

**Iryna Gabro**, Ph.D. in Political Science, Petro Mohyla Black Sea State University, Nikolaev, Ukraine.

#### **«THINK TANKS» AND THE PROCESS OF MAKING FOREIGN POLICY DECISIONS BY ADMINISTRATION OF US PRESIDENT PS. BUSH**

**Abstract.** *In the article the influence of «think tanks» in the process of making foreign policy decisions 43rd US President George. W. Bush is analysed. The feature constructed by the US liberal democratic system is that the American foreign policy process consists of a number of well-known components. In fact, chosen foreign policy is always a «compromise» between the viewpoints and positions of the various elements of the system of decision-making, ethnic and economic lobby groups, party leaders installations, fundamental foreign policy reasons. Such kinde of the main «repeaters» influencing American foreign policy process are research centers.*

*The article proves that feature acceptance of foreign policy decisions the administration of George. W. Bush was that the president and his entourage were given a monopoly on brain activity only one analytical center – «Project New American Century». Representatives of the organization lobbied the concept of preventive strikes for over 10 years. In particular, in preparation for the presidential elections in 2000, the organization published a report «Rebuilding American Defense» (Rebuilding America's Defenses), which became the basis of the national military strategy John. D. Bush and Rumsfeld. From their official submission to the doctrinal documents included the phrase «regime change». «Project New American century» the concept produced by Bush, which was to prevent the emergence of a global competitor US unipolarity is the preservation of the situation in the world. It is this «think tank» Bush told to recommendations of the report «Restructuring of American Defense». Based on the postulates of this report, unilateral policies of Washington led eventually to the war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and invading Iran's nuclear programme. But, leaders of «Project New American Century» claimed that their institution did not influence the decision to start the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. In general, the project was removed from the decision-making process even during the election campaign.*

**Key words:** *foreign policy, analytical center, «think tank», foreign policy strategy.*

**УДК 327(73)**

**Dmytro Lakishyk**,  
Ph.D. in History, Senior Research Fellow,  
The State Institution «Institute of World  
History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine»

#### **EVOLUTION OF US FOREIGN POLICY: FROM GEORGE BUSH TO BARACK OBAMA**

**Abstract.** *The article analyzes the doctrinal and geostrategic foundation of the US foreign policy in the period from George Bush to Barack Obama. We argue that the fundamental approach G.W. Bush was formally based on the concept of critical geopolitics, which made possible to use all known forms of influence to change the political and economic state systems in its focus. Further, we show that key means of implementing this strategy were: the rejection of isolationism and protectionism; focus on leadership as an alternative to isolationism; free and fair trade and open markets as opposed to protectionism; preventive influence on events.*

*The Obama administration demonstrates a clear commitment to multilateralism in making and implementing decisions that carry global significance. The proposed Barack Obama's foreign policy strategy contains a number of important innovations of tactical and strategic nature: in particular, for the first time it combines all of the key tools of American influence – diplomacy, economic instruments, military strength and intelligence; national security forces to serve geopolitical interests. We discuss four aspects of the foreign policy – security; economic prosperity; promotion of «universal values»; strengthening of world order under the American leadership.*

*International political strategy of the USA maintains a global focus, which requires daily reinforcement of global leadership and safeguarding of the active ties with allies and partners. US maintain a unique set of tools that enable a targeted and multidimensional influence on the world economy and international relations. At the same time, US foreign policy is becoming more balanced and restrained, avoiding excessive obligations, risk or resources.*

**Keywords:** *US foreign policy, the Strategy of «Global Democratization, National Security Strategy.*

For a long time American policy oscillates between active in international affairs and isolationism. After World War II, when the US became the center of a global system of alliances and the factor of relative geographical remoteness from world centers lost its previous value, isolationism as an alternative strategy became purely hypothetical. The center of gravity of American politics began to lean it periodically to unilateralism, then multilateralism. However, US policy has never been a pure embodiment of any of these approaches, but rather was a combination of them in different proportions, which is dominated by one or the other tendency.

The first test of US foreign policy strategy in the era of George Bush became containment of Saddam Hussein's aggressive regime embodied in military operation, known as the «Desert Storm». It has become traditional in the sense that after the liberation of Kuwait, US troops almost immediately ceased military operations and soon withdrew its contingent from the recent fighting zone [5, p. 274-278].

