

The Repricing of Security Guarantees

Defense Cost-Sharing, Alliance Cost Transfer, and US Strategic Redeployment

Author Daeho Lee

Date May 04, 2026

Keywords Cost Reallocation, Conditional Support, Strategic Redeployment, Restructuring Security Portfolios

Executive Summary

Recent U.S. pressure regarding defense cost-sharing functions as a cost reallocation structure. This mechanism transfers a portion of previous security guarantees to allies and reallocates the resulting strategic capacity to regions where U.S. influence is relatively weak. While allies increase their share of defense costs and accept greater regional defense responsibilities and strategic involvement, the United States reduces its burden on existing fronts. It shifts strategic resources to Southeast Asia, African mineral zones, South American resources and infrastructure, maritime chokepoints, and supply chain nodes.

China functions as a competitive axis justifying this U.S. reallocation strategy, but the actual effects of the structural change concentrate on peripheral competitive arenas where U.S. influence is limited, extending beyond direct lines of confrontation.

Consequently, the transition of U.S. security guarantees toward a structure of increased cost-sharing and conditional support pressures the choices of allies. Allies must specifically delineate the level of continued dependence on the United States and the specific areas for expanding autonomous capabilities. This requirement functions as the core analytical axis defining the scope of security strategy recalibration, the appropriate intensity of U.S. dependence, and the priorities for autonomous capability expansion.

The Repricing of Security Guarantees

U.S. pressure over defense cost-sharing functions as a process of resetting the pricing structure of U.S. security guarantees. This pressure extends beyond the logic of demanding greater cost-sharing from allies. Under the existing alliance framework, U.S. security guarantees served as core assets provided in exchange for political and military cooperation. However, as cost-sharing pressure intensifies, these guarantees shift from default assets to conditional assets with specific costs attached.

Allies continue to require the U.S. nuclear umbrella, intelligence assets, naval power, defense standards, and diplomatic protection. While these needs persist, the cost of maintaining the guarantees increases and the conditions for support become frequent subjects of negotiation. This change forces allies to recalculate the level and scope of their dependence on the United States.

The core question involves determining the level of U.S. dependence to be maintained and identifying the domains where autonomous capabilities must be expanded. This requirement emerges as the security guarantee structure moves toward a model of increased cost-sharing and conditional support.

Shift in the Location of the Cost Burden

The United States does not reduce its total defense expenditure. It maintains its overall defense scale and advanced military assets while demanding that existing allies share regional defense costs and expand their roles. The core variable in this structure is the geographical reallocation of costs.

The United States implements policies that increase individual burdens within institutionally cohesive alliance systems. NATO, South Korea, Japan, Australia, and Taiwan are core allies deeply integrated into the U.S. security order. These nations are closely linked to the United States through nuclear umbrellas, intelligence networks, weapon systems, and defense standards, as well as financial and technological networks and the broader diplomatic order. This multilayered cohesion functions as a decisive variable that increases the cost for allies to exit the system.

The United States utilizes this structural cohesion to pressure allies to increase defense spending, strengthen self-defense capabilities, and expand regional security responsibilities. This process intensifies the regional defense burden on allies while converting U.S. strategic assets previously fixed to specific fronts into an available state. The secured strategic capacity serves as a foundation for projecting assets into

peripheral competitive zones where U.S. influence is unstable, extending beyond regions where its influence is already consolidated.

Arms Race and the Normalization of the Burden

Pressure to increase defense spending intersects with an intensifying arms race. Traditional state-level threats from Russia, China, North Korea, and Iran remain central, while maritime routes, supply chains, cyber systems, energy security, and resource security are emerging simultaneously as additional domains of strategic pressure. Under these conditions, states increasingly accept higher defense spending as an unavoidable policy trajectory. Security-first logic overrides peacetime fiscal constraints, and defense spending settles into the long-term fiscal structure as a core element.

