

NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE U.S. IN THE FIRST DECADE OF XXI CENTURY. EXPERT OPINION OF THE AMERICAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN RESEARCHERS.¹

Bezhekenov Kaisar¹.

¹ Universidad Nacional Al-Farabi, Kazajstán

E-mail: Kaligraf_vko@mail.ru

Recibido: 20 Enero 2013 / Revisado: 5 Febrero 2013 / Aceptado: 22 Febrero 2013 / Publicación Online: 15 Junio 2013

Abstract: This article describes the national security strategy of the United States in 2002 and its consequences for further international relationships of the US with other states on the political arena. Therefore, there are different opinions of politics and experts of foreign countries and also there are minds of the experts from Central Asia on the key issues of the national security strategy of the US.

Key-words: strategy, security, United States, Central Asia.

Introduction.

In September 2002, the Bush administration presented the document that outlines the key principles and objectives of the U.S. foreign policy, as well as their vision of a new world order - "National Security Strategy of the United States." Also, this document identified the main threats to the national security interests of the United States, which included - international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and sensitive technologies. In this regard, as part of this document, the White House administration as a priority aimed to destroy terrorist organizations using all facilities of the United States of America and capacity of the allied states, as well as friendly states before the terrorist threat would reach the national borders of the United States.

The main reason for adoption of the strategy was a threat to the national security of the

United States by international terrorists. September 11 2001 showed the weakness of the security and unpreparedness of internal security forces. New enemy was not required a large army, in order to deliver a crushing blow, but it took only the presence of a small group of men armed with explosive weapons.

There were new conditions that promoted the adoption of a new national security strategy by the George W. Bush, which were created after the terrorist attacks of September 11. The first decade of the twenty-first century has introduced a new threat to the national security not only of the United States, but also to other states of the international community. The main threat, which was opposed by the U.S., was not physical destruction, but the threat of mass psychological impact, which could destabilize the country.

The new document defined the threat posed by international terrorism for the U.S. and the necessity of protecting national interests and implementing fight against them: "Enemies in the past needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger America. Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank. Terrorists are organized to penetrate open societies and to turn the power of modern technologies against us" [1].

Thus, this legal instrument is a conceptual, holistic and comprehensive account of U.S.

foreign policy on the world stage in terms of America's security. "Strategy" considered not only the basic security issues, but in general, the most important strategic directions of the foreign policy of the country.

1. The goal, objectives and principles of national security strategy of the United States.

The following official objectives of the United States were marked in National Security Strategy of 2002 - to ensure political and economic freedom on a global scale, peaceful relations with other countries and respect for human dignity. "In building a balance of power that favors freedom, the United States is guided by the conviction that all nations have important responsibilities. Nations that enjoy freedom must actively fight terror. Nations that depend on international stability must help prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Nations that seek international aid must govern themselves wisely, so that aid is well spent. For freedom to thrive, accountability must be expected and required"[2]. According to the document in order to achieve these objectives the United States will:

- champion aspirations for human dignity;
- strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends;
 - work with others to defuse regional conflicts;
 - prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends, with weapons of mass destruction;
 - ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade;
 - expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy;
 - develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power; and
 - transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century [3].

These tasks are separate chapters of U.S. national security strategy of 2002, and are treated separately in the strategy.

The need to study the principles of Washington's new foreign policy emphasizes that terrorism is part of the struggle for the freedom to provide

this freedom to all mankind: "Freedom is the non-negotiable demand of human dignity; the birthright of every person—in every civilization. Throughout history, freedom has been threatened by war and terror; it has been challenged by the clashing wills of powerful states and the evil designs of tyrants; and it has been tested by widespread poverty and disease. Today, humanity holds in its hands the opportunity to further freedom's triumph over all these foes. The United States welcomes our responsibility to lead in this great mission"[4].

2. The main provisions of the Strategy that define the scope of the U.S. in world.

First of all, the Bush administration launched the concept of pre-emptive strikes. In particular, the U.S. national security strategy of 2002 is presented and justified the U.S. right to preemptive strikes (key idea) on the territories of other countries - terrorist sanctuaries in order to ensure its own national security: "Our enemies have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction, and evidence indicates that they are doing so with determination. The United States will not allow these efforts to succeed. We will build defenses against ballistic missiles and other means of delivery. We will cooperate with other nations to deny, contain, and curtail our enemies' efforts to acquire dangerous technologies. And, as a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed. We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best.

So we must be prepared to defeat our enemies' plans, using the best intelligence and proceeding with deliberation. History will judge harshly those who saw this coming danger but failed to act. In the new world we have entered, the only path to peace and security is the path of action"[5]. As noted by Kazakhstani expert M. Laumulin in National Security Strategy 2002: "it was stated that its power will be based on weapons and ideology and the U.S. is ready ahead of negative developments and will neutralize threats with preventive strikes" [6].

