



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 9, Issue, 4(F), pp. 26095-26102, April, 2018

**International Journal of
Recent Scientific
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

Research Article

BASIC MAP FOR THE NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Monov, LB¹ and *Karev, ML²

¹“Strategic Planning”, Ministry of Defence, Sofia, Bulgaria

²Defense Advanced Research Institute, G. S. Rakovski National Defense College, Sofia, Bulgaria

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0904.1990>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 16th January, 2018
Received in revised form 20th
February, 2018
Accepted 8th March, 2018
Published online 28th April, 2018

Key Words:

Strategy, national interests, strategic map,
national security.

ABSTRACT

This report introduces the context analysis of seven speeches of the current President of the United States which were presented between May and November 2017. The basic assumption of this study is that all these events are meticulously organized and thoroughly considered. They represent the new point of view of the American Administration on current strategic challenges and they provide some answers on the possible US approach against contemporary complex threats. Therefore, considering these speeches as one entity and scrutinizing their content, it is possible to discover some vital elements of the new National Security Strategy of the US. Connecting them in one matrix provides an opportunity to build a basic strategic map for the new global approach of America.

Copyright © Monov, LB and Karev, ML, 2018, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Since the inauguration of President Trump, national security experts and the mainstream media have hotly debated the subject of the US National Security Strategy. A significant part of the participants have expressed concerns that the current administration might withdraw its support for the liberal world model, which the US has established after the Second World War. Indeed, there are at least two reasons for this. The main explanation for their concern stems from the fact that the world has changed. The geopolitical competition and the power politics that also includes an active use of the military instrument of power are part of the struggle, which as a result increases the level of uncertainty. On the other hand, the non-conventional approach of the US President who successfully used the power of social media to share opinions and signal to allies, partners, and enemies also increased the level of anxiety. His idea for advancing and promoting American influence in the world as well as his stated intention to take Washington out from some unpopular agreements and alliances has caused further disruption. As a result, some experts claim that President Trump is ready to reject basic for the US foreign policy assumptions as forward deployment of military forces, protection of human rights and freedoms and to undertake global changes often motivated by economic interests (Wright

and Kludt, 2016). For example, the prominent scholar and practitioner Richard Haass insists that the “*assumptions about the willingness of the United States to continue doing what it has been doing in the world are being questioned as never before by friends, foes, and everyone in between*” (Haass, 2017). Certainly, this gives ground to some authors to claim that the new strategic approach of America will use politics which are designated to protect its specific national interests without taking into account those of its allies and partners. Consequently, there are concerns that the US might fall into isolation and that was the perception during the G-20 Summit in July 2017 (Erlanger and Davis, 2017).

There is another position. Washington's current approach is based on a principal perception of the contemporary global context and on politics in which everyone shares the burden and responsibilities to ensure common interests and values. At the heart of this strategy is the notion that globally there is a vigorous competition with widespread use of military, economic and political measures. Terrorist organizations, transnational criminal groups, authoritarian regimes and revisionist states threaten the global influence of the United States, its values and prosperity. Their protection requires an active engagement of all instruments of national power, where actions are primarily taken to check competing states, while

*Corresponding author: Karev, ML

Defense Advanced Research Institute, G. S. Rakovski National Defense College, Sofia, Bulgaria

looking for opportunities for cooperation in areas of common interest. This new approach is defined by the term practical realism and it has been structured around two statements. The first is typical for the representatives of realism, who consider that the superior state power as a guarantee for the advancement of national interests. The second is based on the principle that the basic obligation of each government is to serve its citizens and their best interests. The most important part is to ensure their prosperity and security.

