CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES IN THE PROCESS OF US NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY MAKING

КОНЦЕПЦИСКИ ПРИСТАПИ ВО ПРОЦЕСОТ НА ДОНЕСУВАЊЕ НА НАЦИОНАЛНАТА БЕЗБЕДНОСНА ПОЛИТИКА НА САД

MA Oliver STOJANOSKI
MOD, Army of the Republic of Macedonia
oliverstojanoski@gmail.com

PhD Toni NAUMOVSKI
MOD, Army of the Republic of Macedonia
toninaumovski@yahoo.com

Abstract

The conceptual approach towards the process of adopting foreign policy and national security decisions in the United States is of particular importance for the management of the same process. The access and theories define different approaches and are extremely important for both the US foreign policy, as well as the process of adopting national security policy. Each of the separate theories reflects the process of the US administration in making military and political decisions through the conventional approach and supporting the grand strategy. Contrary to this approach, the unconventional approach tends to be aimed at displaying national security through legislation, despite the unpredictability and the complexity of the fundamental laws of nature. In the political discourse of the United States, however, supporters of conservatism and neo-conservatism, two opposite views and approaches to the foreign policy and national security, further complicate the already complex cohesion of all institutions and government bodies involved in the process.

Апстракт

Концепциискиот пристап кон процесот на донесувањето на надворешно политичките и националните одлуки за безбедност во САД е од особено значење за менаџирањето на истиот процес. Пристапот и теориите ги дефинираат различните приоди и се, исклучително важни како за американската надворешна политика, така и за самиот процес на донесувањето на политиката за национална безбедност. Секоја од посебните теории го отсликуваат процесот на американската администрација во донесувањето на воени и политички одлуки, преку конвенцијалниот пристап и поддржувањето на големата стратегија. Спротивно на овој пристап неконвенцијалниот пристап има тенденција да биде во насока на прикажување на националната безбедност преку законска регулатива, и покрај непредвидливоста и комплексноста на основните закони на природата. Во политичкиот дискурс на САД пак, приврзаниците на конзерватизмот и неоконзерватизмот, две спротивни мислења и пристапи кон надворешната политика и националната безбедност, дополнително ја усложнуваат и така сложената кохезија на сите институции и владини тела вклучени во процесот.

Клучни зборови: Национална безбедност, конвенционален пристап, неконвенцијален пристап, конзервативен и неоконзервативен пристап.

1. Introduction

The conceptual context and the theories of national security policy are important for understanding the framework of the formation and access to it. In addition, it is necessary to perceive the nature of policies through theories, events and approaches that overlap with the foreign policy. The paper analyses the development of the conceptual framework for understanding and explaining the political events in the world and the need for understanding the major theories. Some supporters of these theories try to unite the literature with the legislation. For example, the classical approaches of (Claude, 2005) are

useful as well as the John's innovations, (John Norton and Moore, 2005), in form of incentive theory.

The conventional approach in the process of adopting the US national security includes several theories where primacy is given to the grand strategy of the United States whereupon the military structure bears the main primacy when making decisions.

The unconventional approach involves a series of theories that give a general impression that on the other hand rules out the use of military force and favors the production and trade of goods and services (the economy) that would contribute to the benefits in the entire society.

The complexity of the conservative foreign policy requires careful examination and, as a consequence of the Cold War, the American Conservatives developed a warlike reputation, while military adventurism is not, nor ever was, a conservative value in America.

Unlike the conservative approach, the conviction of Neoconservatives and the use of the US military power are needed and necessary in order to defend the great American values. The neoconservative US foreign policy in the modern politics lately is most noticeable during the George Bush administration and the global war against terrorism.