Special attention in this document is on the problem of preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction to terrorist organizations and so-called "rogue states", or states that are providing support to terrorism.

Rogue state is a controversial term applied by some international theorists to states they consider threatening to the world's peace. This means meeting certain criteria, such as being ruled by authoritarian regimes that severely restrict human rights, sponsor terrorism, and seek to proliferate weapons of mass destruction. The term is used most by the United States, though the US State Department officially quit using the term in 2000. However, it has been applied by other countries as well. In the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, the Bush administration returned to using this term toward such states as Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Afghanistan etc. [7].

Thus, the U.S. national security strategy of 2002 states: "We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today's adversaries. Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack us using conventional means. They know such attacks would fail. Instead, they rely on acts of terror and, potentially, the use of weapons of mass destruction—weapons that can be easily concealed, delivered covertly, and used without warning"[8]. It should be noted, that the theme of probability of getting by terrorists or states that support terrorism weapon of mass destruction, is a key for the entire document.

The U.S. National Security Strategy 2002 states that in the fight against the global threat of terrorism, Washington will take any action to ensure its own national security, and especially will emphasize the possibility of using military force. Also document shows the intention of the United States to use a system of alliances, the effect of which will be allocated to the fight against terror. Thus, in the fight against terrorism the U.S. attach great importance to the international community, as the assistant of America to achieve her goals in countering terrorism: "To defeat this threat we must make use of every tool in our arsenal—military power, better homeland defenses, law enforcement, intelligence, and vigorous efforts to cut off terrorist financing. The war against terrorists of global reach is a global enterprise of uncertain duration. America will help nations that need our assistance in combating terror. And America will hold to account nations that are compromised by terror, including those who harbor terrorists—because the allies of terror are the enemies of civilization. The United States and countries cooperating with us must not allow the terrorists to develop new home bases.

Together, we will seek to deny them sanctuary at every turn"[9].

3. National Security Strategy in the political assessment of the U.S. experts.

Undoubtedly, the publication of the new national security strategy of the United States was an important stage in the development of American foreign policy, and therefore generated a great interest in the expert and scientific environment. This document had both - positive and negative responses, especially within the United States. In this context, the U.S. researchers say that a report on the Bush national security strategy: "has attracted great attention at home and abroad as a compelling statement of American grand strategy in the post-September 11th world. The new document, entitled, "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," has been both praised as a clear, farsighted, and impressive response to the threats America now faces, and criticized as a radical and troubling departure from American foreign policy tradition"[10].

Following the publication of this document, the leading U.S. politicians have prepared papers in which lit own view of the importance and role of the new national security strategy. Course of their evaluation in the majority were positive.

The need to adopt the concept of pre-emptive strikes, which is rightly the main idea of the new U.S. national security strategy is justified as follows: "The National Security Strategy does not overturn five decades of doctrine and jettison either containment or deterrence. These strategic concepts can and will continue to be employed where appropriate. But some threats are so potentially catastrophic —and can arrive with so little warning, by means that are untraceable—that they cannot be contained. Extremists who seem to view suicide as a sacrament are unlikely to ever be deterred. And new technology requires new thinking about when a threat actually becomes "imminent." So as a matter of common sense, the United States must be prepared to take action, when necessary, before threats have fully materialized.

Preemption is not a new concept. There has never been a moral or legal requirement that a country wait to be attacked before it can address existential threats. As George Shultz recently wrote, "If there is a rattlesnake in the yard, you don't wait for it to strike before you take action

in self-defense." The United States has long affirmed the right to anticipatory self-defense—from the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 to the crisis on the Korean Peninsula in 1994"[11].

According to the Deputy Secretary of State Richard L. Armitage: "September 11th was a devastating day in American and world history, but perhaps some good has come out of those terrible events. In a sense, the National Security Strategy reflects a grand global realignment in which all nations have an opportunity to redefine their priorities. In redefining our priorities, we also have an opportunity to focus international partnerships not just on winning the war against terrorism, but on meeting all transnational challenges to states"[12].

Chairman of the House Committee on International Relations of the U.S. Congress, Henry J. Hyde, believes that the main idea of U.S. national security strategy in 2002 was to enhance international cooperation in combating terrorism: "The updated National Security Strategy proceeds from an understanding that the power of the United States is immense and unprecedented, but it also wisely notes that we cannot achieve all of our goals by acting alone. We must have allies to help shoulder the tasks, especially if we are to render our accomplishments secure"[13].

It should be noted that the preparation of these works and their publication were directed primarily for the justification of unlimited use of military force in the war against terrorism in the eyes of the international community.

The U.S. expert community also has a number of political scientists who hold similar positions on the new U.S. National Security Strategy. Thus, according to some U.S. scientists: "The Bush National Security Strategy is an ambitious and important work and it is not surprising that the document has attracted considerable attention and wide debate. The NSS is broadly consistent with American strategic tradition while setting forth a coherent grand design for American policy in the face of new and dangerous threats"[14].