Immediately after the operation a legitimate question about the upcoming features of American foreign policy after the Cold war was arisen with a new force. Moreover, on the one hand, it was considered in two main angles – isolationism or interventionism, and the other – under the policy, which was based on using national military capabilities to promote freedom and human rights in other countries. This usually meant parallel impose US-style capitalism and democracy and left-total denial of social revolutions often from positions of racism and arrogance.

But at the time of George Bush coming to power there was a third form of influence on the essential principles of American foreign policy. It is a heavy psychological trauma suffered by several American generations as a result of the tragedy of Pearl Harbor, further participation in the Second World War, the wars in Korea and Vietnam and so on. The authorities in Washington didn't have simply to adapt to the post-bipolar world, but also permanently deleting the old isolationism as the basis of foreign policy interventionism to develop a new model for peaceful era.

The situation was such that in the years 1991–1992 accounted for a fairly massive disappointment of Americans in their own political system that, in their view, paid too much attention to the outside world, often at the expense of extraordinary costs and losses for the American nation. With the end of Cold war, they believed, the United States was «donated» to return at least to the active isolationism [18, p. 2-8]. This would mean denial of armed intervention as a way of solving the problems of other countries and its replacement for foreign economic expansion.

As it turned out this change in the American worldview was better felt and understood by Democrats. Their candidate Bill Clinton in his speeches and interviews focused on economic issues. The economic downturn in 1991, which coincided with the war in Iraq temporarily moved to second issue of «pure» foreign policy in the perception

of voters. Therefore, Clinton proposed the intensification of state regulation as a crucial means of revival of economic development.

But George Bush as the Republican candidate didn't thought that the neoconservative paradigm with the completion of Cold war becomes the object of study by historians. He focused his attention on international affairs, trying to win by manipulating foreign policy successes of his presidency, the first of which called to prevent Iraqi control over Kuwait. But the attempt to use the traditional conservative approach to solving economic problems on the background of the continuing deterioration of the situation in this area gave the opposite of the desired result.

Meanwhile, the US Presidential election in 1992 confirmed the fallibility of position of George Bush Administration, which in the disintegration of the Soviet Union as the main opponent of America continued to operate in the context of «external threats» to national interests, strengthening the defense industry, the latest developments to fight «insurgents» in different regions of the world and so on. And it happened after the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe, starting in 1989 that it had been identified by George Bush as the «triumph» of American ideals, but again within the paradigm of neo-conservative «end of history» [9, p. 9-12].

In fact, George Bush formally went beyond the dominant US foreign policy tradition of postwar era, and lost. To power came Clinton, who was not aware of the problems of foreign policy and diplomacy, but with serious intension to focus on the internal problems of American society. His presidential mandate he viewed as voters' order to focus on economic issues. The main principle of building foreign policy for himself, he formulated within the frames of no foreign enemy that could cause economic problems in America. Tough economic crisis, a huge foreign trade deficit, massive unemployment, drug addiction, failure of American democracy to deal with the problems of social and economic development with the isolationist bias of Democratic congressmen dictated President the secondary importance of the idea of international political activity [10, p. 1-2].

The economic security of the United States Clinton took to the key issues of foreign policy, its second largest order he called the restructuring of the armed forces, and the third was the spread of democratic values in the world. Characteristically, he told American diplomats about it before the official inauguration [6, p. 57-58].

Clinton's coming to power in 1992 meant American voters rejection to support a presidential candidate, whose main efforts were directed outward. The 42nd President of the United States firmly focused on fulfilling the promises of his mainly economic election program and achieved in this direction huge success, contrasted sharply with the policies of Ronald Reagan and George Bush.

Overall, before coming to power George W. Bush's administration, US policy could be described as «moderate hegemonic policy» [3]. It combines single and multilateral elements, so that partners in the transatlantic axis generally managed effectively coordinate their policies and interests. Although the tendency to new force approaches but in more cautious manner was felt in the strategy of liberal hegemony of Clinton's administration. This is obviously concerned and NATO Strategic Concept (1999), which was defined as a new kind of force and preventive measure «real response to the crisis» [17, p. 10].

But Democrats were kept from the straight and decisive actions to demonstrate the superiority of US by traditional propensity to multilateralism, fear accusations of

imperialism, a desire to present the actions of the US establishment unipolar structure within the «expansion of democracy». It is ignoring the exclusivity of America during the presidency of Clinton administration, neoconservatives believe, led the United States and the world to the crisis in September 2001 [19].

