

INFLUENCE OF US NEOCONSERVATISM ON FORMATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY PARADIGM

АҚШ НЕОКОНСЕРВАТИЗМИНИНГ МИЛЛИЙ ХАВФСИЗЛИК ПАРАДИГМАЛАРИ ШАКЛЛАНИШИГА ТАЪСИРИ

ВЛИЯНИЕ НЕОКОНСЕРВАТИЗМА США НА ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ПАРАДИГМ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ

Mukhammadolim MUKHAMMADSIDIQOV,
*INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC ACADEMY OF
UZBEKISTAN*

*Doctor of Political Sciences, Associate Professor
11, A.Kadiri, Tashkent, 100011, Uzbekistan
E-mail: m.muxammadsiddiqov@iia.uz*

Abrar TURAEV,
*Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan
Senior teacher
4, Sh.Rashidov, Jizzakh, 130100, Uzbekistan
E-mail: ijtimoiy2017@mail.ru*

DOI: 10.47980/TLOI/2020/3/12

Abstract: This article analyzes the impact of neoconservative ideology on the formation of national security paradigms in the United States and reveals the impact of views and ideas put forward by U.S. neoconservatives on the formation of public administration, especially security goals in domestic and foreign policy. In particular, the role of Albert Walstetter, a well-known proponent of neoconservative views, in the formation of security concepts is discussed. The role of political philosopher Leo Strauss's political-philosophical and military-strategic approaches in the development of neoconservative ideology and the conceptual basis of modern security problems are theoretically analyzed.

It is emphasized that the assessment of the impact of neoconservative ideology on the formation of security policy in the development of political processes related to public administration in the United States depends on understanding the content of formed neoconservative security concepts.

Based on the predominance of national interests based on national security approaches in the ideology of neoconservatism, the influence of neoconservatism on the interpretation of international relations as a highly conflicted, the anarchic environment is revealed in the formation of the neoconservative paradigm of security.

In the following periods, the implementation of Albert Walstetter and Leo Strauss's military-strategic ideas under the influence of neoconservatives in the US administration, in particular, the practice of proposing to continue the

foreign policy course on the use of military force as a factor of national security.

Keywords: *the US, neoconservatism, national interests, security, national security, security paradigm, U.S. foreign policy, neoconservative policy, security threats, priorities of national security policy*

Аннотация: Ушбу мақолада неоконсерватив мафкуранинг АҚШда миллий хавфсизлик парадигмаларининг шаклланишига таъсири таҳлил қилиниб, АҚШ неоконсерваторлари томонидан илгари сурилган қарашлар ва ғояларнинг давлат бошқаруви шаклланишига, айниқса ички ва ташқи сиёсатдаги хавфсизлик мақсадлари шаклланишига таъсири очиб берилади. Хусусан, неоконсерватив қарашларнинг таниқли тарафдори Альберт Уолстеттер ғояларининг хавфсизлик концепциялари шаклланишидаги ўрни кўриб чиқилади. Сиёсий файласуф Лео Штрауснинг сиёсий-фалсафий ва ҳарбий-стратегик ёндашувларининг неоконсерватизм мафкураси ривожига ўрни ҳамда замонавий хавфсизлик муаммоларининг концептуал асослари назарий жиҳатдан таҳлил қилинади.

АҚШдаги давлат бошқаруви билан боғлиқ сиёсий жараёнлар ривожига неоконсерватизм мафкурасининг хавфсизлик сиёсати шаклланишига таъсирини баҳолаш шаклланган неоконсерватив хавфсизлик концепциялари мазмунини тушунишга боғлиқ эканлигига эътибор қаратилади.

АҚШ неоконсерватизм мафкурасида миллий хавфсизлик ёндашувларининг асосида миллий манфаатларни таъминлаш масаласи устуворлик қилиши асосланиб, хавфсизликнинг неоконсерватив парадигмаси шаклланишида неоконсерватизм мафкурасининг халқаро муносабатларни юқори конфликтлашган, анархик муҳит сифатида талқин этиши билан боғлиқ қарашлари таъсири очиб берилган.