According to the eminent American scholar, an expert on national defense U.S. Congressional Research Service, Richard F. Grimmett choice of the United States in favor of the concept of pre-emptive strikes are justified from a historical

point of view. In his work " U.S. USE OF PREEMPTIVE MILITARY FORCE: THE HISTORICAL RECORD" Richard F. Grimmett notes that the United States came to this concept for a reason, and it was quite expected and therefore is logical.

Another American scientist, director of Center for Technology and National Security Policy in National Defense University, Richard L. Kugler believes that: "The long-awaited National Security Strategy provides a sophisticated portrayal of the emerging U.S. role in world affairs for the early 21st century. Contrary to the expectations of critics, it is neither hegemonic and unilateralist, nor ultra-militarist and focused on preempting enemies. Instead, its assessment of U.S. interests and values results in a 'distinctly American internationalism' aimed at creating a balance of power that favors human freedom and makes the globalized world a safer and better place"[15].

However, the expert community in the U.S. has different opinions, more critically about the nature, role and purpose of the U.S. National Security Strategy 2002.

The well-known American expert Zbigniew Kazimierz Brzezinski, although in general is loyal to the White House, however, states that: "Our doctrine of preemption may encourage others to preempt their neighbors, thereby legitimating increasingly indiscriminate use of power"[16].

4. The U.S. National Security Strategy: the reaction of the expert community of Central Asian countries.

There is also critical opinion of Central Asian authors, primarily leading political scientists of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, towards the basic principles and the US foreign policy based on the US national security strategy 2002.

Thus, assessing the various aspects of the U.S. national security strategy 2002, Kazakhstani expert M. Laumulin notes that under the guise of peaceful motives completely covered in this document, the United States have very different tasks that are dictated by their national interests. For example, he notes the following: "As a first direction of the "Strategy" was called "the protection of human dignity". The most interesting idea here is that in this task the U.S. assign themselves the role of the main fighter

for the values of freedom and human rights around the world. This point of strategy justifies the U.S. actions in the case of interference in the internal affairs of other states. The second direction of its new strategy is the U.S. plan to "strengthen alliances to combat global terrorism and help to prevent attacks against the U.S. and countries friendly to them". In terms of real language, this means that the U.S. policy is directed not only against terrorist organizations but also against states and regimes that support terrorism, which have or plan to have weapons of mass destruction".

The importance of the strategy is assessed by him as follows: "American leadership is completely abandoned the earlier "containment policy", which was the basis for the entire foreign policy strategy of the United States over the last fifty years. The central section of the new strategy justified the need and the right to use preemptive strikes. The U.S. administration has proposed to revise the concept of preemptive strike. According to international law preemption can be applied in the case of obvious signs of mobilization of military forces of another State, however in the case of terrorists it is hard to detect preparing attack. This thesis fully unleashed the hands of Washington for sole, arbitrary decisions and actions undertaken on the international arena".

Relatively to the meaning of the document on the development of global processes and the whole system of international relations Laumulin M. writes the following: "The fact that "strategy" was not just an ordinary document, showed events in Iraq. The U.S. acted in strict accordance with this document. The right to "preemptive strike" was used (under the pretext of Baghdad's desire to take up weapons of mass destruction), the international law, moreover, opinion of the UN, opinion of the Security Council and the opinion of the closest U.S. allies in NATO has been ignored. The processes of "continental drift", i.e. transatlantic divide have started"[17].

Similar views on the revision of the doctrinal foundations of foreign policy and policy ensuring national security is shared by the other well-known Kazakhstani expert M. Shaikhutdinov. In particular, he notes that, in contrast to the doctrine of deterrence new doctrine of preemptive strikes proclaimed the principle of prevention in combating threats to the U.S. national security.

There is also opinion of Kyrgyz political scientist L. Bondartcev. He, in particular, believes that the United States have very different goals and objectives in the fight against terrorism, opposing to those that were proclaimed in strategy. "Under the guise of anti-terrorism banner, the U.S. built up unprecedented levels of military force. Today, their military expenditures account 47 percent of world military spending. This allowed Washington to usurp the "inalienable" right, which put on the digestible doctrine of preemptive action to deliver nuclear strikes at any point in peace time as well as to start a preventive war, or, more simply, an aggression against any country. This doctrine is set out in the National Security Strategy of the U.S. in September 17, 2002. The basis of the doctrine of pre-emption, or as it is often called, the Bush doctrine is the idea of advanced military attack, which is motivated by any slightest manifestation of aggression against the United States in their interpretation. Washington makes decisions and carries out independent preemptive action in the event that they themselves identify as a threat to American security. The U.S. fully appropriate the functions of the UN Security Council alone to determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and to decide what measures should be taken to maintain or restore international peace and security. An illustrative example of application of the doctrine - the aggression against Iraq"[18].