Victory of the Republican Party and George W. Bush in the presidential election in 2000 initiated the formation of a new US foreign policy strategy, which consisted of several important tenets. According to the «new strategy» the US foreign policy goal was that the White House will less take into account the interests of other political actors in accordance with universal rules and global institutions, will seek an exclusive and advanced role in combating the threat of terrorism and countries «axis of evil» (Libya, Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Cuba) that have weapons of mass destruction, will use military force to establish global order [14].

Political ideology which inherited George W. Bush from his idol Ronald Reagan in the interpretation of international foreign policy columnist B. Woodward largely reminiscent of that which was being taken for service by official Washington during the Second World War [21, p. 93-94]. He also pointed to the following pattern as how George W. Bush appointed to the high public office politicians who had gained their first experience in the Reagan administration. Their feature (that of the Minister of Defense Donald Rumsfeld in particular) was that they formed for themselves an image of contemporary world in the frames of «high risk» [8, p. 35].

On the basis of Reagan's political ideology, according to the statements of George W. Bush, built his entire international political activity was built, it identified the features of contemporary American neo-conservatism and interventionism. Its essence was explained at one time by analyst James Mack, for whom the very possibility of murdering people or victims (by the Americans) can be, among other compelling reasons, due to «protect the nation-state, if there is a threat on» [13, p. 47-48].

Foreign policy doctrine for the US administration of George W. Bush was the result of rethinking traditional concepts of security. Given this new American approach was based on the fact that freedom and democracy are the main guarantors of security and stability and the spread of freedom is the most effective response to international terrorism. The fight against terrorism as a priority of the country was the basis for foreign policy of the president and reflected in the program of the Republican Party. Administration of George W. Bush spontaneously faced a long-standing problem of a purely domestic nature that is inconsistency of American democracy to the tendencies of the international community. It is increasingly becoming the subject of domestic political discourse in the American establishment. Analytical and scientific communities are not exception. But it is significant as in accordance with the views of social scientists syndrome affects traditional Americanism [2, c. 52-59].

Such an explicit bias towards unilateralism shown by the administration of George W. Bush was temporary departure from the traditions of American foreign policy, which would be adjusted in with the arrival of new president Barack Obama. The foreign policy of the Republican administration was not an opportunistic deviation, but marked the end of the whole era: «it is both a symptom and cause of the collapse of consensus on liberal internationalism that guided the United States for nearly half a century. Geopolitical and domestic political conditions that gave rise to liberal internationalism disappeared, destroying its two-party political basis» [11, p. 56]. US needed to develop a sound and

balanced foreign policy strategy, based on a more sustainable balance of political forces in the country.

American community and the world in general welcomed the election of Barack Obama president of the United States because of what he represented the completion of the policy of unilateral actions of the previous administration of George W. Bush. In the keynote speech «A new strategy for a new world», Obama offered his own vision of ways to solve the most difficult problems of American foreign policy. Among the priorities of the president attention was paid to upgrading international alliances involving the US in accordance with the XXI century, to the effective use of multilateral diplomacy tools, forming an effective system of energy security, participation in the development of a legally binding international treaty that will include a significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere etc.

To the modern American foreign policy doctrines can be include qualitatively new «Obama doctrine» concept which has been entered the political vocabulary by leading columnist of «The American Prospect» and «The Washington Independent» Spencer Ackerman is March 24, 2008. In his view, the 44<sup>th</sup> US President during the election debates with Hillary Clinton in California, held on January 31, 2008, presented his doctrinal approach based on the principles of unprecedented scale criticism of the administration's foreign policy of George W. Bush. The political history of American postwar era did not know a similar severity in assessment of the international course of his predecessor by presidential candidate. It actually refers to the collision of two forms and manifestations of American internationalism or interventionism in the XXI century. The first of them was reproduced and implemented by the administration of George W. Bush and called for the key role of the power factor. Its strategic consequence was the spread of anti-American sentiment in the world, including the territory of states that are traditional allies of the United States.

The second dimension of internationalism, which was proposed by the administration of Obama, provided the US power advantage as an example, using the mechanisms of multilateralism and active diplomacy, even when it comes to so-called «failed states» or members of the international community, demonstrating intent to violate the principles of non-proliferation destruction.

The implementation of the concept of the US foreign policy was embodied in the «National Security Strategy», which was published by Barack Obama in May 2010 and February 2015, which defined the principles of defending the geopolitical interests of America in the world today. «National Security Strategy» was the basic doctrinal document in which for domestic politicians, the public and the outside world has been laid out goals, objectives and methods of its implementation in national and international security. The strategy makes it possible to see the degree of continuity and novelty of the approach of the relevant administration to the US national security.