The specific roles assigned to individual allies are also reinforced. Europe directly shares the burden of deterring Russia. South Korea faces growing pressure to perform roles beyond the deterrence of North Korea. Japan raises its level of involvement around the Southwest Islands, the Taiwan periphery, and maritime interdiction axes. Australia strengthens its rear-base functions and submarine capabilities to defend the link between the Indian Ocean and the South Pacific. Taiwan is required to expand its own defense spending and capacity for sustained resistance.

These shifts reduce the direct burden on the United States. As a result, allies move beyond paying for their own survival and begin to shoulder a significant portion of the costs and functions previously embedded in U.S. security guarantees.

Conditional Support Structure

The structural shift is finalized as U.S. security guarantees transition from default commitments into conditional services. Under the previous framework, the United States provided security unilaterally while allies cooperated with the established order. In the current structure, allies bear greater costs, assume direct responsibility for regional defense, and become deeply involved in U.S. offshore strategy. The status of the ally shifts from a protected subject to a co-bearer of U.S. strategic costs.

Defense spending, support conditions, operational coordination, weapon systems, intelligence sharing, and the persistence of troop presence function as renegotiable variables. Allies cannot treat U.S. security guarantees as fixed constants. Instead, U.S. domestic political conditions, theater priorities, cost-sharing demands, and the degree of cooperation in offshore operations determine the intensity and conditions of the guarantee. This structure redefines the essence of the alliance. The alliance functions

not as a fixed protective mechanism but as a variable contractual structure requiring continuous adjustments of costs and roles.

Regional Defense Costs and Strategic Capacity

The United States leverages the intensifying arms race to simultaneously achieve the localization of regional defense costs, the recovery of strategic capacity, and dominance over defense standard systems. Allies enter a structure where they must perform conventional defense, ammunition stockpiling, base operations, and surveillance and reconnaissance with greater constancy and higher intensity than in the past. This shift replaces a portion of the fixed defense costs previously borne directly by the United States with local budgets and capabilities, and this change enables the operation of personnel, naval power, missiles, and intelligence assets as fluid strategic resources.

The military buildup process reinforces U.S.-centric defense and standard systems across weapon systems, intelligence networks, and command and control. As increased demand is absorbed into U.S. defense firms and interoperability frameworks, allies pay higher costs but face difficulty in reducing technical dependence on the United States as the structural center.

Within this structure, the autonomy of allies does not expand at the same rate as the cost increases. While regional defense responsibilities are localized and defense demand is integrated into U.S. standards, the United States secures the momentum to recalibrate global priorities through the recovered strategic assets. The actual interests of the United States reside in the substantive structural reorganization of localized costs, reallocated strategic capacity, and strengthened standard dominance, and the increase in defense spending functions as a superficial achievement.

Countering China and Access to the Periphery

The discourse of countering China serves as a strategic justification for the United States to enter peripheral theaters of competition. By framing China as the central axis of its threat narrative, the U.S. legitimizes its push for expanded access to regions where its influence is not yet fully established.

Major allies are already deeply integrated into the U.S. security order. Since these are secured assets requiring little new influence, the U.S. finds grounds to demand higher costs and greater responsibilities from them.

Peripheral competitive arenas operate under a different structure. In these areas, U.S.

influence is unevenly distributed, making them open spaces where China, Russia, Gulf capital, and regional powers compete for sway. The U.S. thus has a structural incentive to take the strategic latitude gained from existing alliances and reinvest it into these uncommitted regions.

Target Areas for Strategic Redeployment

The primary regions for the redeployment of U.S. strategic latitude are Southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. Southeast Asia, in particular, is a theater where maritime bottlenecks, southern access routes to Taiwan, the South China Sea, ports, semiconductor and electronics supply chains, and military base access all intersect. Because the U.S. views a NATO-style alliance network as impractical for this region, it focuses on securing access to individual nodes rather than attempting to bind entire nations into a collective framework.

