

MAIN TRENDS AND IMPLEMENTATION METHODS OF THE US NATIONAL INTERESTS AT THE END OF THE 20TH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Botir B. Ochilov, Research Fellow,
University of World Economy and Diplomacy,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract. The election of Donald Trump as a new President started new phase in the development of the US foreign policy. In this case the study of the institutional space of the previous stages of the US foreign policy in 1991-2008 allows to get as far as possible the greater picture of the newest history of American foreign policy and to determine the mechanisms, ways to implement the choice of foreign policy doctrines in the sphere of national and international security.

Key words: USA, D.Trump, B.Clinton, doctrinal documents, foreign policy, national interests.

A new stage in the US foreign policy started with the election of Donald Trump to the President of the United States of Amerika and fundamentally, different picture of the country's foreign policy is being formed under his leadership. The initial steps of Trump administration point to the fact that America's foreign policy actions will differ sharply from the behavior of previous presidents, including in the issues of the US influence on world development.

Experts identify three fundamental elements for understanding the position of Donald Trump: first, a review of the contents of the alliances concluded by the previous administration, adherence to the mercantile agenda in the global economy and sympathy for an authoritarian style of government; second, the fulfillment of pre-election promises during the presidential campaign of 2016, including the construction of a wall along the Mexican border, the position to the deal with Iran, the ban of Muslim migrants, the denial of the need to combat climate change; third, the contradictory views on relations with China, Brexit and the proliferation of nuclear weapons.¹

The foreign policy of the Trump administration is still in the stage of formation; it will certainly become the subject of targeted academic research. The position of Trump as a politician and businessman and as a 45th US president, his political and economic credo is already well known to form an idea of what role this politician will choose in the US and internationally. In this context, it seems interesting to find a source in which the essence of the

¹ Wright Thomas. The 2016 presidential campaign and the crisis of US foreign policy//Lowy Institute for International Policy, October 2016.

comprehensive modernization of the United States as a great world power is revealed.² Obviously, depending on the world situation and the US doctrinal dispositions, the prospects for the formation of a new world order and the reform of the global architecture will become for the Trump administration the basis for understanding the diversification of state management, including in the context of "non-standard" geostrategic configurations involving America, the "transfer" nature of its international activities.

The study of the institutional space of the previous stages of the US foreign policy in 1991-2008 allows to get as far as possible the greater picture of the newest history of American foreign policy and to determine the mechanisms, ways to implement the choice of foreign policy doctrines in the sphere of national and international security. This period has already been described and illustrated, however it has not yet been systematized.

The year 1991 was marked by the end of the Cold War period and the world entered into an era of uncertainty. In these circumstances, Washington had to substantially "revise" its national interests, change the strategy and tactics of foreign policy behavior. 2008 was marked by the victory of Barack Obama.³ His team developed a political model that, in the course of the presidential election cycle in 2016, created a highly volatile background of the "checks and balances" system within the United States.⁴

The collapse of the USSR radically changed the international political situation. The documents confirm that the disintegration of the bipolar world was accompanied by a number of challenges, the realization of which required the revision of the essence of international politics, taking into account the emergence of a new "post-Soviet space".

² See Donald Trump. Crippled America: How to Make America Great Again. - NY: Threshold Editions, 2015.

³ Barack Obama's win: News to make Jesse Jackson weep. Top of the Ticket // Los Angeles Times. - 04 December

⁴ Certainly, the turbulence of "social and political atmosphere" within the United States affected international relations, including the main players and events unfolding on the world stage.

Western Europe and other countries, which recognized the leadership of the United States and the preservation of the status of a superpower, contributed a lot to the formation of a new American identity. The US National Security Strategy of 1991 stated such provisions as:

- the old models of international relations collapsed;
- the new world order is "expectation and opportunity";
- the US should focus on ways of establishing new international system in accordance with American ideals.⁵

Samuel Huntington pointed to a number of fundamentally important aspects for the US: first, the collapse of the USSR freed the US not just from a specific enemy, but from the enemy in general; Secondly, for more than 200 years, liberal-democratic principles have been the basis of American identity, which was viewed from the standpoint of "American exceptionalism"; Thirdly, this exceptionality has become universal, liberal democracy has been intensively spreading around the world, turning into theories into the only possible form of legitimate government; Fourthly, the end of the "Cold War" leads to the emasculation of national components, including strategic interests.⁶

The American official circles faced the task of finding a new enemy in order to find a chance to fulfill their "historical mission." The search for a global US mission is a manifestation of America's centrality and political culture of Washington.

