, and Peacetime Costs. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *38*(2), 270–297. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002794038002005

NSO. (2025). *Allied Joint Doctrine for Maritime Operations Edition B Version 1*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67f3b07d53505b2ca44efeed/AJP_3_1_Maritime_Ops_EdB.pdf

Patil, A. T., Vidhale, B., & Titarmare, A. (2024). Strategic Innovations in Defense Systems: A Comprehensive Analysis of Emerging Technologies and Future Trends. *2024 International Conference on Intelligent Systems for Cybersecurity (ISCS)*. https://doi.org/10.1109/iscs61804.2024.10581013

Pope, W. R. (2001, April). *U.S. and Coalition Command and Control Interoperability for the Future*. Dtic.mil. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/html/tr/ADA390627/

Raska, M. (2019). Strategic Competition for Emerging Military Technologies: Comparative Paths and Patterns. *PRISM*, *8*(3), 64–81. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26864277

Rathbun, B. C. (2007). Uncertain about Uncertainty: Understanding the Multiple Meanings of a Crucial Concept in International Relations Theory. *International Studies Quarterly*, *51*(3), 533–557. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2007.00463.x

Ray, J., Edge, W., Raia, G., & Brown, K. (2001). *Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California Thesis Logistics and Maintenance Concepts for a Future Naval Force*. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA401437.pdf

Reed, T. (2025). Acquisition Solutions for Contested Logistics in the Indo-Pacific Region. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5295987

Reid. (2025). *The Art of Coercion*. Cornell University Press.

Sechser, T. S. (2010). Goliath's Curse: Coercive Threats and Asymmetric Power. *International Organization*, *64*(4), 627–660. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020818310000214

Silva, V., Akkar, S., Baker, J., Bazzurro, P., Castro, J. M., Crowley, H., Dolsek, M., Galasso, C., Lagomarsino, S., Monteiro, R., Perrone, D., Pitilakis, K., & Vamvatsikos, D. (2019). Current Challenges and Future Trends in Analytical Fragility and Vulnerability Modeling. *Earthquake Spectra*, *35*(4), 1927–1952. https://doi.org/10.1193/042418eqs101o

Smetana, M., & Ludvik, J. (2019). Theorising indirect coercion: The logic of triangular strategies. *International Relations*, *33*(3), 455–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819836691

Speller, I. (2023). *Understanding Naval Warfare*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003272151

Starr, H., & Siverson, R. M. (1990). Alliances and geopolitics. *Political Geography Quarterly*, *9*(3), 232–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/0260-9827(90)90025-6

Stein, J. G. (1991). Reassurance in International Conflict Management. *Political Science Quarterly*, *106*(3), 431. https://doi.org/10.2307/2151741

Tan, Z., Parambath, P., Anagnostopoulos, C., Singer, J., & Marnerides, A. (2025). *Advanced Persistent Threats based on Supply Chain Vulnerabilities: Challenges, Solutions & Future Directions*. https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/345000/1/345000.pdf

Tantray, T. L. (2025). Red Sea undersea cable disruptions: internet vulnerabilities and emerging geopolitical risks in a strategic maritime corridor. *The Round Table*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2025.2565225

Tarar, A. (2016). A Strategic Logic of the MilitaryFait Accompli. *International Studies Quarterly*, *60*(4), 742–752. https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqw018

Till, G. (2013). *Seapower*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203105917

Tow, W. (2020). The United States' Regional Alliances and Partnerships. *Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment 2020*, 39–56. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003104728-3

Tsailas, D. N. (2025). Risks And Threats in the 21st Century Maritime Security. *Security Science Journal*, *6*(1), 106–144. https://doi.org/10.37458/ssj.6.1.7

Van, P. C., Kampen, T. V., Gerold De Gooijer, Faber, N., & Schlicher, L. (2020, November 19). *Sustaining Relevance: Repositioning Strategic Logistics Innovation in the Military*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346023372_Sustaining_Relevance_Repositioning_Strategic_Logistics_Innovation_in_the_Military

Vego, M. (2017). *Operational Warfare at Sea*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315402949

Vego, M. (2018). *Maritime Strategy and Sea Denial*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351047722

Vollmer, B. (2021, February 18). *NATOs Mission-Critical Space Capabilities under Threat: Cybersecurity Gaps in the Military Space Asset Supply Chain*. ArXiv.org. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2102.09674

Wilkinson, E. (2020). Resilience and Deterrence: Exploring Correspondence Between the Concepts. *Deterrence*, 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29367-3_2

Work, R. (2005). *"To Take and Keep the Lead:" A Naval Fleet Platform Architecture for Enduring Maritime Supremacy*. https://csbaonline.org/uploads/documents/2005.12.01-Naval-Fleet-Platform-Architecture.pdf

Wright, T. M., & Rider, T. J. (2013). Disputed territory, defensive alliances and conflict initiation. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, *31*(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0738894213503440

Wu, S. (2017). The modern naval fortress: an additional sea denial option for coastal states. *Defence Studies*, *18*(1), 76–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/14702436.2017.1416954

Zagare, F. C. (1996). Classical deterrence theory: A critical assessment. *International Interactions*, *21*(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629608434873

Zagare, F. C., & Kilgour, D. M. (1995). Assessing Competing Defense Postures: The Strategic Implications of "Flexible Response." *World Politics*, *47*(3), 373–417. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0043887100016439