Despite the widely accepted view that President Trump's opinions in Twitter are an official position, they are not deliberately analyzed in the article. The main reason for this point is our understanding that they discuss vital for the US domestic context issues. For example, there was data collected from 20 January to 7 July 2017 which indicated that from a total of 920 tweets only 83 covered foreign policy issues. The majority of the tweets debated subjects such as biased media coverage, Russia's interventions in the elections, economics and trade, health insurance, immigration and the leakage of classified information (Kiersz, 2017). On the other hand, in the preparation of important events, the political apparatus intended to serve the President controlled the process and the messages that the speeches disseminated. Therefore, with high credibility it can be argued that in terms of foreign policy action, predominance will have pre-prepared positions, which are presented in the light of principal realism.

The philosophy of this new approach has been gradually developed by the administration and has been clearly defined by the US National Security Strategy adopted in December 2017. Key elements of these (approach and strategy) can be found in analyzing the speeches of the US President, presented between May and November 2017. A basic assumption of this research is an understanding that such events are the result of careful consideration and cautious assessment of possible consequences. The common feature of this new approach is the fact that it discusses important American security issues and most of them are announced before an international public. These include the President's speeches to the leaders of the Arab world (Trump, 2017), NATO (Trump, 2017), UN (Trump, 2017), APEC (Trump, 2017) and ASEAN (Trump, 2017). Some exceptions were the speeches before the US military in Washington (Trump, 2017) and the citizens of Warsaw (Trump, 2017), which deliberated specific strategic dilemmas such as the war in Afghanistan and Russia's politics. Despite the differences, each of these speeches covered some key elements of the National security strategy. Therefore, their consideration as one entity represents an opportunity to create a basic strategic map, which gives a comprehensive picture of the US interests, threats, goals, and ways to achieve them.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to understand and assess the US President's messages we used a methodology that relies on two matrixes. First, a structural matrix that encompasses within a single framework some of the logical categories that have a presence in the national security strategy (Table 1). For instance, these are the national interests. They represent a desired condition or "state of reality", or they provide an answer to the question, why does somebody take actions? Next, the matrix includes threats, which might be conditions, actions, and dynamics, or actor(s)

that endanger one or more of the national interests. Also, it encompasses objectives/desired end state or the final outcome, to include protection against a particular threat. Finally, the matrix reflects possible ways and means to achieve specific policy goals.

Table 1 Strategic Logic Analysis Matrix

Category	Definition
Interests	A desired condition or "state of reality"
Threats	Conditions, actions, dynamics, actor that endanger one or more of the national interests
Ends/Objectives	The desired final outcome, to include protection against a particular threat
Ways	The strategic design for using the available resources
Means	Capabilities and resources that are available or can be developed for implementation. Usually these are the tools of national power

After we had the matrix, we analyzed the speeches to extracted the key concepts from them. We searched for links between the content of the text and the definitions from the matrix. Then, we deconstructed the ideas into the defined categories and based on the output we filled in the matrix that created a visual map of the relationship between them. Finally, considering the output for each specific category we developed a deductive matrix that represents the basic strategic map for the new national security strategy of the US.

In order to understand some of the specific ideas we also used an additional matrix (Table 2) for inductive analysis. It includes specific words as it captures their frequency of appearance that allows us to categorize and put them in precise groups. For example, words with a high frequency of repetition such as peace, security, freedom, prosperity, values and sovereignty can be grouped into the "interests" category. Another category considers some possible ways to achieve any objective such as "partnership", "together" and "work together".

Table 2 Inductive analysis matrix

Category	Geographic audience							Total
	Saudi Arabia	NATO	Poland	Fort Myer, Arlington, VA	UN	APEC	ASEAN	
Interests								
peace	10	2	1	8	15	10	2	48
security	11	2	3	6	10	9	2	43
freedom	0	0	15	1	9	7	0	32
sovereign	1	0	2	0	21	7	1	32
value	3	0	10	1	7	3	1	25
prosperity	3	1	0	0	12	5	2	23
Ways								
together	10	3	9	6	10	10	1	49
Partner-ship	10	0	1	2	1	6	3	23
work together	3	0	1	1	5	3	1	14
Threats								
terror	31	9	4	23	14	2	0	83
States of particular importance								
Iran	11		1		12			24
Pakistan				12				12
China	1				2	9		12
North Korea					8	1		9
Russia	1	1	1		1			4

The third group covers the threats where the word "terror" is very often in active use. The fourth category covers countries of particular interest to America such as Iran, Pakistan, China, North Korea and Russia.