«National Security Strategy» proposed by Barack Obama contains a number of important innovations of tactical and strategic character: it is for the first time proposed to combine the basic tools of American power – diplomacy, economic instruments, military power, intelligence, internal security force to achieve geopolitical interests. The document highlighted four aspects: safety; economic prosperity; promotion of «universal values»; strengthening world order under American leadership. «National Security Strategy» examines the scientific and technological achievements as an instrument to ensure the US security priorities, including the protection of the US troops from

asymmetric attacks; enforcement of agreements on arms control and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; prevent terrorist attacks in the United States; protection of information infrastructure, communications and transport [15; 16].

Thus, the strategy does not fully withdrawn the idea of presidential administration right to unilateral military power actions by the choice of the USA: «when all other methods have been used it sometimes becomes necessary to use force. Before waging war we carefully weigh the risks and costs of action and inaction ... We will strive for broad international support, including such institutions as NATO and the UN Security Council. The United States retains the right to unilateral action when it is necessary to defend our country and our interests, but we will strive to adhere to the rules governing the use of force» [15].

Commenting on the «National Security Strategy» of Obama administration, Javier Solana, former High Representative of the Union for Foreign and Security Policy and former Secretary General of NATO, and now president of the Center for Global Economy and Geopolitics international business school ESADE, notes that are «national» strategy of Obama goes beyond the dominant, unilateral paradigm of the previous strategy of George W. Bush and contains commitments to respect international law. Obama's approach to security, stresses Javier Solana, is broader due to the proposed «triple formula», which includes the following components – defense, diplomacy and development as an integral parts of a unified concept of security.

According to Javier Solana, the military dimension of intervention in the affairs of foreign countries, thus lose its priority role, giving way to the politics of conflict prevention and peacekeeping and stabilization missions. In particular, the war in Afghanistan and the complex situation in Iraq, says Javier Solana, stressed the importance of a comprehensive approach to international security: military actions can't be considered the only part of the benefits [4]. According to political analyst Yuri Dulerayn, Barack Obama maintains the idea of service to a historical mission of the US – to guarantee global security, but unlike his predecessors, Obama's strategy recognizes the value of partnership, gives more importance to civil choice as opposed to military dimension and underlines the importance of dialogue and the need to strengthen international institutions. Therefore, the strategy of Obama in terms of Yuri Dulerayn, shows the political aspirations of the USA to support the international order able to solve problems of international security [1].

It should be noted that the tendency of Obama to multilateral policy coordination system has its limits. This show that even with a strong desire to translate his ideas into reality, President Obama has serious external structural limitations. However, with constructive statements about the need to find an international consensus on the basis of balance of interests Obama insists on compulsory preservation of American leadership in the world and strengthening its maintenance tools. Thus, the president announced intentions to further increase the US military budget and the armed forces, to provide them with new modern types of weapons, to maintain an extensive network of American military bases around the world for maintaining the US military superiority over any country or group of countries. His concept of multilateral cooperation involves the further transformation of NATO in Europe, and establishing formal ties with mutual obligations between NATO and other allied countries such as Australia and New Zealand.

In terms of analysts confirmation of continued the US global leadership policies is observed in the annual address «The situation of the country» at the end of the first term

of presidency of Obama, with which he spoke before Congress on January 24, 2012 [20] and which outlined the plans of the US administration in 2012 in the areas of domestic and foreign policy.

New approaches of Obama on issues of the US foreign policy relate especially the restoration of the American world leadership. It refers to the significance of state authority in the world, to strengthening ties with Europe, Asia, Latin America, maintaining further changes in the Middle East, and the continuation of the policy of democratic values protection throughout the world, particularly in Syria and Burma. As an achievement of the current administration Obama noted the stabilization of the situation in Afghanistan – minimization of military operations in this country and the transfer of responsibility for the safety of its own country to the Afghan government. «The United States will continue to develop a strong partnership with Afghanistan – said Obama – that terrorist and other armed attacks will never begin from this country». Obama supported the «wave of change» in North Africa and the Middle East and spoke about the situation in Syria, calling on the president of the country Assad to immediate democratic reforms. An important focus of the US administration, says the statement, remain issues of mass destruction weapon non-proliferation and safe storage of nuclear materials. Thus, the United States insist that North Korea adhered to promises to renounce nuclear weapons because of it conducted the test [12; 20].