2. Conventional approach to the national security

According Hart (Hart, 1954), the approach starts with the idea that the theory and the strategy are overlapping in a grand strategy, which can be defined as the integration of military-political and economic resources in order to fulfill the ultimate goal of the states in the international system.[3] Each nation usually has explicit or implicit strategy on how to deal with other countries/regions in the world regarding the security and defense issues. However, the grand strategy is usually in the domain of the scientists, (such as Waltz, 1979; Gaddis, 1982; Heymann, 2003; Ikenberry, 2002; Mead, 2004; Nye, 2002) as well as those who elaborate the struggle against the terrorism (Clark, 2003; Frum and Perle, 2003; Kagan, 2003; Brzezinski, 2004; Cronin and Ludes 2004; Etzioni, 2004; Ferguson, 2004; Hart, 2004; Stevenson, 2004; Barnett, 2005). (Metz and Johnson, 2001) done a review of the concepts background through a strategic asymmetry i.e. use of the differences to get an

---

[3] Biddle, Stephen D. (2005) "American Grand Strategy After, 9/11: ANSSESSMENT", USA.
See more on: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub603.pdf

advantage against the opponent, as well as (Walt, 2005) who presented the realism and states that the war against the global terrorism should be considered by how the other countries perceive it, not only from an American perspective. Walt considers several opportunities, from balancing and asymmetric strategies, through binding approaches of the alliance, the institutions and the norms. Walt emphasize the so-called "offshore balancing" as ideal for the US grand strategy, an approach which is part of the Balance of Power theory.

The isolationism and exceptionalism have always been hidden theories in any foreign policy debate. (Hook and Spanier, 2006) however describe the new American style of foreign policy acquired with the grand strategy feeling, and through the primacy of conducting preventive wars.

For something to qualify as a theory, it can be monitored by the analysis of Moore and Turner which identify six different approaches, as follows:

- Balance of Power approach;
- Collective Security approach;
- World Federalist approach;
- Functionalist approach;
- Democratic Peace approach and
- Incentive approach.

Balance of Power approach

The Balance of Power approach is one of the most effective and popular segments to the national security. The term dates from 1740 when Frederick the Great (1712-1786), introduces for the first time in his book "Anti-Machiavel", as idea that balancing of power is actually parity or stability between the competing forces. This theory supports the idea of "just equilibrium" in the world, a doctrine or an axiom designed to prevent any nation to become strong enough to enable implementation of its will on the rest. The world is reflected as part of rational actors and unification in alliances or coalitions to counter threats. Technically speaking forming these "alliances" (as well as most of the international organizations) are formalized with a long term agreement, while "coalitions" are generally

less formalized and for a shorter period of time to perform specific tasks.[4] According to (Lansford, 2006) there are three major security alliances in the world, first is NATO, second the Security Treaty between United States and Japan and third is the Commonwealth of Independent States created of twelve countries of the former USSR.

Through the realist tradition in the international relations, the definition of balance of power, according to (Waltz, 1979), who states that nations created and will create weak coalitions in order to fight against the stronger enemy. The balancing can be internal or external-foreign. Internal balancing is when a state is strengthened by mobilizing resources within its borders, and external balance refers to the formation of coalitions and alliances against a common enemy. Historically, the transition caused by the increase in power and the challenge of the great powers often led to new security threats worldwide. Independent states that are not in alliances also persist through balance of power approach but in other forms, such as regional alliances and informal alliances. There is, also, another approach called hegemony. The hegemony is the fastest way to reduce the anarchy, but leads to an increase in military force that can lead to counter effects. Wars should not happen in the theory of balance of power, since each country constantly monitor the security agenda of its friendly or hostile possible alliances or states.

Collective security approach

The term collective security was first mentioned in 1914 during the First World War and represents substitution for the balance of power approach, although historically this idea is attributed to (Kant, 1724-1804). The collective security approach perceives the national security as benefit in the new world order. That is the theoretical basis of the United Nations Organization and the League of Nations.[5]

The theory rejects the possibility of alliances and neutral states to act alone, instead that is replaced with the claim that "an attack against a State is an attack against all States". The basis of this theory states that countries should be free from the burden of providing their own national security because weak nations cannot defend themselves, and

---

[4] Steven M. Douglas V. (2001) "Asymmetry and U.S. military, strategy: Definitions, background, and strategic concepts", USA.
More on: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub223.pdf
[5] Kent, R. (2004) "Collective security and humanitarian intervention".
More on: www.alnap.org/pool/files/14b%20Kent%20paper.pdf

the stronger nations are often involved in arming race. This theory calls on peaceful collaboration, and as such differentiates from the term "collective defense" as some confuse it. NATO is a classic example of "collective defense", while the UN are classical example of collective security organization. The fundamental collective security approach, according to (Claude, 2005), is that violence should be the last place in seeking changes, instead the peace right should be respected in the international relations. If this peace process does not bring results and proves as dysfunctional, the status quo must be respected in order nations to help themselves in collective security.