Thus, bearing in mind the results from the second matrix we link them with the logical categories from matrix one that allows us to focus our attention in defining the interests, threats, objectives, and ways and means to achieve them.

National interests

The starting point for this research is the general assumption that until now, regardless of the peculiarities and political party affiliation of a particular administration, the US national interests have always included three elements. The first involves physical security, which encompasses actions of protection against externally caused loss of life and property. The second embraces the prosperity of the US citizens. The third has a deep connection with the core values of the American society, such as the protection of the national system of government, sovereignty, cultural sensitivities and morality. Basic theoretical understanding is that as grammatical parts of speech interests are nouns and adjectives (Diebel, 2007). Built on this ground as well as the above-mentioned methodology we conducted a deep dive into the US Presidential Remarks and we discovered specific notions that represent the idea of what the national interests are (Table 3).

Table 3 National interests' categorization matrix

N	Date	Place	Interests
1	21 May	Saudi Arabia	Peace, security and prosperity in this area and in the world Safety and security of our citizens
2	6 July	Poland	Strong and democratic Europe Individual freedom Sovereignty Rule of law; right for free speech and expression
3	21 August	Fort "Myer" Arlington, VA	Honorable and enduring outcome in Afghanistan Security threats in Afghanistan and the border region are immense
4	19 September	UN	Sovereignty, security, prosperity and peace for themselves and in the world; Needs, safety, rights and values of American people
5	10 November	APEC	Free and open Indo-Pacific Patriotism, prosperity, and pride Strong, sovereign, independent states that thrive in freedom and in peace in peace
6	13 November	ASEAN	Security and prosperity of the American people and the people of all Indo-Pacific nations Free and open Indo-Pacific region

Thus, it is obvious that considering the information in table 3 there is no significant discrepancy between the general theoretical understanding of the national interest and these, which we took from the US President's speeches. Despite the fact that the latter had been presented before a geographically and culturally diverse audience they have repeatedly reiterated messages connected with the US security and safety, prosperity of the population, values preservation, sovereignty and peace.

For the United States, as a global power, it is extremely important that these interests are properly formulated, presented to the world and adopted not only by security experts, but also by the public and leaders of the allies, partners

and adversaries. A significant part in this process belongs to the different Think-Tank organizations. For instance, in early 2017, the Heritage Foundation formulated as national interests: the defense of the country, the successful ending of the long war which has the potential to destabilize critical areas and protection of the freedom of movement of goods that guarantee the successful conduct of the business of ensuring prosperity. (The Heritage Foundation, 2017).

Therefore, in different geographic areas, although with specific regional nuances, Washington spreads identical messages. They can be summarized into two groups. The first encompasses the interests of the United States worldwide and includes peace, respect for sovereignty, guaranteeing security, respect for individual freedoms, the rule of law, freedom of speech; prosperity, free trade and free market competition. The second includes the basis for US interests such as protection of the population and way of life that is based on sovereignty and values as well as guaranteeing the country's prosperity. Finally, the analysis offers an opportunity to identify the US national interests in three directions: preserving peace in the world; protection of the state, population and values; thus ensuring the prosperity of the United States.

Threats

The next step in the research process requires to reveal the threats and to link them to specific national interests. The aim is to extract the threats from the text while bearing in mind the specific geographic areas and the US interest in these parts. Then, after capturing the main ideas, it becomes possible to formulate common sources and threats.

