REPORT

THE END OF ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION:
READING INTO THE 2025 U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

ecsstudies
ecss.com.eg

Prepared by

Sally Ashour

Senior Researcher, Egyptian Center for Strategic Studies (ECSS)

A careful examination of transformations in the global economic order makes it impossible to regard the 2025 U.S. National Security Strategy as merely a periodic policy document. It represents a clear declaration of a qualitative shift in American strategic doctrine, one that fuses economics and national security into an inseparable framework under the slogan "America First." The strategy reflects a comprehensive reassessment of the trajectory of traditional globalization, paving the way for a new phase characterized by "selective globalization."

The document articulates a redefinition of national power: the economy is no longer simply a driver of military strength, but the very backbone of national security. What is underway is a deliberate reengineering of globalization to serve national interests. Washington places its full strategic weight behind reshoring the industrial base, transforming the energy sector from a consumptive resource into an instrument of export-driven dominance, and fortifying advanced technologies with strict protectionist barriers against competitors—foremost among them China.

This analysis delves into Washington's emerging political philosophy: an overtly pragmatic version of "America First." Aspirations of spreading democracy and managing the global order recede in favor of safeguarding interests, securing supply chains, and employing economic leverage as both a deterrent and an offensive tool. The United States now openly asserts that military superiority begins on domestic factory floors, and that political autonomy is contingent upon energy independence and technological innovation. The following sections present an analytical reading of the strategy from an economic perspective, examining how Washington seeks to deploy economic instruments to redraw global influence maps, and highlighting the risks inherent in an approach that may transform the global economy from a space of cooperation into an open battlefield.

Design & Art Direction

Monem Aboutaleb

Controversy Over the Role of David Friedman in the Organization:

The World Zionist Congress elections witnessed tensions after the name of the former US ambassador to Israel, David Friedman, became associated with the Israel365 slate's campaign. As the Christian organization seeking to bolster Israeli influence attempted to mobilize support for a list titled "One Jewish State," it later became apparent that the use of this name had attracted supporters who signed onto the list under the assumption that Friedman was formally involved.

Founded in 1897 by Theodor Herzl, the World Zionist Congress remains the most prominent platform through which Jewish communities worldwide exercise tangible influence over Israeli governing institutions. Its representatives allocate approximately $1 billion annually and oversee major bodies such as the Jewish Agency, the Jewish National Fund, and the World Zionist Organization.

Israel365 initially approved the launch of the slate under the name "One Jewish State," reflecting a clear stance opposing the two-state solution and endorsing full Israeli control over the West Bank. However, after the slate collected the required number of signatures, Friedman was compelled to clarify his position via the X platform, stating that he was not affiliated with any electoral list and had not authorized anyone to speak on his behalf. The controversy intensified when former candidates, including Tilly Feldman and Seth Lytman, accused the slate of misleading them through videos and statements implying Friedman's direct involvement. As a result, dozens of supporters withdrew from the list and submitted formal complaints to the American Zionist Movement, which oversees the elections in the United States, although the total number of signatures remained above the required threshold.

The debate further escalated amid growing concerns over the influence of Christian evangelicals on Zionist elections, which are intended to represent Jewish communities worldwide. These concerns prompted amendments to voter eligibility criteria, now requiring voters to declare that they are Jewish, Zionist, and do not adhere to another religion. Election officials maintain that the changes were not directed specifically at Israel365, but rather aimed at preventing voting by groups such as Messianic Jews or "Jews for Jesus," the most organized manifestation of Messianic Judaism, established in the 1970s. These groups consist of individuals who identify as Jewish culturally or nationally but believe that Jesus is the Messiah—a belief regarded by Jewish religious institutions as placing them outside traditional Judaism, since faith in Jesus as savior is central to Christian doctrine rather than Jewish belief.

Against this backdrop, candidates from the liberal camps are closely monitoring developments with growing concern, warning that any unified right-wing dominance of the Congress grounded in religious or nationalist ideology would create an imbalance in representation among Jewish communities worldwide.

Against the backdrop of these controversies, Israel365 introduced changes to its electoral platform after rebranding the slate as "Israel365 Action." The revised platform incorporated new language emphasizing the engagement and education of young Christians to ensure the continuity of their support for Israel. This shift led many individuals who had previously joined the slate to feel misled, stating that their participation had been based on principles they associated with David Friedman rather than on an agenda centered on a Christian–Zionist alliance. Ultimately, the election administration announced that it would not intervene in the absence of a clear violation of electoral rules, considering internal disputes within slates to be a natural part of the political process. Meanwhile, the upcoming elections are shaping up to be more competitive than any previous cycle, as they have become a battleground over the future of Zionism itself and the weight of the American Jewish community in shaping that future.