World Federalist Approach

The basics of this principle cover ideas and decisions which should not be made at high level in the society, but each individual shall have the right to increase the influence and his own opinion on the politics. Few of these opinions can be found in the Federalist Paper No. 20, noted by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, where the authors address to the citizens of New York with an appeal to accept the federalist approach for the politics following the example of Netherlands.[6] This approach supports the idea that the sovereignty should be achieved by each individual's effort which should be completed by adopting civil and state establishment i.e. policy or sovereignty, "...from individuals... ends with civil policy".[7] As a movement, the world federalism draws its inspiration from the globalization and multiculturalism, replacing the international law (referring to states) with a global law which applies to individuals and requires UN reforms in order to increase the role in the social, ecological and human rights, and especially in the minority rights. The most visible achievement of this theory is the Rome Statute from 1998, which lead to establishing the International Criminal Court in 2002.

Functionalist Principle

The Functionalist Principle in the field of global policy aims to establish a stable, predictable growth and development model in the world, by establishing the necessary

---

[6] Alexander H. and James M. (1787),FEDERALIST No. 20, (The Insufficiency for the Present Confederation to Preserve the Union), From the New York Packet.
More on: http://www.foundingfathers.info/federalistpapers/fed20.htm
[7] More on: http://www.foundingfathers.info/federalistpapers/fedindex.htm

organization which will have tasks that ought to be conducted in certain parts and regions of the world in the name of the general welfare. The mutual need of uniting the nations beyond their borders is one of the main postulates of this theory. The functionalist principle, in terms of pluralism, is a principle where the integration between the nations from different races supports the idea of tolerance, mutual respect and cooperation. In such a frame, the nations will constantly seek allegiance to an agency or organization that mostly helps them to enrich their lives, to achieve human dignity or to seek higher values.

Democratic Peace Approach

The democratic peace approach represents a theory of responsible government based on the idea that the democracies worldwide will almost never start a war between themselves, statement expressed by the philosopher (Kant, 1795) in his essay named "Perpetual Peace".[8] Some theorists (Jack, 1988) support this idea as most closely related to what is called respecting the right of the international relations. Throughout history this proved to be true because, according to (Rummel, 2003) and his analysis, in the period between 1816 and 1991 there were no wars between the democracies in the world, while at the expense of this, there were 155 wars between democracies and non-democracies and 198 wars between non-democratic states.[9]

Incentive Approach

This approach is attributed to (Moore, 2005) who also defined the name - democratic governance, a theory that supports the foreign policy, while its main focus is on the rule of law and trade agreements. Not all non-democracies are considered as threat to the peace, but the democracies usually start a war as defenders rather than as aggressors against dictatorial regimes. As a contribution to this theory also goes the deterrence concept as external stimulus provided against war and terrorism, it plays a key role in this theory, at least in regard to the explanation where the democracies, geographically and strategically, enter into war. Intimidation alone is not a good idea for the overall foreign policy, but due to the failure of other methods as sanctions, diplomatic actions and similar. It is important

---

[8] More on: https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/kant/kant1.htm
[9] More on: http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/MIRACLE.HTM

to emphasize that Moore does not support the intimidation idea, in classic terms of the military strategist Sun Tzu ("The Art of War"). It is evident that this approach has positive consideration in connection to the fight against terrorism and the manner in which that war should be included in the foreign policy.

3. Unconventional Approach to the National Security Theory

One of the ways to explain the unconventional theories can be perceived through ideas in academic circles known as cultural studies, which likewise represent a new practice in the second half of the 20th century.