In analyzing the President Trump's speeches, it is not difficult to formulate a wide range of threats to the US security and to the world. These include terrorist attacks, cyber-crimes, territorial expansion, theft of intellectual property, unfair commercial practices, propaganda, oppressive ideology, illegal migration, and so on. Associated with the above-identified national interests, threats and their sources can be assembled into several groups. The first group involves those that endanger peace and covers rogue states that provide support to terrorism, development of weapons of mass destruction and the use of capabilities of modern technology and criminal networks to harm the security and prosperity of the nation. This includes countries like Iran, North Korea. The second group, related to the protection of territory, population and values considers terrorism and extremism that directly threatens the security, life and liberty of its population. This group also comprises of illegal migration, propaganda, dispersing of terrorist ideology, international criminal networks, the spread of weapons and drugs. These threats come from Iran and Pakistan and take into account groups such as the Islamic State, Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, and others. The third category reflects revisionist forces, which look for opportunities to revise the established world order and the model of life. They use actions that cover propaganda and modern technologies, economic coercion, corruption, unfair commercial practices, predatory industrial policy, corporate espionage and cyber-crimes. Their main sources are Russia and China. Consequently, these threats are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Threat categorization matrix

N	Date	Place	Threats
1	21 May	Saudi Arabia	Organized terror Barbaric attacks on American soil and in the world. The spread of ideology
2	25 May	NATO	Iran, Islamic State, Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, and so many others Terrorism - a common threat to all of humanity and barbaric and vicious attack upon our civilization Thousands of people pouring into our various countries and spreading throughout
3	6 July	Poland	Threats from Russia Oppressive ideology Terrorism and extremism Propaganda
4	21 August	Fort "Myer" Arlington, VA	Financial crimes, cyberwarfare Terrorist organizations Afghanistan and Pakistan
5	19 September	UN	Terrorists and extremists have gathered strength and spread to every region of the planet Rogue regimes not only support terrorists but threaten other nations and their own people with the most destructive weapons known to humanity Authority and authoritarian powers seek to collapse the values, the systems, and alliances International criminal networks traffic drugs, weapons, people Mass migration New forms of aggression exploit technology to menace our citizens
6	10 November	APEC	Iran, North Korea Unfair trade undermines us all Currency manipulation Predatory industrial policies China's unfair trade practices and the enormous trade deficits they have produced with the United States Cyberattacks, corporate espionage Criminal cartels, human smuggling, drugs, corruption, cybercrime Territorial extension Radical Islamic terrorism

Goals - desired end states

After the formulation of the national interests and the threats to them, we continued to investigate the President's remarks in order to identify if there were thoughts that may be defined as desired end states of the possible strategy. The general strategic logic and theory states that the goals are future conditions, which deserve efforts and resources. Since objectives are derived from interests and are related to specific actions, they usually start with verbs such as: to create, to protect, to avoid, to ensure, to maintain, and so on. Therefore, the goals are the bridge between interests and threats, and they essentially identify what someone has to do. As Colin Gray insists *"We label as strategic particular objectives for our planned behavior, simply because of their importance assessed in terms of the consequences we believe could follow from their achievement"* (Gray, 2015).

Precisely, during the analysis we searched for word pattern related to the specific actions which serve to ascertain national interests which includes the use of force. Taking into account these conditions, we could define the specific strategic goals of the US, which are presented in Table 5.

Now, according to the defined interests and threats, we summarized the geostrategic objectives of the US Strategic approach in several categories. Firstly, with regard to preserve world peace and to contain the behavior of the despotic states, we identified the following: to ensure the sovereignty and independence of the states, to prevent aggression and to guarantee the rights and freedoms of population. Secondly, the protection of the territory and the people requires actions which have to ensure border safety, to deny all the territory of terrorists, to block their access to funds, to cut off their financial channels and to reveal the false attraction of their ideology.