First

Pillars of the Economic Strategy

The economic vision outlined in the strategy rests on several core pillars aimed at expanding the U.S. economy from approximately $30 trillion to $40 trillion within a decade.

1. Economic Nationalism and Reindustrialization

The new economic strategy represents a strategic departure from previous decades. Traditional globalization, as institutionalized through the World Trade Organization, is no longer seen as compatible with the American model—particularly after Washington concluded that China had benefited disproportionately from free trade to the extent of threatening U.S. influence itself. The American economy is no longer managed solely according to market efficiency, but increasingly through a national security lens, making reindustrialization a top priority.

This shift seeks not only to improve economic indicators, but to restore “productive sovereignty” through a systematic reshoring of supply chains, especially in vital and defense-related sectors. The objective is to ensure that America’s industrial weight remains within its geographical borders rather than dispersed across external markets that may evolve into strategic rivals.

Within this protectionist framework, Washington redefines tariffs from fiscal trade tools into major strategic instruments. They are no longer merely revenue-generating mechanisms, but dual-use weapons—serving as shields to protect emerging and returning domestic industries, and as geopolitical pressure tools to compel other states to comply with American trade conditions.

These measures are reinforced by the adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies designed to attract domestic industrial investment and reduce incentives for U.S. companies to seek cheaper labor abroad. Collectively, these policies serve a single strategic objective: building a resilient industrial base capable of meeting national requirements in both peace and wartime. The strategy thus aims to achieve a state of "strategic decoupling," ensuring that the United States is never dependent on rival powers—particularly China—for critical components or strategic materials. In the 2025 doctrine, national security begins and ends with self-sufficiency in times of global crisis.

2. Energy Dominance: Geopolitical Realism over Climate Commitments

Energy constitutes a central pillar of the 2025 strategy, reflecting a decisive intellectual shift from concepts of energy security and green transition toward a more assertive doctrine of "Energy Dominance." This approach does not merely seek self-sufficiency, but aims to entrench the United States as an unrivaled global energy superpower. Hydrocarbon resources are framed not as environmental liabilities, but as strategic assets to be maximized.

Key dimensions of this approach include:

- **Marginalization of the climate agenda:** The strategy deprioritizes recent climate commitments, arguing that net-zero targets risk becoming costly regulatory constraints—especially when competitors do not adhere to similar standards, thereby gaining unfair advantages.
- **Maximizing production**: The stated objective is to reach maximum productive capacity across oil, natural gas, clean coal, and nuclear energy. This expansion is intended not only to satisfy domestic demand, but to flood global markets with American energy, based on the premise that refraining from exploiting vast domestic reserves constitutes "economic self-sabotage."
- **Energy as industrial leverage:** Cheap and abundant energy is viewed as a cornerstone of industrial competitiveness. With higher labor costs in the United States, low energy prices become the decisive factor enabling

domestic manufacturers to compete with Asian counterparts and outperform energy-constrained European economies.

- **Energy as a geopolitical weapon**: Liquefied natural gas and oil exports are deployed to strengthen alliances by offering reliable energy alternatives to allies, while simultaneously undermining competitors whose budgets depend heavily on energy revenues, such as Russia and Iran.

In essence, energy dominance under the 2025 strategy represents an explicit declaration that America's geology will be wielded as a political and economic weapon, with national economic interest prioritized above global environmental considerations.

3. Financial and Technological Security

At the heart of the strategy lies a fusion of financial security and technological sovereignty as twin pillars of modern dominance. The strategy reflects a conviction that conventional military superiority alone is insufficient, and that true centers of gravity in the twenty-first century lie in controlling global capital flows and advanced knowledge systems.

Financially, the U.S. dollar is reframed not merely as a medium of exchange or store of value, but as a strategic asset and deterrent tool. Access to the U.S. financial system is no longer considered a universal right, but a privilege extended to allies and denied to adversaries. Sanctions, financial exclusion, and dominance over global payment networks are leveraged to suffocate rival economies and counter de-dollarization efforts.

Technologically, innovation is elevated to the level of national security. Absolute leadership in artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and biotechnology is deemed existential. The strategy adopts a strict protectionist approach, treating intellectual property security—particularly vis-à-vis China—as a national security imperative. Consequently, technology transitions from an open arena of cooperation into fortified enclaves surrounded by export controls and investment screening mechanisms.