Cultural studies, as their subject of study, take the production and the supply of goods that positively contribute to the society. It is about media presentation, literary texts, psychoanalysis, ideology and political aspects of everyday life. The unconventional approach of national security theories covers the following: Chaos Theory, Game Theory, Globalization Theory, Postcolonialism Theory, Neo-Marxist Theory.

Chaos Theory

The Chaos Theory represents a concept developed in the mid-70s and it refers to extremely sensitive issues related to the national security. This approach also supports the complexity theory which includes studying the complex political systems with an emphasis on foreign policy, where the chaos and the right will constantly be on the edge.[10] Most of the debates on the chaos theory are directed towards how many concepts are based on the accurate mathematics or how many concepts are just literary metaphors (Hayles, 1991). Theoretical development of this theory tends to be in the direction of showing the national security through a legal regulation, besides the unpredictability and complexity of the nature's basic laws.

---

[10] More on: http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol7_2/Clemens.htm

Game Theory

Lately, the strict supporters of the game theory seem more likely as supporters of a conventional than unconventional approach, because the fact that the relatively recent events indicate to that, for example the "theory of moves" (Brams, 1994), remains the same. In the area of international relations, the game theory cannot remain without critics (Schelling, 1960), who emphasize the lack of trust concept, but since 1983 it is also used with the beginning of the terrorism model (Sandler, 1983). The game theory has also contributed to several models of deterrence, arming race, while the central issue is when an actor or state should rationally decide with whom he is going to cooperate and what are the adverse factors if he does it by himself.

Globalization Theory

This theory is, actually, a process of establishing global institutions which became popular in the 90s, placing themselves as an evolution of the global policy and economy in the post-communism, capitalism and technology. There are many definitions on the globalization and, of course, an open debate in positive and negative terms of the word (Lechner and Boli, 2000).

This theory, for example, states that the internet expansion in the so-called Third World will influence the reduction of nationalist conflicts and that the internet transparency will contribute to the flow of financial services, to the economy and the culture. The globalization theory tends to maintain a constant balance, and also to destroy the gap between rich and poor, the growing monopolization, transnational criminal etc.

Post colonialism Theory

The post colonialism theory represents an ideological learning of the culture's influence on the western colonialism, as part of the consequences that occur or neo-colonialism or the need of new articulation in the policy. Post-colonialism includes a historian version (change) as well, since most of the countries in the world, in order to avoid

the deep experience with colonialism, often change the history, and although it seems paradoxically, it provides them a national identity.[11]

In order to be better understood, the post-colonialism theory is closely related to the imperialism theory, through the most popular scientist in this field, Edward Said (1978; 1993), and even through the famous historian Frantz Fanon, who says that in the essence, it is an anti-colonialism theory. The Said's book (Said, 1978) "Orientalism" was quite influential in that period, claiming that there is no way for the Asians to be completely exempt from the stereotype of colonialism. The same author also introduces a new theory of identity policy, it is a theory on the social injustice of all kinds of organization of regional resistance movements that occurred or will occur in order to result in "liberating" effect.

Neo-Marxist Theory

Neo-Marxist theory is the fundamental Marxist model that suffered complex changes, and the most striking is the distancing of the classical policy and the acceptance of the Frankfurt School's approaches to the study of fascism and totalitarianism. Other theories have also arisen as a critique of the fascism (the root of evil in the world), and it is a theory of relentless cancellation and opposition (Cutler, 1999). Neo-Marxist research tends not to focus to the power only, which leads to many opened questions regarding the policy of interventions in the name of national security (Robinson, 1996). Neo-Marxism as theory should be developed, because its emphasis on the conflict is completely compatible with the realism or the power of the policy in the international relations.

4. US Conservatism and Foreign Policy

Political discourse of American conservative supporters may be freely categorized as no longer "war minded" when it comes to foreign policy. Considered from different perspectives of individuals and experts in the political culture, the conservatism expanded its spectrum of activity in the US foreign policy.[12] As a consequence of the Cold War, the

---

[11] More on: http://english.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/Jouvert/

[12] Wagner, R. (2015), The Decline of Military Adventurism in the Conservative Big Tent: Why Grassroots Conservatives in the United States Are Embracing a More Cautious Foreign Policy, Sage Journals, USA.