Table 5 End state categorization matrix

N	Date	Place	Goals
1	21 May	Saudi Arabia	To deny all the territory of the terrorists To strip them of their access to funds To cut off the financial channels
2	25 May	NATO	To starve the false allure of their craven ideology
3	6 July	Poland	To find, expose, and remove these killers and extremists To show America's commitment to your security
4	21 August	Fort "Myer" Arlington, VA	To expand our partnership To reaffirm article 5 and mutual defense commitment To stop resurgence of safe havens that enable terrorist to threaten America
5	19 September	UN	To prevent nuclear weapons and materials from coming into the hands of terrorist and being used against us, or anywhere in the world All nations - To respect the interests of their own people To respect the rights of every other sovereign nation To ensure their safety;
6	10 November	APEC	To protect borders To respect the sovereign rights of every member To achieve mutually beneficial commerce To achieve a trading relationship that is conducted on a truly fair and equal basis with China

Next, ensuring the prosperity of the United States involves actions aimed at the termination of unfair trade arrangements and the establishment of mutually beneficial agreements based on the principles of free and fair competition. Furthermore, it is vitally important to guarantee intellectual property and economic stability from cyber-attacks, corporate espionage and manipulative practices.

Thus, from the summarized goals and considering the specific geographic interests of the US it is possible to formulate its explicit strategic objectives. For example, with regard to North Korea, the goal may be to cease nuclear weapons development, experimentation and complete nuclear disarmament. Regarding Iran, the main goal might be to stop its support to terrorism and nuclear development, as well as Iran has to respect the rights of its own citizens. In terms of China, goals could be to create economic and trade ties on an equal basis, to avoid a military collision and to ensure the security of US allies in the Indo-Pacific region. Thinking about Russia, these goals could be aimed at deterring Moscow's provocative and destabilizing actions as well as to avoid any high-intensity direct military conflict while cooperating in the areas of mutual interests.

Ways

A strategic map can provide an understanding for any future approach of the US only if it contains information about the ways to achieve specific policy goals. In other words, it serves as a bond and as a visual model between actions and objectives. Moreover, it allows for an alignment of simultaneous and corresponding activities of different foreign policy concepts in one process that has to deliver well defined desired end states.

Indeed, the process of speech analysis shows that America is ready to use all available concepts such as persuasion, inducement, coercion, and military action. For example, there are numerous expressions, which speak about direct use of military instrument as well as force based on sanctions. The economic instrument of power also provides various approaches as inducement with new commercial arrangements and financial incentives. Additionally, the diplomatic instrument offers a range of opportunities grounded on bilateral negotiations, cooperation and persuasion at different international institutions.

It is easy to distinguish the general understanding about the importance of America's superior military power and greater economic influence. The willingness of this administration to resist threats at their sources is unconditional, including their physical destruction. Also, Washington declared its readiness to work with allies and partners in order to renegotiate existing agreements and to seek new co-operations in the areas of common interests. There is also a will to continue these activities that support economic development, sustain rules, backing law and order, and individual freedoms. Existing international organizations have a specific attention down the road to achieve common goals in both security and prosperity. The central assumption around these strategic ways is that all common interests require a distribution of responsibilities and sharing of the financial burden by allies and partners. At the same time, in order to preserve its global leading role, Washington is ready to use all instruments of national power, diplomatic, informational, military and economic.

Table 6 Matrix for ways

N	Date	Place	Ways
1	21 May	Saudi Arabia	Military arrangements and providing new equipment Physical removal of terrorists Increase investment in the military field Strengthening partnership and forming new relationships based on mutual interests Strengthening regional cooperation
2	25 May	NATO	Sharing the financial burden from NATO members and preparing additional reserves
3	6 July	Poland	Adapting NATO so as to be able to effectively counter new forms of aggression, propaganda, financial crime and cyberwar Forcing Russia to end its destabilizing actions in Europe and withdrawing its support for Syria and Iran Conducting joint actions to counter the forces that undermine the freedom and sovereignty of the parties Reassurance of Art. 5 and the US contribution to collective defense Forcing Europe to invest more in its own defense and increase defense spending
4	21 August	Fort "Myer" Arlington, VA	Strengthening cooperation with allies and partners Integrated use of all instruments of national power - diplomatic, economic and military
5	19 September	UN	Rethinking the connections with Pakistan Strengthening cooperation with India Confronting threats to sovereignty Joint actions against the forces of terror, chaos and disorder Sanctions against North Korea and isolation of the regime Use the power of the United States and total destruction of the North Korea Revision of the Iran deal joint action with other countries Joint action to combat terrorism and Islamic extremism Provide financial assistance to refugee countries Involvement of the UN and the African Union for peacekeeping operations Humanitarian assistance and use of different programs and initiatives Strengthening business connections, trade and cooperation on the basis of mutually beneficial actions
6	10 November	APEC	Strengthening partnership Conduct joint actions to strengthen friendship and commerce Joint action with China Bilateral trade arrangements respecting the principles of reciprocity, mutual respect and benefit Countering to the destructive business practices, cyber-attacks, intellectual property theft, and corporate espionage Supporting the private sector and initiatives in the region