4. Geopolitical Reorientation: The "Trump Corollary" and the Rediscovery of the Western Hemisphere

In an unprecedented strategic move that resets the order U.S. national security priorities, the 2025 document introduces a profound geographic and philosophical shift. The United States declares a firm return to enforcing the Monroe Doctrine[1] , not as a historical legacy, but as an urgent necessity to restore American primacy in the Western Hemisphere. This return seeks to protect the homeland while imposing a strict prohibition on any military or strategic presence by extra-regional competitors.

This constitutes the core of the new transformation. The approach is not merely a geographic preference, but rather the practical application of what may be termed the "Trump Corollary"—a radical update to U.S. foreign policy doctrine that breaks decisively with the legacy of the twentieth century. Under this framework, Washington retreats from its traditional European theater and pivots toward Latin America and Canada. The new hemispheric doctrine is structured around a bipolar strategy of "mobilization and expansion," implemented through the following mechanisms:

- **Mobilization: Alliance-Building**

U.S. policy is centered on mobilizing "regional champions" capable of enforcing stability not only within their borders but across their surrounding geographic environments. This is pursued through curbing irregular migration, near-shoring critical industries, and adopting a pragmatic approach that rewards governments and movements aligned with American principles and strategic orientations.

- **Expansion: Commercial Diplomacy and Economic Dominance**

In parallel with deepening existing alliances, the United States seeks to expand its regional influence network in order to position Washington as the undisputed "partner of first choice," while systematically obstructing any cooperation with international competitors. This expansion is operationalized through:

Resource and Supply Chain Warfare:

The Western Hemisphere (Latin America and Canada) possesses vast strategic resources. Accordingly, an immediate, intelligence-backed comprehensive survey will be conducted to identify these assets—particularly minerals and energy resources—and to develop and secure them in partnership with allies. The objective is to integrate regional supply chains into the U.S. economy, thereby reducing external dependency and enhancing economic resilience. This would render external penetration—particularly by China—prohibitively costly and operationally difficult.

Conditionality of Assistance:

Any U.S. alliance or aid provision will be strictly conditioned upon the termination of hostile external influence.

Promotion of the American Model:

American goods and technologies are presented as incentives and advantages enabling partners to free themselves from the coercive conditions imposed by other actors. To ensure effectiveness, the United States commits to internal bureaucratic reforms aimed at accelerating licensing and approval processes.

• Activating the "Merchant State": Government as a Backer of the Private Sector

To achieve this transformation, diplomacy must be fused with commerce. Every U.S. official operating in the region is to function as a promoter of American economic interests. The United States seeks to implement this approach through:

Militarization of Finance:

All financing arms—including foreign assistance, defense, energy, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation—will operate as a unified bloc to fund U.S. corporate acquisitions of strategic opportunities and to invest in secure energy and telecommunications infrastructure.

Sole-Source Contracting Strategy:

Washington aims to confront protectionist policies and taxation targeting U.S. companies with uncompromising measures. More critically, in states where dependence on the United States is high and Washington holds leverage, sole-source contracts will be imposed to expel competing foreign firms from key infrastructure sectors.

Second

Structural Shifts between the 2022 and 2025 Strategies

A close examination of the qualitative shift between the 2022 and 2025 strategies reveals a fundamental transformation in U.S. economic doctrine—one that marks a transition from “institutional liberalism” to “economic nationalist realism.” The following provides a detailed deconstruction of this strategic inflection point:

1. The Core of the Shift: The Return of “Economic Nationalism”

The 2025 document represents an epistemic rupture with the recent past. The economy is no longer viewed as an arena for international cooperation and mutual gains, but rather as a hard instrument for asserting sovereignty and influence, grounded in several key pillars:

• **Militarization of the Economy:**

Threat perceptions within Washington’s strategic mindset have evolved. Risks are no longer defined solely in military terms, but also encompass trade deficits, the erosion of the industrial base, and the fragility of supply chains. National security has effectively become synonymous with industrial security.

•**“America First” as an Operational Doctrine:**

No longer a mere electoral slogan, “America First” has been transformed into a benchmark for policymaking. Traditional partnerships have not disappeared entirely, but they have lost their central appeal in favor of isolationist tendencies that assign absolute priority to domestic American interests.

• **The New Protectionism:**

This orientation signals the advent of an era of intense competition, not only with rivals such as China, but also with allies whenever their economic practices are perceived as threatening U.S. industry.