American conservatives had developed warlike reputation, while the military adventurism neither is, nor has ever been, a conservative value in the United States. For this very reason, the different approaches on the foreign policy will be examined, viewed within the great conservative module to examine any possible future wars. Some of the intellectuals, the realists in particular, do not have to be identified as "conservatives", but their influence on the conservative foreign policy must be taken into consideration.[13]

Ever since the time of Reagan, the American conservatives were successful and had the possibility to create "big circle of protection" and this is where the question whether this big circle would refer to the US foreign policy in future is posed. For the conservative interventionism the war does not only mean acquiring political or military goals. Instead, if there is a potential threat for the conservatives in the security domain, they would immediately support any military intervention. Unlike, non-conservatives dominate in the foreign policy by direct or indirect influence on the US military power. According to (Wagner, 2015), the conservatives can be divided in four categories: those who do not support the military intervention, careful realists, warlike realists and neo-conservatives. The first ones, who do not support the military intervention (mostly often with liberal beliefs) are convinced that precisely the enemies were provoked by the United States. As an example, they claim that Al-Qaeda attacked on September 11th, 2001 exclusively because the increased military presence of the United States in the Near and Middle East. This has been confirmed by the Ron Paul's statement in 2008 during the presidential debate who said, "They do not come here to attack us because we are rich and we are free. They come and they attack us because we're over there (Ron Paul, presidential candidate)". Gradually, the supporters of the non-military intervention were removed during the Bush's administration, as well as during the Republican elections in 2006 and 2008. The second category, i.e. the careful or cautious realists is usually on the same side with the supporters of the non-military policy, but for other reasons. They refuse any idea for military intervention beyond the country's borders, except in cases when other nations would be in a position to harm the United States. According to (Wagner, 2015), this completely ignores the balance of the large forces' power, and that is actually the ideology of realists in the foreign policy. However, the cautious realists would usually avoid military intervention of any kind, believing that the military adventurism is unreasonable and without purpose. On

---

More on: http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/5/1/2158244015575556
[13] Ibid, page.1

the other hand, the cautious realists certainly provide a complete support for a strong national defense, believing that the enemies should not be provoked by the United States.

The third category or the "warlike realists" share an interesting and pragmatic view to the world apart from the other realists. Followers of the military intervention are equally aware of the power policy and are constantly concerned about the balance or the distribution of the large forces' power. They also believe that the occasional interventions, maybe in certain situations, are justified, but still they do not believe that the United States can efficiently make the world safe for full democracy.

The fourth category, or non-conservatives, such as Charles Krauthammer, supports the military interventions in order to establish a whole new global harmony in the world, led by the United States. Non-conservatives during the Cold War, Bill Kristol and Robert Kagan had similar views as Krauthammer, such as "American hegemony is the only reliable defense against a breakdown of peace and international order" (Kristol and Kagan, 2011).

5. US Neo-conservatism and Foreign Policy

The beginnings of the neo-conservatism in the US policy occurred in late 60s, and its greatest influence was on the George W. Bush's administration policy regarding the events in the period after 9/11 and the war against terrorism.

Neoconservatism, for those who disapprove it, represents special political movement which emphasizes the military power, (Mearsheimer, 2005), while for the supporters it, actually, represents an individual "belief" of each followers of this ideology (Kristol, 1995). In order to better explain this ideology, the fundamental beginnings of the same should be taken into consideration, then by examples to perceive its implementation as well, through the global war against terrorism and the relation between the United States and Israel, and whether the neo-colonialism is present in today's foreign policy.

Neoconservatism became special ideology or belief as a consequence of the university protests and arrests in the United States during the late 60s. A larger group of Jews, belonging to the working class, led by Irving Kristol, stood against the liberalism in US policy for the first time. According to the Kristol's words "the liberal were wrong, liberals are wrong, because they are liberals". The wrong about the liberalism are the liberals themselves - they are blind inheritors of the human and political reality" (Murray, 2005).