Table 6 provides comprehensive information about possible foreign policy ways that the US might use.

In essence, the proposed matrix demonstrates the general geopolitical approach that the US intends to apply in solving foreign policy problems. What is important to be noted and understood by people working on security issues is that the language of these documents demonstrate the administration's desire to work with Allies and to rely on well-established and US-created international institutions. Concurrently, it can be argued that there is a tendency to put pressure on both the states closest to Washington as well as all other actors for free, honest and reciprocal economic ties. Last but not least, there is a clear intention to use the military instrument to guarantee the interests of the United States and its Allies. Of course, the current analysis gives an idea for the overall intentions and possible ways to achieve the goals of the present administration; however, the actual approach will depend on the details.

General Strategic Map

It is difficult to predict the future actions of the US, but considering all findings, it is possible to build a general strategic map for the Americas' basic strategic approach (Table 7). Its purpose is to promote a better understanding for the driving forces that would influence the possible decisions of the United States.

The underlying assumption, as evidenced by the proposed analysis, is that Washington's actions are based on realistic and pragmatic recognition of the current global environment. The first and main fact is that the strategic environment is extremely complex and complicated. There are obvious challenges to the World Order including the resurfacing of power politics; the re-emergence of long-term strategic competition with terrorism and radical ideologies continuing to be a serious challenge. Some countries embrace systems of complex actions in multiple domains that engage all instruments of power. Additional threats that endanger America include illegal migration, organized crime and violent use of modern technology that undermine political stability and values.

Table 7 General Strategic Map for the United States' Basic Foreign Policy Approach

Terms of the strategic environment		
Strategic environment is extremely complex and complicated; There are obvious challenges to the world order; The resurface of power politics; Re-emergence of long-term strategic competition; Terrorism and radical ideologies continue to be a serious challenge		
National interests	Threats	Power and influence
Protection of the state, population and values	Terrorism and extremism (Iran and Pakistan and groups such as the Islamic State, Al-Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, etc.)	Unmatched military power
Ensuring the prosperity of the United States	Revisionist Forces (China and Russia)	Economic influence
Preserving peace in the world	Authoritarian states (Iran and North Korea)	Dominant diplomatic positions in international organizations
Ends	Ways	Means
To deny the territory of terrorists	Direct military action to destroy terrorist organizations	
To cut terrorist off form access to funds and to interrupt their financial channels	Imposition of economic sanctions and involvement of allies	Diplomatically Economically Military Information
To reveal the false allure of terrorist ideology	Strengthening regional cooperation and building new connections, including business	
To protect the state borders	Changes in immigration policy and border control	
To terminate unfair commercial arrangements	Revision of existing treaties and negotiation to achieve mutually beneficial conditions while respecting the principles of reciprocity and mutual respect	
To respect the principles of free and fair competition and to establish mutually beneficial arrangements	Disclosure of economic and financial violations and action to strengthen friendship and trade	Diplomatically Economically Military Information
To guarantee the intellectual property and economic stability of the business	Countering to the destructive business practices, cyber-attacks, intellectual property theft, and corporate espionage	
To respect sovereignty and independence	Developing partnership, use the opportunities of international organizations and economic interests	
To deter aggression	Maintaining the Supreme Military Power of the United States and investing in the development of new capabilities as a precondition for peace Forcing US allies to invest and increase the cost of their own defense	Diplomatically Economically Military Information
To preserve the rights and freedoms of citizens	Reasserting the importance and readiness of the United States to respect existing defense alliances	

Thus, these new realities also require a modern strategy which has to ensure the global leadership and security of the United States.