When the Gorbachev's "perestroika" was going on in the USSR, America tried to assist Moscow in the implementation of democratic and market reforms. One of the reasons for the American interest in the Soviet

⁵ National Security Strategy of the United States. W.: The White House, 1991.

⁶ Samuel Huntington. Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity. NY: Simon & Schuster 2004.

country was the presence of its nuclear potential, control of which for the United States looked faulty. If the National Security Strategy of 1991 established a victory in the "cold war", the 1993 Strategy considered the post-Soviet space as a single unit.⁷

American official circles believed that the disintegration of the USSR opens wide opportunities for promoting global US interests and building a new world order in accordance with American values. Washington sought to consolidate profitable changes for itself in the world, ensuring its own leadership. The war in the Persian Gulf was used as an example, demonstrating the leading role of the United States in solving world problems.

The Clinton administration, replacing the era of George W. Bush, revised the strategic documents, entitled The National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, modifying their conceptual notions and interests according to the content of the whole system of international relations.⁸ The emergence of the new strategy indicated the desire of the Clinton administration to develop a comprehensive approach to the issue of national security and all US foreign policy, to conceptually fix the transformation of the bipolar system through a revision of the world, and strategically comprehend the role of the US in the emerging system of international relations. Washington also revised its attitude to "force" as a way of solving international problems. The development of processes on the dichotomous "interaction-expansion" series in the United States was considered in the context of strengthening the community of states loyal to Washington. At the same time, the concept of coercion to peace was

⁷ National Security Strategy of the United States - W.: The White House. - January 1993.

⁸ See National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement – W.: The White House. - July 1994.

formulated, which later became the justification for the US military presence in many countries.

Back in 1994-1998, when the development of fundamentally new basic characteristics of foreign policy began in the United States, American national interests were divided into "vital interests", "survival interests" and "important national interests". Humanitarian component concerned both the first and second concept. The Clinton administration declared that observance of vital US interests can be achieved "alone", regardless of any other country. In the light of this, it is instructive to conduct such operations as Desert Storm, Alert Warrior and others, during which the United States resorted to unilateral use of its armed forces.⁹

The 1996 Strategy emphasized that the United States recognizes the special responsibility inherent in the great-power status that can guarantee the inviolability of the borders and the sovereignty of all nations. As history shows, this approach was largely conditioned by the growing awareness of the importance of military force in the Americans as a way of promoting national interests. The armed forces of the country were charged with deterring and defeating the aggressors in the two major regional conflicts, ensuring the necessary presence in other territories, countering proliferation and protection from weapons of mass destruction, participating in multilateral peacekeeping operations, supporting efforts to combat terrorism and other actions in the interests of providing national security.¹⁰

According to Zbigniew Brzezinski, American world hegemony is unique in itself, because in other cases, the international community is threatened by anarchy and chaos. The US government perceives its active

⁹ These military campaigns were undertaken in accordance with the 1994 Strategy, which provides for unilateral actions by the United States without coordination with international organizations and individual states. See National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. The White House, - February 1995.

¹⁰ National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. – The White House, - February 1996.

involvement in the system of international relations as a kind of reaction to potential challenges and real threats, and the main task of the foreign policy strategy is the long-term consolidation of the US's dominant position.¹¹

The objectives of the 1997 Strategy remained: (a) ensuring US security through the effective use of diplomacy, the armed forces, the non-governmental sector; (b) the all-round development of the economy, the banking and financial sector, innovations; (c) promoting the American development model around the world through the active functioning of NGOs, the media, and counter-propaganda.¹² The 1997 Strategy itself changed its name: it became known as the National Security Strategy for the New Century. It used more clear formulations of current and future challenges and threats, which were divided into three sections:

- Regional or state-centered threats;
- Transnational threats;
- Threats from weapons of mass destruction.

For the first time, the US approaches to new independent states were outlined in the 1997 Strategy. The term "new independent states" (NIS) was first used in the 1994 Strategy towards post-Soviet space. At the same time, the main attention was paid to Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan.