Stressing that the world transiently transforms and the US are not able to control every situation, Obama, however, argues that America is the only country in international relations, which is able to influence any crisis. As a political declaration can be viewed the rhetoric of Obama that while he is a president, «America will be a great nation, and all the problems will be overcome, all the missions will be made to achieve a common goal» [7].

So, the decisive influence on American foreign policy during the twentieth century was the ideology, which was based on the principles of liberal democracy and free market. Gradually becoming «the empire of liberty» the United States gradually shifted to the implementation of relevant ideological tenets in its foreign policy. Actually because of this in the era of George W. Bush gained strategic significance and specific political content the idea, the concept, doctrine and strategy of creating a world order based on shared values of democracy and the free market.

During the presidency of George W. Bush the United States undertake a number of features that were previously exclusive authority of the UN. If during the two presidencies of Clinton it happened selectively, then George W. Bush didn't longer limited himself to decide on strategies to combat international terrorism and the global spread of Euro-American model democracy.

Betting on the fight against international terrorism, George W. Bush won in the short term. However, unilateral action against Iraq led to a political and social crisis in the US and shook confidence of the American community in the president.

By the end of the second term of George W. Bush presidency it became obvious that his doctrine of the US «global dominance», which was originally seen as effective «grand strategy», could not be realized. If Clinton has used globalization in the interests of the US, George W. Bush tried to control via the doctrine of «global democracy» world development, believing it possible to impose criteria and values of the American way of life on other countries. War (later called the struggle) against global terrorism under the slogan «a bright future for all mankind» did not lead to the attraction of this strategy in

the world global processes on conditions that suited the US. Accordingly, incompatibility of vectors of world and American global policy caused the change of administration in the White House and led to a «new American course», proposed by the Democratic Party of the United States.

The main strategies of the administration Obama are the strategy of «global leadership», «containment and engagement» and «limited intervention», each of which provides a comprehensive approach to security and preserving American leadership in the world, considering the peculiarities of the international positioning of other key actors of the global system. The main goal of the strategy is defined national update for strengthening the US global leadership, which implies military power, economic competitiveness, moral authority, active participation in international political processes globally and efforts to streamline the international system. As the US continues to have unique resources, which in previous decades allowed it to keep leadership of the country in the world. However, providing leadership linked, as in previous presidential administrations policies, the concept of messianic exclusivity of the US for a long term.

#### Література

1. Дулерайн Ю. У США оприлюднили нову стратегію національної безпеки / Ю. Дулерайн // Радіо свобода. – 2010. – 27 травня. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.radiosvoboda.org/content/article/2054788.html>.
2. Лакішик Д. Доктрина «глобальної демократизації» Дж. Буша-молодшого / Д. Лакішик // Сполучені Штати Америки у сучасному світі: політика, економіка, право, суспільство. Збірник матеріалів II міжнародної науково-практичної конференції (15 травня 2015 р., м. Львів). – Львів: Центр американських студій ФМВ ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2015. – Ч. 2. – С. 52-59.
3. Линк В. Имперский или плюралистический мир? / В. Линк // Internationale Politik. – 2003. – № 3. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.deutschebotschaft-moskau.ru/ru/bibliothek/internationale-politik/2003-03/article06.html>.
4. Солана Х. Стратегія безпеки для XXI століття / Х. Солана // День. – 2010. – 17 червня. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.day.kiev.ua/uk/article/den-planeti/strategiya-bezpeki-dlya-xxi-stolitnya>.
5. Beschloss M.R., Talbott S. At the Highest Levels. The Inside Story of the Cold War / M.R. Beschloss, S. Talbott. – Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1993. – 876 p.
6. Bill Clinton Address to the Diplomatic Corps. January 18, 1993 // Department of State Dispatch. – 1993. – February 1. – P. 57-58.
7. Friedman G. Obama's Foreign Policy: The End of the Beginning / G. Friedman // Real Clear World / A Stratfor Intelligence Report, 26.08.2009. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20090824\\_obamas\\_foreign\\_policy\\_end\\_beginning](http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20090824_obamas_foreign_policy_end_beginning).
8. Hayward S. J. The Age of Reagan: The Decline of the Old Liberal Order, 1964–1980 / S. J. Hayward. – New York: Prima, 2001. – 432 p.
9. Hoff J., Farnham C. Theories about the End of Everything / J. Hoff, C. Farnham // Journal of Women's History. – 1990. – Vol. 1. – P. 6-12.
10. International Herald Tribune. – 1992. – November 6. – P. 1-2.
11. Kupchan C., Trubowitz P. Liberal Visions at Home and Abroad. Dead Center: The Demise of Liberal Internationalism in the United States / C. Kupchan, P. Trubowitz // International Security. – 2007. – Fall. – Vol. 32. – № 2. – P. 48-60.
12. Larrabee F. S., Chivvis Ch. Biden's task in Eastern Europe: Reassurance / F. S. Larrabee, Ch. Chivvis // The Christian Science Monitor. – 20.10.2009. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2009/1020/p09s03-coop.html>.
13. Mack J. Nationalism and the Self / J. Mack // The Psychohistory Review. – 1983. – Spring. – P. 47-48.
14. A National Security Strategy of the United States of America. – Washington, DC: The White House, 2002. – September. – 35 p. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>.