The name of this new approach is principled realism and it was for the first time presented before the leaders of the Arab World in May 2017. During his speech, President Trump announced it as a practical realism which is based on experience, judgment, common values and shared interests. Furthermore, the President refined the term in his statement to the US military revealing the new Strategy for Afghanistan where he emphasized that the purpose of the military instrument is not to build democracies or societies with similar values. Instead, America will work with allies and partners to protect shared interests, whereby military power will create political conditions for peace. The term was further explained to the United Nations General Assembly where President Trump stressed the importance of outcomes without connecting them with any ideology. The central pillar around the concept of principled realism is that the conditions for a peaceful existence and mutual action are: respect for sovereignty, respect for borders and culture. In November 2017 the US President also spoke before the leaders of ASEAN and APEC. There he added two more principles - honesty and reciprocity in trade and in economic relations.

It is common truth that in every aspect the United States has the most powerful and prepared military machine. It is clear that the economic power of the country is abundant enough to induce and to force friends and opponents. The diplomatic positions of the country are also dominant and they could persuade or coerce partners and foes. Consequently, bearing in mind the picture depicted by President Trump's remarks, it is possible to speculate that one of the preferred approaches would encompass joint action based on principles.

The US continues to have the widest and most diverse portfolio of means that can be used either directly or indirectly. It is likely that the administration will take actions to stabilize alliances and coalitions and will continue to conduct direct military action to destroy terrorist organizations. Furthermore, we may expect that America will take individual actions which are focused on certain state leaders or on specific communities or specific groups. These might include: imposing economic sanctions, reviewing existing treaties and negotiating economic partnership on the basis of fairness and reciprocity.

The international community should expect immediate reactions as well as gradual approaches. They may include responses against cyber-attacks, theft of intellectual property, corporate espionage and policies to reject destructive business practices. Simultaneously, Washington will continue to force its Allies to invest more and to increase the spending of their own defense. The United States will not only cooperate, but will also work to expose economic and financial conflicts and will engage in actions to boost friendship and trade.

The administration' "red lines" will be important and their crossing will lead to retaliation. This will be ensured by the superior military power of the United States and its further development. The military apparatus will continue to invest in new capabilities, to maintain current systems and to modernize the existing hardware. The Pentagon will conduct experiments with modern technologies and test them during training and

exercises. Thus, that might change the basic military concepts of waging a war. In order to ensure the balance of power in Europe, the Indo-Pacific region and the Middle East, the US will maintain its forward deployment of forces. Finally, to preserve America's global leading role, the administration will utilize all instruments of national power in a synchronized and rational manner.

CONCLUSION

This paper represents an imaginable strategic map for the possible future approach of the US which might describe an essentially conventional concept. Of course, it shows what we may expect from the current administration without any desire to advocate for it. Moreover, it applies a system of matrix to conduct the analysis of the President Trump's statements and to offer a structural model of the Washington foreign policy effort.

During our analysis we also deliberated the criticisms of the President and his national security apparatus. These include positions which insist that the current administration' actions and goals lack priorities, that objectives are very ambitious, that there is no link between ends, ways and means (Lissner, 2017). Also, some argue that the US strategy does not hold true to the fundamental American values, such as respect for human rights and support for the democracy as the strongest weapon for peace (Abrams, 2017). Others respect the efforts of the security experts to outline and implement the correct foreign policy course, however they have a lot of doubts. They also are vocal about the lack of a clear position on Russia and that the President avoids to speak on this (Wright, 2017). Under pressure are the red lines on Iran, North Korea and Pakistan. There are arguments that in case of crossing, retaliatory actions are almost impossible and therefore it would bring a heavy price to the US credibility (Zakaria, 2018).