Simultaneously with the Strategy in 1997, the US Congress approved the first version of the law on its interests on the routes of the Silk Road¹³, thereby defining the contours of a kind of "road map" that allowed it to pursue its own policy in Central Asia, the Caucasus, the water area of the Caspian Sea and adjacent territories. Thus, the US administration outlined the directions and tools for cooperation with the specified macro-region.

¹¹ Zbigniew Brzezinski, The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and It's Geostrategic Imperatives – 1997

¹² See A National Security Strategy for a New Century - W.: The White House, - May 1997.

¹³ Silk Road Strategy Act of 1997. In fact, this was a package of additions to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, aimed at supporting the economic and political independence of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia.

The cooperation with the countries of the former so-called "socialist camp" was supplemented by the NATO Partnership for Peace program, established in 1994, which became a key area for establishing military and technical ties.¹⁴ Individual countries have begun negotiations on accession to GATT, whose economic reforms have been supported in the United States, as well as in the IMF, WB, and others.¹⁵

Washington sought to avoid a "head-on collision" with Moscow. Even when the US was not going to weaken Russia's influence in those countries where it was traditional, they sought to establish with them a form of relations that would comply American interests.¹⁶ Thus, the US was interested in an energetic process of democratization and liberalization of social and economic life in the post-Soviet space.¹⁷

The events of September 11, 2001 were a shock to the whole world, they corrected the vector of development of the US strategic policy, in particular, determined the definition of an external enemy threatening the preservation and development of American identity. According to Huntington, the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington pushed the US to combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, where the fight against terror was qualified as a war against militant Islam, one of the main enemies of America.¹⁸

In the 2002 strategy, the fight against terrorism and extremism is brought to the forefront of international relations, first considered in an

¹⁴ The Partnership for Peace (PfP) program was a system of measures for military cooperation between NATO and the European and post-Soviet countries. In the beginning, the project covered 24 countries, later some states came out of it.

¹⁵ The GATT agreement was replaced by the World Trade Organization (WTO) on January 1, 1995

¹⁶ The weakening of Moscow's influence became a natural consequence of the disintegration of the union state and the deep economic crisis in which the Russian Federation faced.

¹⁷ The issues of democratization and liberalization are increasingly being used not for their semantic-textbook purposes. In recent years, they are used not for their direct semantic purpose, but in servicing manipulations to achieve specific political goals.

¹⁸ Huntington. Ibid.

integrated and comprehensive scale. The new document determined the degree of threat that international terrorism poses to the US, the need to protect national interests and ways to combat it is grounded. The main counter-terrorism measures were preventive strikes against the enemy, representing a potential threat (preventive strike), and preemptive strikes against an opponent preparing for aggression (preemptive strike). Particular attention was paid in the 2002 Strategy to ways to prevent weapons of mass destruction from falling into the hands of terrorist organizations and rogue states (rouge states) that support the spread of terrorism.

The long-term goals of fighting terrorism are the provision of political and economic freedoms, peaceful coexistence with other countries, respect for human rights and its dignity.¹⁹ In connection with the need to justify new foreign policy principles, the document stressed that the fight against terrorism is part of the struggle to provide freedom to all of humanity, and American society was presented as a historical example of the commonwealth of nations and nations, races and religions, That the United States continue to export its standards in the world. This formulation of the question retained for the United States the moral right to continue to actively influence both international institutions and the political regimes of other countries. The main goal of the 2002 Strategy was to build a new system of the world order in accordance with the strategic goals of the United States.

Achievements along the lines of interaction with Russia, China, India, along with the coalition support received by the US in the first stages of anti-terrorist activity, were considered by Washington as a significant deepening of the processes of cardinal change in the world. Meanwhile, realizing the possibility of geopolitical obstruction on a global scale, Washington decided

¹⁹ A National Security Strategy of the United States of America. W.: The White House, September 2002.