For Kristol, the political reality in that time represented an evil. Following the collapse of socialism, a solution has been searched in secondary solutions of the liberal democracy (Murray, 2005). After finding an identity in the domestic political sphere, several postulates of the neoconservatism followed. Kristol describes three pillars: strong idea for patriotism, refusing cooperation with other governments, including UN and NATO, and creating a clear image of who is friend, and who is not (Kristol, 2003). These pillars are fused by the strong idea that the United States is entitled to use power for the world's welfare in general. This has been proved and it could have been clearly seen in the war against terrorism of the Bush's administration, and of the previous administrations of Reagan and Carter also, as (Fukuyama 2006) claimed in his records. According to (Fukuyama, 2006) who said, "If your only tool is a hammer then every problem looks like a nail", confirms exactly the ideology of neoconservatism. In the 21 century, neoconservative beliefs have moral and ideological basics for successful acting in the international relations and that the United States has the only possibility to be part of it. According to (Kagan and Kristol, 2000), "Americans need to understand that their supremacy is equal to strike or disregard of international law".

In the period after the Cold War, the neoconservatism was identified as end of the history (Fukuyama, 1989). It means that the liberal democracy will spread globally in the wake of the triumph of the West in the Cold War. The support to the democratization and spreading the liberal institutions in non-West regions overlaps the idea for cosmopolitanism of Kantian and the thesis for democratic peace of Doyle. In fact, it is considered that the application of this strategy caused massive critics regarding the Bush's foreign policy in the period following 9/11. In 2006, in the war on terror analysis described by him as "mostly shaped by the neoconservatism" (Fukuyama, 2006) he left his neoconservative belief and condemned the moral and ideology of the foreign policy, since, according to him, the United States has no moral credibility in the Middle East anymore as a result of the past and current military actions. The lack of credibility has obviously reduced the American international position and led to suspicion that democratic efforts represent a veil of the imperialism and a manner to control the access to the oil reserves in the Middle East, which also proves the unchanged regional policy since the Cold War. Since the idea of democratization "survived" the neoconservative era of Bush's administration, the legitimacy of the war on terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq remains under suspicion.

6. Conclusion

Theory analysis in connection to the formulation of the US national security policy indicates that the same is an extremely complex process. Interagency processes and cooperation in the US administration are of great importance, especially in the period following September 11th. From historical perspective, the eternal "rivals" - Democrats and Republicans – had different approach to the foreign policy and US national security. The theoretical model of the research through theories, regarding the adoption of the US national security, contributed to the adoption of several conclusions, emphasizing the following:

▪ Conventional theories and their supporters consider that the balance of power is, in essence, parity or stability between the competing forces. This theory supports the idea of just equilibrium in the world, doctrine or axiom that is designed to prevent any nation to become strong enough to allow it to carry out its will on the rest of the world. This approach, also, started with the idea that the theory and strategy overlap in a grand strategy which can be defined as integration of the military and political and economic means in order to complete the final goal of states in the international system. Most remarkable is the balance of power and the collective security theory and approach, where the idea of creating coalitions for securing the world peace is supported in order the same to receive a multinational character versus the unilateralism for which it is deemed to be ended by the Bush administration.

▪ Unconventional approach to the national security theories in the academic circles is deemed to have started in the second half of 20th century. Most influential is the globalization theory, the post-colonialism and neo-Marxist theory which tends to maintain a constant balance of the forces, to remove the gap between the rich and poor, the growing monopolization and terrorism, but it also poses many questions on the military intervention policy in the name of national security (Robinson, 1996).

▪ Conservative approach in the foreign policy and the national security policy is categorized in the group of non-military minded supporters, when it comes to the national security. Divided into four groups and influenced by various perspectives of individuals and experts in the political culture, the conservatives expanded their range of action in the US foreign policy. The first group of non-military followers, usually the liberals, is convinced that the enemies were provoked because of the mistakes in the US policy, but, above all, it emphasizes the military excessive presence in the Middle East region. The second group of

so-called cautious realists refuses the military intervention as a solution or primate of the national policy, believing that the US military adventures are unreasonable and purposeless. On the other hand, they provide their support to strong national defense, but the military force should in no case be used to acquire political goals. The third group or the so-called "warlike realists", believes that the occasional military interventions are maybe necessary and justified, however they hold firmly to the attitude that precisely those interventions will not advance the overall peace and spread of the American democracy in the world. The fourth group or the supporters of the neoconservatism supports the military interventions exclusively with the purpose to establish a whole new global hegemony in the world, led by the United States. But also that the "American hegemony is the only reliable defense against a breakdown of peace and international order" (Kristol and Kagan, 2000).