Comparative Framework

Dimension	Biden Strategy (2022)	Trump Strategy (2025)
Core Philosophy	“Modern Industrial Strategy”: combining domestic investment (infrastructure, semiconductors) with international cooperation. The economy serves the middle class by enhancing global competitiveness.	“Economic Nationalism” (America First): the economy itself constitutes national security. Rejection of globalization and free trade as destructive; emphasis on reindustrialization and protectionism.
Economic Instruments	Investment and subsidies: extensive government support for strategic industries (CHIPS Act, Inflation Reduction Act), with a focus on technology and innovation.	Tariffs: deployment of tariffs as a strategic weapon to force firms to reshore and to penalize competitors and non-compliant allies.
Energy and Climate	“Green Transition”: climate change framed as an existential threat; clean energy investment as a major economic opportunity for job creation and global market leadership.	“Energy Dominance”: rejection of net-zero policies; maximization of fossil fuel production (oil, gas, coal) to reduce costs and employ energy as a geopolitical pressure tool.
International Trade	Multilateralism: building new economic frameworks (e.g., IPEF) that move beyond traditional free trade toward standards and supply-chain governance.	Bilateral deals and transactions: preference for direct bilateral agreements, pursuit of trade reciprocity, and rejection of persistent trade deficits.
Relationship with China	“Strategic Competition”: an “invest, ally, compete” approach; restricting China’s access to advanced technologies (de-risking) without full decoupling, alongside selective cooperation (e.g., climate).	“The Primary Economic Bet”: focus on structural imbalances and technology theft; pursuit of decoupling in strategic goods and use of tariffs to curb Chinese influence.
Supply Chains	Friend-shoring: diversification through trusted allies to ensure resilience.	Re-shoring: compelling supply chains to return entirely to the U.S. to ensure self-sufficiency and eliminate external dependence.

Dimension	Biden Strategy (2022)	Trump Strategy (2025)
Allies (Europe)	Cooperation and coordination: alliance repair viewed as a force multiplier; economic and technological coordination (Trade and Technology Council).	"Tough Love": demands that allies increase defense spending to 5%; economic pressure if markets remain closed or dependence on China/Russia persists.
Geographic Focus	Indo-Pacific and Europe: Asia prioritized to counter China, Europe to counter Russia.	Western Hemisphere (the Americas): top priority to integrate neighboring economies and exclude China (the Trump Corollary).
Alliance Philosophy	Multilateralism as the prevailing doctrine; belief that competition requires strong alliance networks to shape global trade and technology norms.	Transactional logic: allies—particularly Europeans—viewed as unfair economic competitors; objective is restoring autonomous strategic independence and imposing U.S. terms without costly diplomatic concessions.
Conflict Management	Managing competition with China to avoid catastrophic escalation.	Zero-sum confrontation: past economic engagement framed as "liberal naïveté" that hollowed out U.S. manufacturing.

In sum, while the 2022 strategy sought to rehabilitate the liberal international order under U.S. leadership, the 2025 strategy aims to reconstruct it entirely around America's autonomous power—where the economy is the weapon, sovereignty is the objective, and there is no place for "free riders."

Third

Assessments and Perspectives of Global Think Tanks

Major international think tanks have produced a dual reading of the strategy, oscillating between praise for its economic realism and warnings about its geopolitical repercussions, as outlined below:

1. Strengths (Supporters' and Realist Perspectives)

• **Activation of "Economic Statecraft":**

Analysts such as James Mazarilla and Alexander Gray argue that the strategy successfully ends the artificial separation between commercial interests and national security, transforming the economy into an effective instrument of state policy.

• **Clarity of Interests and Geographic Focus:**

Commentaries commend the emphasis on securing supply chains and prioritizing the Western Hemisphere (Latin America and Canada), viewing this as a pragmatic and logical response to reducing external exposure in an increasingly volatile global environment.

2. Weaknesses and Risks (Critical Perspectives)

• **Oversimplification of the China Challenge:**

Experts at the Council on Foreign Relations, including David Sacks, warn that the strategy may implicitly dismantle the comprehensive framework of "great power competition" by reducing the existential struggle with China to a purely commercial rivalry—potentially overlooking Beijing's direct military and security threats.

• **Fracturing of the Transatlantic Alliance (Relations with Europe):**

Policies toward Europe risk creating an adversarial environment that could alienate traditional allies, due to:

- Demands to raise defense spending to 5%;
- Characterization of the European economy as “declining”;
- Threats to deploy tariffs against allied economies.

• **Structural Contradiction between Ambition and Funding:**

Analysts at the Atlantic Council identify a fundamental contradiction that undermines feasibility: while the strategy defines technological dominance as an existential objective, it simultaneously plans to reduce federal government spending—raising doubts about the sustainability of innovation and research and development under austerity-oriented policies.