Кейинги даврларда АҚШ маъмуриятидаги неоконсерваторлар таъсирида Альберт Уолстеттер ва Лео Штраусларнинг ҳарбий-стратегик ғоялари тадбиғи, хусусан, миллий манфаатларни таъминлаш ва миллий хавфсизлик омили сифатида ҳарбий кучдан фойдаланиш бўйича ташқи сиёсат курсини давом эттириш таклифлари амалиёти очиб берилади.

Калит сўзлар: *АҚШ, неоконсерватизм, миллий манфаатлар, хавфсизлик, миллий хавфсизлик, хавфсизлик парадигмаси, АҚШ ташқи сиёсати, неоконсерватив сиёсат, хавфсизликка таҳдидлар, миллий хавфсизлик сиёсатининг устуворликлари*

Аннотация: В этой статье анализируется влияние неоконсервативной идеологии на формирование парадигм национальной безопасности в Соединенных Штатах и раскрывается влияние взглядов и идей, выдвинутых неоконсерваторами США на формирование государственного управления, особенно целей безопасности во внутренней и внешней политике. В частности, обсуждается роль Альберта Уолстеттера, известного сторонника не-

оконсервативных взглядов, в формировании концепций безопасности. Теоретически анализируется роль политико-философского и военно-стратегического подходов политического философа Лео Штрауса в развитии неоконсервативной идеологии и концептуальной основы современных проблем безопасности.

В статье подчеркивается, что оценка влияния неоконсервативной идеологии на формирование политики безопасности при развитии политических процессов, связанных с государственным управлением в США, зависит от понимания содержания сформированных неоконсервативных концепций безопасности.

Также изучено влияние неоконсервативной идеологии на интерпретацию международных отношений как крайне противоречивой, анархической среды, что проявляется в формировании неоконсервативной парадигмы безопасности с учетом приоритетности национальных интересов на основе критериев национальной безопасности в идеологии неоконсерватизма,

Изучена практика реализации военно-стратегических идей Альберт Уолстеттера и Лео Штрауса под влиянием неоконсерваторов в администрации США, в частности, по вопросу продолжения внешнеполитического курса на использование военной силы как фактора национальной безопасности в последующие периоды.

Ключевые слова: *США, неоконсерватизм, национальные интересы, безопасность, национальная безопасность, парадигма безопасности, внешняя политика США, неоконсервативная политика, угрозы безопасности, приоритеты политики национальной безопасности*

INTRODUCTION

Historically, humanity has tried to protect itself from various dangers. The fact that a society is free from dangers or that its level of protection is an important factor in its stability and development necessitates the need for states to pursue security policies.

Security is a broad concept and different approaches to its interpretation have been formed. But the main idea that summarizes all views and interpretations is that security is a state of protection from various levels of threats.

The security issue did not arise yesterday or today. This problem arose with the formation of humanity and the state. Security theory has gone through several historical stages. As a result of humanity's desire for security, a system of security was formed first in one society, then in the state, and finally in the international arena.

At all levels, from international security to national security, the impact of a particular threat and the state of protection against it reflect the content of key views. In particular, international security means the state of international relations that ensures the stability of the world community. In other words, international security

is a situation in which the subjects of international relations are no longer at risk of war or other external aggression on their sovereign lives and independent development. In general, security is an important category of political science, and the processes associated with it have become the main object of study. In particular, ensuring national security is a priority of every government. Security policy in all directions is directly dependent on the influence of political ideology. This or that political ideology influences the political decisions of the authorities, which are the programmatic basis, the formation of the domestic and foreign policy of the state, in particular, security policy. First of all, the task of ensuring internal political security will be solved by focusing on internal security.

METHODS

Internal political security is characterized by the stability and effectiveness of government institutions, the ability of government structures to control political processes, the existence of effective non-governmental political institutions that ensure political stability in society. The state of political consciousness of citizens and the political culture of a society has a serious impact on the safe political development of a society.