15. A National Security Strategy of the United States of America. – Washington, DC: The White House, 2010. – May. – 60 p. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss\\_viewer/national\\_security\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf).
16. A National Security Strategy of the United States of America. – Washington, DC: The White House, 2015. – February. – 29 p. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015\\_national\\_security\\_strategy\\_2.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy_2.pdf).
17. The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington 23-24 April 1999. – Brussels, 1999. – 119 p.
18. Schlesinger A. Jr. Back to the Womb? Isolationism's New Threat / A. Jr. Schlesinger // Foreign Affairs. – 1995. – Vol. 74. – № 2. – P. 2-8.
19. Schmitt G. Case of Continuity / G. Schmitt // The National Interest. – 2002. – Fall. – № 69. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16753>.
20. State of the Union: President Obama's Speech 2012. – Washington, D.C. – 2012. – January 24. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/state-of-the-union-2012>.
21. Woodward B. Plan of Attack / B. Woodward. – New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004. – 467 p.

**Дмитро Лакішик**, кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, ДУ «Інститут всесвітньої історії НАН України».

### **ЕВОЛЮЦІЯ ЗОВНІШНЬОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ США: ВІД ДЖОРДЖА БУША ДО БАРАКА ОБАМИ**

***Анотація.** У статті аналізуються доктринальні та геостратегічні засади зовнішньої політики США від Дж. Буша до Б. Обами. Доведено, що фундаментальний підхід Дж. Буша-молодшого формально базувався на концепті критичної геополітики, який уможлилював використання всіх відомих форм впливу для зміни політичних і економічних систем держави, на які він спрямовується. Основними засобами реалізації стратегії визнано: відмову від ізоляціонізму і протекціонізму; курс на лідерство як альтернативу ізоляціонізму; вільна і чесна торгівля та відкриті ринки на противагу протекціонізму; формування нового світу; превентивний вплив на події.*

*Адміністрація Б. Обами демонструє очевидну прихильність ідеям багатосторонності у прийнятті глобально значимих рішень та їх реалізації. Запропонована Б. Обамою зовнішньополітична стратегія містить низку важливих новацій тактичного і стратегічного характеру: зокрема, уперше пропонується поєднати основні інструменти американського впливу – дипломатію, економічні інструменти, військову потугу, розвідку; сили забезпечення внутрішньої безпеки для досягнення геополітичних інтересів.*

*Міжнародно-політична стратегія США зберігає глобальну спрямованість, що потребує повсякденного підтвердження глобального лідерства та збереження активних зв'язків з союзниками та партнерами. США зберігають унікальний набір засобів, які дозволяють здійснювати цілеспрямований багатоаспектний вплив на світову економіку та міжнародні відносини. Водночас міжнародна політика США стає більш виваженою та обережною, уникаючи надмірних зобов'язань, ризикованих рішень та надмірних витрат ресурсів.*

***Ключові слова:** зовнішня політика США, стратегія «глобальної демократизації», стратегія національної безпеки.*

**УДК 94:327:329.11(73) Р.Рейган**

**Юлія Панченко,**  
кандидат історичних наук, доцент,  
Сумський державний університет

### **НЕОКОНСЕРВАТИЗМ ТА ЗОВНІШНЯ ПОЛІТИКА ПРЕЗИДЕНТА Р. РЕЙГАНА**

***Анотація.** Сучасні дослідження в США, Європі висвітлюють різні аспекти ідеології неоконсерватизму, при цьому дуже мало уваги приділяється дослідженню унікальності правління Р. Рейгана в плані створення різноманітних наукових інститутів, що займалися зовнішньою політикою, а також збагачення зовнішньополітичної концепції*