In Africa, the competition for influence with China and Russia is tied to minerals, energy, ports, regime stability, and counter-terrorism. Rather than providing security guarantees, the U.S. seeks to secure practical access through investments, mineral contracts, the development of transport corridors, local security assistance, development finance, and diplomatic mediation.

South America is a complex space where ports, canals, lithium, energy, and agricultural assets are layered with Chinese infrastructure investments, cartels, and border security issues. The U.S. defines this region as an outer perimeter for homeland defense and a critical arena for competition over resources, transportation, and supply chains.

These regions represent "uncommitted zones" where U.S. influence is not the dominant factor. Consequently, the U.S. has a structural incentive to take the strategic latitude secured from its existing alliance networks and reinvest it into these peripheral spaces.

The Double Burden of Allies

A security model centered on reliance on the United States no longer translates solely into a calculation of safety guarantees. While the nuclear umbrella, intelligence assets, naval power, defense standards, diplomatic protection, and financial and technological networks still provide allies with clear survival benefits, the critical variable is a change in the cost structure.

Allies are increasing defense cost-sharing, expanding their roles in regional defense, and deepening cooperation with U.S. foreign strategy. In this process, they shoulder the costs

of their own defense while indirectly providing the strategic latitude the U.S. requires to expand its influence elsewhere. This structural shift moves the U.S.-led security model away from a low-cost insurance framework toward a business expansion model. As premiums rise and coverage terms become more volatile, a system is now in place where the policyholders share the costs of the insurer's expansion.

Ultimately, the burden on allies is focused on two fronts: the cost of their own survival and the cost of U.S. strategic expansion.

Restructuring the Cost of Security Portfolios

The focus for major allies is shifting toward how to restructure the cost of their security portfolios. Core U.S. deterrent assets are difficult to replace in the short term, and as pressure for defense spending and conditional support grows, the fixed costs of relying on the United States continue to climb. In this environment, both the financial burden and the cost of strategic entanglement for allies grow in tandem.

The repricing of U.S. security guarantees operates as a cost-recovery mechanism that turns higher allied defense spending into U.S. strategic latitude. Allies pay more while remaining tied to U.S.-led standards and extended deterrence, while Washington uses this asymmetry to reduce its fixed burden on traditional fronts. In this structure, allied spending strengthens local defense, but it also supports the broader redistribution of U.S. strategic capacity toward secondary theaters of competition.

The stated purpose of higher defense spending is to strengthen allied defense and expand cost-sharing. The actual structure concerns the allocation of the rising price of U.S. security guarantees. Security portfolio adjustment therefore becomes a cost-structure problem: how much of the rising expense of U.S. dependency allies can absorb, and where they can preserve bargaining power.

Endnotes

1. The White House, *National Security Strategy*, November 2025.
2. U.S. Department of War, *2026 National Defense Strategy*, January 2026.
3. Jens Ringsmose, “Paying for Protection: Denmark’s Military Expenditures during the Cold War,” *Cooperation and Conflict* 44, no. 1 (2009): 73–97.
4. Matt Ferchen, “Growing US-China Rivalry in Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia: Implications for the EU,” MERICS, March 24, 2022.
5. Sydney Tucker, “Competing for Africa’s Resources: How the US and China Invest in Critical Minerals,” Stimson Center, February 28, 2025.
6. European Commission, “Joint Statement Declaration of Intent from the United States Government and the European Commission on the Lobito Corridor and Investment in the Great Lakes Region,” December 4, 2025.
7. Henry Ziemer, “China’s Expanding Interests in Latin America: Development, Leverage, Coercion, and Crime,” congressional testimony, CSIS, March 19, 2026.
8. European Commission, *White Paper for European Defence - Readiness 2030*, March 19, 2025.

This document is provided for informational and analytical purposes only. It does not constitute legal, financial, investment, policy, or operational advice, nor does it represent the official position of any government or institution. Strategic Science Institute (SSI) makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness or accuracy of the information presented. Any use of or reliance on this document is at the reader’s own risk.