Assessing the impact of neoconservative ideology on security policy development in the development of public administration-related political processes depends on understanding the content of the neoconservative security concepts that have been formed. Approaches to U.S. national security are dominated by approaches such as external threats, the geostrategic position in international relations, and the nature of world politics. Given the leadership role of liberal-democratic principles in domestic political processes in the United States, the scope of influence of neoconservative ideology is largely determined by international relations and the foreign policy of the state. Therefore, the influence of neoconservatism's foreign policy goals on the formation of US national security paradigms is obvious. The influence of such principles of neoconservatism as civic responsibility, high patriotism, elitism and meritocracy in public administration can also be seen in ensuring internal security.

RESULTS

In the ideology of U.S. neoconservatism, the issue of ensuring national interests based on national security approaches takes precedence. Specific conservative views have been formed in the pursuit of national interests, which serve as the basis for updated conservative approaches. It should be noted that the level of protection of national interests in the United States is one of the important criteria of national security.

In the United States, there are several approaches to defining national interests. G. Morgenthau, the founder of the realist school, distinguishes two levels of national interests: vital and secondary.

No compromise and no restrictions on wars can be tolerated to protect vital interests. Defining vital interests is fairly simple: preserving U.S. independence and freedom, protecting its core institutions and fundamental values. At certain times, vital interests are understood on a much broader scale, and all forces, primarily the armed forces, must be coordinated and prepared to deal with threats posed by any other state.

The system of national interests formed during the Cold War was enriched with neoconservative ideas of the new era. According to neoconservatism, one of the main features of neoconservatism aimed at supporting national interests is the focus on patriotism and nationalism in society.

Neoconservative views in the formation of security strategies based on historical experience are close to realist approaches. Like political realism, neoconservatism sees the nation-state as the main subject.

In contrast, neoconservatism denies the “balance of power” and the “de-ideology of national interests”, which are important concepts of realism. What brings us closer to the liberal paradigm is the strategy of spreading democracy. But the difference is in the use of military force. Unlike neoconservatism, in political realism, national interests are democratized and based on rational actions aimed at maintaining sovereignty and security.

Unlike realists who base the system of stability and relations in international relations on a “balance of power,” neoconservatives seek to articulate this issue through the ideology of “America’s Choice” and the universality of American socio-political principles. That is, instead of trying to strike a balance against the U.S., a weak state should instead seek to unite with it.

However, it is emphasized that this proposal applies only to democratic systems.

DISCUSSION

In the current era of globalization, interstate relations are becoming more and more intense. But such processes as turning the balance of relations to their advantage, elevating their own national interests above the interests of other nations (in the sense of “trampling”) on their foreign policy principles not only undermine the national sovereignty of individual states but also the global problems facing humanity are undermining the solution system of these problems. In particular, the threat of interference in the internal affairs and sovereignty of other states through the “export” of democracy (the mask of democracy), which

is a universal value, should be scientifically investigated as well.

According to the neoconservative approach, international law and institutions are ineffective tools and can also play a negative role in advancing national interests. Allied states are perceived by neoconservatives as a situation where interests are matched. But still their reliability is questionable, the main means of restraining them is military force. Another characteristic aspect of neoconservatism is its rigorous approach to evaluating a state’s foreign policy with its political system. According to neoconservatism, authoritarian regimes are more aggressive subjects of international relations, and at the domestic political level, they are not bound by certain restrictions. Democracies, on the other hand, are more peace-loving. Kirkpatrick also emphasizes that there is a need for US power for the survival of liberal democracy.

Based on the analysis of official documents of state policy and statements of Republican presidents, formed under the influence of neoconservative ideology, it is possible to highlight four priorities of national security policy. In particular, the first priority is to ensure military superiority and to adapt the armed forces to the fight against transnational terrorist networks, which is directly explained by the fact that it is aimed at ensuring U.S. military superiority.