Outputs.

Analyzing the U.S. national security strategy 2002, it should be noted that this document has historical importance in the development of international relations. As a result of its adoption by the United States, in fact, the right to conduct military operations against other countries without any visible reason for it was legitimized. Subsequently, the introduction of this practice creates the risk that there is a probability of other countries using similar methods to achieve national and strategic interests. For example, in December 2007, Turkey undoubtedly followed the American precedent, carried out a series of air strikes in northern Iraq, and then entered own armed forces. The official cause of the military operation in Iraq (formally sovereign state) was a part of the struggle against terrorism, and in particular, the response of Ankara on activation of the Workers' Party of Kurdistan

". [19] In this case, we cannot exclude possibility that the operation was carried out with the support of the United States. Anyway, as a result of these steps of Turkey, firstly, civilians were injured in Iraq. There were found dozens of deaths among Iraqi civilians. And secondly, once again the principle of international law on the inviolability of the territory of a sovereign state was violated. Thus, dangerous precedent in international politics was created, which was quite capable of destabilizing effects on international order.

Noting the importance of the U.S. National Security Strategy 2002, it should be noted that the document outlined the main priorities and policy directions in the war against international terrorism. For the first time the problem of combating terrorism was considered by the White House administration in such a complex and comprehensive scale.

As can be seen, the new U.S. national security strategy included a series of tasks to promote economic and political development in the world, as well as strengthening the national security of the United States and its allies, according to the new challenges of the time, namely terrorism.

Thus, it seems obvious that this document have made a theoretical basis for a new global antiterrorist policy of the USA, which took one of the key priorities of Washington's foreign policy during the administration of George W. Bush. Some of the principles identified in the National Security Strategy, have had a significant impact on the further development of the system of international relations in general.

References:

1. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, 3. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
2. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, 5. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
3. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2000, 7-8. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
4. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, 5. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
5. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, 4. Available at

- <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
6. Laumulin M.T. - Central Asia within Foreign Political Science and World Geopolitics. Op. cit., 14 (
7. Rogue state definition // http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rogue_state
8. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, 19. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
9. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, 3-4. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
10. US foreign policy agenda (an electronic journal of the department of state, volume 7, number 4). Keir A. Lieber, Robert J. Lieber – The Bush National Security Strategy. Available at http://guangzhou.usembassy-china.org.cn/uploads/images/kl_aV1OROt12NDRbkR__A/ijpe1202.pdf
11. US foreign policy agenda (an electronic journal of the department of state, volume 7, number 4) // C. Rice - A Balance of Power That Favors Freedom, 5. Available at http://guangzhou.usembassy-china.org.cn/uploads/images/kl_aV1OROt12NDRbkR__A/ijpe1202.pdf
12. US foreign policy agenda (an electronic journal of the department of state, volume 7, number 4) // Richard L. Armitage – Allies, friends, and partners on every page: International cooperation in the national security strategy, 10. Available at http://guangzhou.usembassy-china.org.cn/uploads/images/kl_aV1OROt12NDRbkR__A/ijpe1202.pdf
13. US foreign policy agenda (an electronic journal of the department of state, volume 7, number 4) // Henry J. Hyde– speaking to our silent allies: public diplomacy and U.S. foreign policy, 23. Available at http://guangzhou.usembassy-china.org.cn/uploads/images/kl_aV1OROt12NDRbkR__A/ijpe1202.pdf
14. US foreign policy agenda (an electronic journal of the department of state, volume 7, number 4) // Keir A. Lieber, Robert J. Lieber – The Bush National Security Strategy. Available at http://guangzhou.usembassy-china.org.cn/uploads/images/kl_aV1OROt12NDRbkR__A/ijpe1202.pdf
15. US foreign policy agenda (an electronic journal of the department of state, volume 7, number 4) // Richard L. Kugler – A distinctly American internationalism for a globalized world, 36. Available at http://guangzhou.usembassy-china.org.cn/uploads/images/kl_aV1OROt12NDRbkR__A/ijpe1202.pdf
16. Zbigniew K. Brzezinski - Criticism of the Bush doctrine. Available at <http://www.peace.ca/bushdoctrine.htm>

17. Laumulin M.T. - Central Asia within Foreign Political Science and World Geopolitics. Op. cit., 22, 16-17, 25-26 (.)

. - . 22, 16-17, 25-26)

18. Bondarets L.M. - Washington's new Central Asian Initiative: plans, reality, perspectives // Geopolitics - security - terrorism. Col. of art. / Ed. by E.A. Vertlib, L.M. Bondarets: 2006, 70.

19. Turkish soldiers crossed the Iraqi border. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/russian/international/newsid_7149000/7149531.stm