Fourth

Expected Global and Domestic Impacts and Implications

Based on the foregoing analysis, a number of anticipated global and domestic implications can be identified as follows:

1. Global Impacts

• **Fragmentation of the Global Trading System:**

The shift toward regional blocs and protectionism is likely to weaken the World Trade Organization and intensify “trade wars,” not only with China but also with traditional allies.

• **An Economic Arms Race:**

Other major actors—most notably China and the European Union—are expected to attempt the construction of comparable “economic fortresses,” driving up global production costs and, consequently, consumer prices worldwide.

• **Energy Markets:**

The injection of large volumes of U.S. energy into global markets may lead to lower prices, placing pressure on producer states—particularly OPEC+ members—while simultaneously impeding global efforts toward a green energy transition.

2. Implications for Egypt

• **From Aid to Investment:**

The strategy explicitly calls for a shift in U.S. engagement with regions such as Africa and the Middle East from an “aid-based model” to one centered on “trade and investment.” For Egypt, this necessitates prioritizing the attraction of U.S. foreign direct investment (FDI) rather than continued reliance on traditional military or economic assistance.

• **Energy and Natural Gas Sector:**

- Opportunity: The strategy’s emphasis on natural gas and nuclear energy aligns with Egypt’s ambition to serve as a regional energy hub, particularly through the Eastern Mediterranean Gas Forum. Partnerships with U.S. energy companies may therefore deepen.
- Challenge: Increased U.S. supply could depress global gas prices, negatively affecting Egypt’s export revenues.

• **Red Sea and Suez Canal Security:**

The strategy underscores U.S. interests in keeping the Red Sea and the Strait of Hormuz open to navigation. This aligns with Egypt’s national security interests and the sustainability of Suez Canal revenues, and may entail greater—albeit selective—U.S. involvement in securing maritime corridors.

• **Regional Stability:**

The strategy commends “peace agreements” and conflict resolution efforts, and even claims the resolution of disputes such as Egypt–Ethiopia in a hypothetical 2025 scenario. This suggests that Washington may exert strong diplomatic pressure to settle unresolved issues—such as the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam—if it deems such resolutions conducive to regional stability and investment-friendly environments.

• **Supply Chains:**

U.S. efforts to shorten supply chains through friend-shoring may offer Egypt an opportunity to position itself as an industrial hub for American companies relocating from China and other friendly manufacturing centers, provided that Egypt can offer a competitive investment climate.

In final analysis, the 2025 U.S. National Security Strategy does not merely signal the end of a particular policy phase; it announces a fundamental reconfiguration of one of the twentieth century's core assumptions—the universality of globalization. The world now stands at the threshold of a new international order, in which the very power that architected the liberal system has chosen to overturn its own rules, replacing Adam Smith's "invisible hand" with the iron grip of the state, directing economic activity in service of dominance.

What this document ultimately reveals is a decisive shift toward "selective globalization" and the fragmentation of supply chains. The economy is no longer a bridge for open diplomatic engagement, but a trench for defense and offense alike. The United States no longer relies solely on its conventional military power; instead, it has transformed global financial networks, internet protocols, gas pipelines, and semiconductor supply chains into strategic choke points, employed to suffocate adversaries and discipline allies.

Globally, this transformation places the world economy on the path of fragmented globalization, dividing it into competing technological and economic blocs. This reality presents both opportunities and challenges for emerging economies—including Egypt—which must now operate in a gray zone shaped by competing currents: one driving toward economic nationalism, and another still wagering on globalization through regional frameworks.

The implicit message of the strategy is unmistakably clear: the era of "economic neutrality" is drawing to a close. Integration into the global economy is no longer a technical luxury, but a delicate geopolitical choice requiring careful calibration between East and West. Ultimately, the 2025 strategy compels economic and political decision-makers in our region to exit traditional "comfort zones" and adopt a high degree of strategic flexibility in navigating a world where the economy is no longer merely a science of numbers, but a battlefield. Success in this era will not favor those who await assistance, but rather those who command resources, localize technology, and master the art of negotiation in a world governed by the language of unvarnished interests.

Sources

1. This is a strategic doctrine proclaimed by U.S. President James Monroe in 1823, fundamentally asserting that North and South America (the Western Hemisphere) constitute an exclusive sphere of influence for the United States. The doctrine warned the European colonial powers of the time against any attempt to intervene in, or reassert control over, the Americas, deeming any such interference a "hostile act" against the United States itself.In the context of the 2025 document, this historic doctrine is invoked not to deter European colonialism, but rather to block the economic and political penetration of rising powers—most notably China—into America's perceived "backyard."