The views of the ideology of neoconservatism on the interpretation of international relations as a highly conflict-ridden, anarchic environment play an important role in the formation of the neoconservative paradigm of security. That is, according to this view, the decisive role of the military power factor is recognized. According to neoconservatives, humanity will always exist in the “anarchic world of T.Hobbes”, where international legal norms are ineffective, the promotion of security and liberal order depends on the existing military force and readiness to use it.

In international relations where anarchy reigns, the power of a particular state is a more important factor for neoconservatives. R.Kagan emphasizes that this rule has been relevant since the time of the Roman Empire and is still so today ... Despite the possible abuse, military power remains a universal tool for resolving issues.

Many ideas of neoconservatives on political and military-strategic changes in decision-making in crisis were developed by two political scientists and political philosophers Leo Strauss and military strategist-analyst Albert Walstetter, whose political-philosophical and military-strategic approaches are conceptually important for neoconservatism ideology. They have had a major impact on the political-military approach as well as military-strategic thinking of the Pentagon and many presidential administrations.

Leo Strauss, a theorist of the philosophy of neoconservatism, was one of the founders of one of the basic principles of neoconservatism - the use of military force as the primary means of solving problems. Such views of his served as an ideological program for modern neoconservatives. Albert James Wohlstetter is one of the leading defense intellectuals of the twentieth century and is one of the leading neoconservatives known as a leading expert in areas such as strategic analysis of national security problems, creating security systems for high-tech applications, missile defense systems, virtual warfare and nuclear strategy. He was the founder and director of the Pan-Juristics Research Center, which advises the U.S. Department of Defense on political-military and military-strategic issues, and the founder of the University of Chicago's School of National Security Strategic Analysis.

Wohlstetter's views have had a significant impact on the formation of the U.S. national security strategy over the last quarter-century. In the context of the decline of the ideological factor at the end of the Cold War, his views played an important role in the development of ideas of the new era of neoconservatism. In the context of the possibility of new threats and the uncertain military-strategic configuration, it has led to the formation of several strategic concepts. The United States withdrew from the international agreement reached in 1972 as a result of his ideas for the development of a missile defense system in December 2011. The neoconservative strategist proposed a strategy of nuclear doctrine. In particular, he was one of the lobbyists for the U.S. nuclear doctrine, adopted in 2002 under the influence of neoconservatives. In the area of military strategic development, A. Wohlstetter advised the military on the deployment of U.S. strategic air forces abroad. His "Second Strike" strategy is still at the heart of the concept of nuclear weapons in US policy.

Thus, it can be said that Albert Wohlstetter, played an important role in the development of security approaches to the ideology of neoconservatism, and in recent years under the influence of neoconservatives in the US administration, his military-strategic ideas were put into practice. For example, proposals to pursue a foreign policy course to ensure national interests and the use of military force as a factor of national security have been implemented.

The National Security Strategy was developed as a form of accountability to the legislature to justify defense budget expenditures and is today a key focus in assessing the military-strategic views of the U.S. leadership. Based on the analysis, it can be seen that U.S. national security strategies were initially formed during the presidencies of R.Reagan and J. Bush, when the influence of neoconservatism was high. In particular,

in the United States, by 1987, the first national security strategy was adopted as an official document. Based on this tradition, long-term national security strategies were formed in the post-Cold War period. Early security strategies (adopted in 1987, 1988, 1990, and 1991) emphasized that the military force factor was the basis of security. That is, the main means of providing security were found to be the armed forces. Nuclear forces were seen by Republican ideologues as a key means of ensuring the security of the United States and its allies. For the first time in the party's program, steps have been taken to strengthen the nuclear shield. The military strategy section of the 1991 document noted that the main threat to security was regional conflicts, and participation in regional military conflicts was seen as a key criterion of military planning for the U.S. military. For the first time, the issue of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has been taken seriously in a national strategy. U.S. economic well-being has been officially included in the national security definition system. After the end of the Cold War, a serious approach to the preparation of the document began, as the world was made up of many centers, there were more threats, processes were accelerated, the interdependence between the subjects of international relations increased, new factors affecting national security. This also required additional obligations for the use of military force.