▪ Neoconservative approach and theories appeared in the late 60s as a result of university protests and arrests in the United States, while they had the greatest influence during the George W. Bush's administration with the unilateral approach in the foreign policy and military interventions in the Middle East. Fundamental beginnings, implementation and application of this ideology are actually perceived through the global war on terrorism and the relations between the United States and Israel. One of the greatest supporters of the neoconservative approach in this ideology describes three pillars, such as: strong patriotism, refusal to cooperate with other countries and coalitions (including NATO and UN) and determining who real friend of the United States is and who is not (Kristol, 2003). These pillars are fused through the strong ideology that the United States is entitled to use military force (unilaterally) for the common good in the world "The Unipolar Moment" (Krauthammer, 1990).

It can be concluded that the whole process of adopting a national security policy is additionally complicated between the clusters in the US political system. Several departments in the government, the political influence in media, internal issues, financial crisis and military requirements are part of the system responsible to adopt national policies. There is cohesion only in the war on terrorism, but many think that the president must make decisions along with the government and the public in relation to all US policies and strategies.

References

1. [Alexander](#) H. [James M](#), (1987), FEDERALIST No. 20, (The Insufficiency for the Present Confederation to Preserve the Union), From the New York Packet. Tuesday, December 11, 1787.Betts,

2. Baldwin, David A. (2004) "Security Studies and the end of the Cold War", World Politics.

3. Bartoloto, John., (2004) "The origin and development process of the National security strategy", Army War College, USA.

4. Biddle, Stephen D. (2005) "American Grand Strategy After, 9/11: ANSSESSMENT", USA.
   See more on: [http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub603.pdf. 5](http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub603.pdf.5).

5. Condesman, Antony H. (2010) "The Obama administration and US Strategy: The firs 100 days", Centre for strategic and international studies, Washington DC, USA.

6. Cordesman Anthony H. (2013) "Changing US Security Strategy the Search for Stability and the "Non-War" against "Non-Terrorism" center for strategic and international studies, USA.

7. Cerami, Joseph R., Jeffrey A. Engel. (2010) "Rethinking leadership and "whole of government" National Security reform: problems, progress and prospects", USA.

8. Council on Foreign Relations US. (2005) "A New National Security Strategy in an Age of Terrorists, Tyrants, and Weapons of Mass Destruction", USA.

9. Center for research and policy. (2008) "The world after George W. Bush, what to expect from the new administration in Washington", USA,

10. Chicago Council Survey, (2012) "Foreign Policy in the New Millennium Results of the 2012 of American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy", USA.

11. Epstein, Susan, B. (2011)"Foreign reform, national strategy and the quadrennial review" Congressional research service, USA.

12. Davis, Lynn E. (2003) "The U.S. Army and the New National Security Strategy", Arroyo center,USA.

13. Dannreuther, Roland and Peterson, John. (2006) "Security Strategy and Transatlantic Relations", NY.

14. Dennis B. Ross and James F. (2013) Jeffrey "Obama II and the middle east strategic objectives for U.S. policy", The Washiongton Institute for near east policy.

15. Department of State. (2002) "U.S. Foreign Policy agenda" volume 7, number 4, USA;

16. Дејвид Хелд и Ентони Мекгру, (2010) "Управување со глобализација", стр 27-51, Академски печат, Скопје.

17. Fraser, C. (2005), US foreign policy after the Cold War: global hegemony or reluctant sheriff? , (London: Routledge);

18. Георгиевски П. (1998) "Методологија на истражување на општествените појави", Филозофски факултет, Балкански центар за проучување на мирот, Скопје,;

19. Георгиева, Л. (2006) "Менаџирање на ризици", Филозофски факултет, Скопје;

20. Георгиева, Л. (2010) "Европска безбедност", Филозофски факултет,Скопје;

21. Gaddis, John L. (2005) "Strategies of containment: a critical appraisal of American national security policy during the Cold War", New York: Oxford University Press,;

22. John Lewis G. (2003) "A Grand Strategy of Transformation", Department of National and Strategy Textbook, Volume I, Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College.