to promote internal reforms in Russia and China. Regarding the Russian direction, the 2002 Strategy pointed to some positive changes taking place in Russia and called it an ally in the fight against terrorism, but it fixed the need to influence the refocusing of the mentality of Russia's political class in purely American interests. Concerning the Chinese direction, the United States considered the prospects for establishing cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Since the terrorist attacks of 2001 in the United States fundamentally influenced the disposition of America with other centers of power, the 2002 Strategy stipulates that European and Asian partners, like the Russian Federation, the PRC, India, other countries, together with the US, will seek rational solutions in Joint struggle against terrorism. Subsequent events have shown that largely unproductive joint campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq,²⁰ interspersed with NATO's activity in "squeezing" the European ABM system, initiating so-called "color revolutions" in the post-Soviet space, were not successful, Washington's aspirations to conduct antiterrorist activities were not brought to victory end.²¹ It became obvious that neither in Russia, nor in China, nor in other countries ready to solve common problems,²² did not recognize the unconditional leadership of the United States. In particular, the actions of Americans in the UN were not supported by the Russian Federation and the PRC. Russia began reforms to strengthen presidential power, limit the powers of liberal movements, and restore its military, political and economic influence in the newly independent Central Asian republics.

²⁰ The military operation in Iraq against the regime of Saddam Hussein became a kind of "Pandora's box", which spoiled the establishing relations between the US and its allies, on the one hand, and the Russian Federation and the PRC on the other.

²¹ The multiplicity of events could be supplemented by a description of some features of the US relations with other "players", from whose positions the panorama of current international relations became more complicated.

²² For example, the nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea, the fight against terrorist groups, etc.

The goals outlined in the 2006 Strategy radically changed the US position towards the Russian Federation, there was a very skeptical attitude towards the development of democracy in Russia. The document prescribes "The US should be prepared to act independently if necessary," and it was stated that the strengthening of US-Russian relations will directly depend on Moscow's domestic and foreign policies. Regarding China, the 2006 Strategy expresses concern that his leadership "adheres to the old way of thinking and acting, which increases concerns in the region and around the world."²³ We can assume that the 2006 Strategy in many respects repeated the 2002 document, based on the principles of protecting freedom and the idea of American leadership in the fight against global threats.

The retrospective analysis of the annually updated doctrinal documents that determine US foreign policy allows us to draw the following brief conclusions:

First, the US administration constantly revised and supplemented the National Security Strategy. This produced a process that unfolded both in the US itself and around the world in terms of the immediate awareness of "global content" that is changing as a result of the collapse of the bipolar system and the growing globalization. Some of the principles laid down in the reviewed Strategies have had a significant impact on the development of the entire system of international relations.

Second, by 2008, the American political class had realized that the United States could not rely on the voluntary and unconditional acceptance by other countries of American leadership.²⁴

²³ A National Security Strategy of the United States of America. W.: The White House., March 2006.

²⁴ For more than 15 years, after the collapse of the USSR and the emergence of new independent states in the world arena, fundamentally new paradigms of international political, economic, and humanitarian development are being established.

Third, the US actions around the world, mainly in oil-rich countries and regions, have led to the growth of anti-American sentiments.

Fourth, with all the negative developments, one cannot deny the preservation of American identity.²⁵ At the very least, the US positions itself as the only state that has enough financial, economic, political, military-technical and other forces to declare the global essence of its national interests.²⁶ Of course, these interests should be defended, demonstrating to the international community certain moral principles of their global leadership.

²⁶ De facto, it is a geopolitical code of global leadership of the United States, indicated not only in many studies, but also confirmed by the very practice of international relations.

References

1. Wright Thomas. The 2016 presidential campaign and the crisis of US foreign policy // Lowy Institute for International Policy, October 2016.
2. Donald Trump. Crippled America: How to Make America Great Again. - NY: Threshold Editions, 2015.
3. Barack Obama's win: News to make Jesse Jackson weep. Top of the Ticket // Los Angeles Times. - 04 December
4. National Security Strategy of the United States. W.: The White House, 1991.
5. Samuel Huntington. Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity. NY: Simon & Schuster 2004.
6. National Security Strategy of the United States - W.: The White House. - January 1993.
7. National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement - W.: The White House. - July 1994.
8. These military campaigns were undertaken in accordance with the 1994 Strategy, which provides for unilateral actions by the United States without coordination with international organizations and individual states. See National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. The White House, - February 1995.
9. National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. - The White House, - February 1996.
10. Zbigniew Brzezinski, The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and It's Geostrategic Imperatives - 1997
11. National Security Strategy for a New Century - W.: The White House, - May 1997.

12. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. W.:
The White House, September 2002.

13. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. W.:
The White House, March 2006.