To conclude the proposed strategic map is a work plan and the basis for understanding the US's actions to protect its national interests. It should serve as a starting point for debate about what one should expect when considering the realities of the current security environment.

References

- Abrams, E. (2017, December 26). *The Trump National Security Strategy*. Retrieved February 4, 2018, from www.cfr.org/blog/trump-national-security-strategy.
- Diebel, T., L. (2007). *Foreign Affairs Strategy. Logic for American Statecraft*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haass, R. (2017). *A World in Disarray*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Erlanger, S., & Davis, J. H. (2017, July 7). *Once Dominant, the United States Finds Itself Isolated at G-20*. Retrieved December 5, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/07/world/europe/trump-g-20-trade-climate.html>.
- Kiersz, A. (2017, July 14). *13 charts reveal Donald Trump's Twitter habits — from his favorite topics to time of day*. Retrieved December 10, 2017, <http://www.businessinsider.com/president-trump-twitter-by-subject-2017-7/#president-trump-has-tweeted-920-times-between-his-inauguration-on-january-20-and-july-7-making-for-an-average-of-about-54-tweets-per-day-1>.

- Lissner, R. F. (2017, December 19). *The National Security Strategy Is Not a Strategy*. Retrieved February 4, 2018, from www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-12-19/national-security-strategy-not-strategy.
- Trump, D. (2017, May 21). *President Trump's Speech to the Arab Islamic American Summit*. Retrieved June 5, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-trumps-speech-arab-islamic-american-summit/>.
- Trump, D. (2017, May 25). *Remarks by President Trump at NATO Unveiling of the Article 5 and Berlin Wall Memorials – Brussels, Belgium*. Retrieved June 6, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-nato-unveiling-article-5-berlin-wall-memorials-brussels-belgium/>.
- Trump, D. (2017, July 6). *Remarks by President Trump to the People of Poland*. Retrieved July 14, 2017, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-people-poland/>.
- Trump, D. (2017, August 21). *Remarks by President Trump on the Strategy in Afghanistan and South Asia*. Retrieved September 10, 2017, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-strategy-afghanistan-south-asia/>.
- Trump, D. (2017, September 19). *Remarks by President Trump to the 72nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly*. Retrieved October 8, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-72nd-session-united-nations-general-assembly/>.
- Trump, D. (2017, November 10). *Remarks by President Trump at APEC CEO Summit | Da Nang, Vietnam*. Retrieved November 12, 2017, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-apec-ceo-summit-da-nang-vietnam/>.
- Trump, D. (2017, November 13). *Remarks by President Trump at 5th U.S.-ASEAN Summit*. Retrieved November 15, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-5th-u-s-asean-summit/>.
- The Heritage Foundation. (2017). *Threats to U.S. Vital Interests*. Retrieved December 8, 2017, <http://index.heritage.org/military/2017/assessments/threats/>.
- Wright, D., & Kludt, T. (2016, July 21). *Trump would break sharply with US foreign policy tradition*. Retrieved December 4, 2017, <http://www.cnn.com/2016/07/21/politics/trump-foreign-policy-interview/index.html>.
- Wright, T. (2017, December 19). *The National Security Strategy Papers Over a Crisis*. Retrieved February 4, 2018, <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/12/trump-national-security-strategy/548756/>.
- Zakaria, F. (2018, February 1). *Trump has drawn three red lines. They're all likely to be crossed*. Retrieved February 4, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trump-has-drawn-three-red-lines-theyre-all-likely-to-be-crossed/2018/02/01/>.

How to cite this article:

Monov, LB and Karev, ML.2018, Basic Map for the New National Security Strategy of the United States of America. *Int J Recent Sci Res*. 9(4), pp. 26095-26102. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0904.1990>