23. John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, Colin S. Gray, and Eliot Coen, (2007) "Strategy in the Contemporary World" , An Introduction to Strategic Studies.

24. Jentleson, W. Bruse, (2012) "American foreign policy: The dynamics of choises in the 21st centures – 4th", USA.

25. Jervis, Robert, (2005) "American foreign policy in a new era", (New York: Routledge).

26. Киркова, Р. (2010) "Иднината на НАТО: Редефинирање на трансантлантското сојузништо", Аутопринт, Скопје,;

27. Lynn, E.Davis. (2003) "Globalization's Security implications", Issue paper, RAND,;

28. Luden, J. (2011) "Picturing U.S. Foreign Policy Without Bin Laden", Special Report", National strategy forum, USA.

29. Sam C.Sarkesian, John Allen Williams, Stephen J. Cimbala, (2012) "US National Security, Policymakers, Processes & Politics", Lyene Rienner Piblishers, fifth edition USA.

30. Steven M. Douglas V. (2001) "Asymmetry and U.S. military, strategy: Definitions, background, and strategic concepts", USA.
http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub223.pdf

31. Hall, G. (2005) "American global strategy and the "war on terrorism" American University of Paris, France.

32. Haggins, T. (2008) "America's prsuit of the national interest: past, present and future, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks', USA.

33. Hoffman, S. (2006) "Chaos and violence: what globalization, failed states, and terrorism mean for U.S. foreign policy", (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).

34. History of the "National Security Strategy of the United States", (2011) National Strategy Forum, volume 20, issue 1, winter.

35. Lingenfelter, Michael D. (2004) "United States Army and National security strategy for the 21st century", Army War College, USA.

36. Lawrence, J. Korb and Robert O. Boorstin, (2009) "Integrated power of the national security strategy for the 21st century", USA.

37. Morse, Eric S. (2010) "Analysis of the Obama Administration's 'National security strategy 2010" National security forum, USA, June.

38. Michael Cox & Doug Stokes, (2012) "US Foreign policy", Oxford University press, , USA.

39. Malackowski C. Patrick, (2005) "Improving the United States National security strategy", Army War College, USA.

40. National security strategy for global age, (2000) The White House, USA.

41. Нацески, Р. (2002) "Планетарниот стратегиски контекст по 11 септември 2001 година" Современа Македонска Одбрана, Скопје.

42. Renshon, Stanley A. (2010) "National security in the Obama administration, Reassessing the Bush doctrine", Routledge, New York, USA.

43. Richard, D. (2004) "U.S. National security strategy: Lenses and landmarks", The Princenton Project University, USA.

44. The Stanley Foundation, (2006) Policy analysis brief, "A critique of the Bush Administration's national security strategy", USA.

45. Thomas E. Ricks , (2008) "The Gamble: General David Petraeus and the American Military adventures in Iraq".

46. U.S. ARMY war college library, (2007) "U.S. National security strategy, selected Bibliography", USA.

47. Ванковска Б. (2007) "Меѓународната безбедност во 21 век: војната е мир, мирот е војна", Бомат графикс, Скопје,;

48. Wagner, R. (2015), The Decline of Military Adventurism in the Conservative Big Tent: Why Grassroots Conservatives in the United States Are Embracing a More Cautious Foreign Policy, Sage Journals, USA.
http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/5/1/2158244015575556

49. Williams, John A., (2009) "U.S. National Security Challenges", National Strategy Forum,volume 19, issue 1, Winter.

50. Kent, R. (2004) "Collective security and humanitarian intervention".
www.alnap.org/pool/files/14b%20Kent%20paper.pdf

51. Кузев, С. (2001) "Основи на стратегија за одбрана", Скопје;

52. Zaborowski, M. (2008) "Obama's Change and America's relations with the world", EU institute for Security Studies.