Under the influence of Wohlstetter's ideas, two U.S. national security strategies were adopted in 2002 and 2006, with warnings of new threats following the end of the Clinton Democratic administration. It is acknowledged that Wohlstetter's ideas also influenced the creation of a network of military bases in Eastern Europe and the post-Soviet space based on claims of military protection of national interests, as well as the adoption of a new national defense strategy in 2005 and military strategy in 2004. His ideas were also the basis for the formation of ideas such as the latest high-precision weapons test against Iraq in 2003, the "Paralysis and Hunting" - the sixth-generation war. As in the Cold War, the emphasis was on victory, not ideological, but military (Kristol W. Memorandum to:..)

Neoconservatives have been strongly opposed to entering into several arms deals. This ranges from nuclear test ban treaties to medium- and short-range missile limitation agreements. In general, neoconservatives believe that U.S. security, in turn, relies on the U.S. armed forces, not on the mirage of arms control. That is, in the anarchic context of international relations, it makes no sense to reduce or limit U.S. military power. In turn, U.S. neoconservatives support military cooperation, particularly military blocs led by him. In this regard, Churchill's view that "in cooperation with

the Allies, sometimes they have personal views” and similar approaches are in full harmony with the views of neoconservatism. According to neoconservatives, NATO has the ability to perform many UN functions. With the end of the Cold War, it became a central element of a community of nations that united common political values (Schmitt, Memorandum...).

It can be said that the modern neoconservative concept of the development of the U.S. armed forces was formed by the 2000s. In the run-up to the presidential election, the PNAC released a report entitled “Rebuilding America’s Defense: Strategies, Forces, and Sources of the New American Age.” The document was prepared in collaboration with the US Armed Forces, military academies and major corporations. The objectives of this document are developed in line with the objectives of the 1992 Defense Planning Manual. The neoconservatives’ U.S. military success in the post-Cold War era and the aftermath of the Gulf War suggest that now is the time to forget “extreme caution”. To neoconservatives, this military bloc is the guarantor of world order.

And in turn, it is emphasized that the syndrome of the Vietnam War should be completely eliminated.

In the context of the ideology of neoconservatism, the fact that the military force is the basis of national security maintains its priority as a constant and unchanging ideological and political element in the development of neoconservative ideas. That is why the neoconservatives have to increase the annual military budget to maintain US global dominance, emphasize that the US military power should be several times greater than the threat of other countries, promote patriotism and military values among the civilian population, ensure “unity of people and army”, try to ensure the performance of tasks such as attracting as many volunteers as possible.

The second priority of national security policy is to ensure internal security, combat the threat of terrorism, border security and illegal immigration, drug trafficking, information security, infrastructure security, emergency response, combating the spread of dangerous epidemics and mitigating the effects of bioterrorist attacks. covers tasks in areas such as health system development. In this regard, neoconservatives have focused mainly on the fight against terrorism. It can be said that measures have been taken to achieve widespread recognition by neoconservatives as a priority of U.S. national security. In particular, the U.S. administration, led by the younger J.Bush, became at war in response to the events of September 11, 2001. In terms of internal security, Bush has implemented extensive institutional reforms. In particular, it has taken comprehensive measures to prevent bioterrorism, increase border security, and ensure information and infrastructure

security. Particular attention was paid to improving the exchange of information between law enforcement and intelligence agencies, as well as public authorities, the private sector (which owns 85% of all important infrastructure facilities) and international partners. In the international arena, the United States has formed a large-scale anti-terrorism coalition (military assistance was offered to 136 countries, 89 countries were allowed to use their airspace, and the financial assets of terrorist organizations were frozen in 142 countries).

The United States has also begun providing military-technical assistance to other countries fighting terrorism and has emphasized cooperation in managing weapons of mass destruction technology. Gradually, under the influence of neoconservatism, the war on terror began to turn into a war against the conflicting states. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, called for an immediate review of the country’s foreign policy and the development of a precautionary strike strategy.

The third priority of the US national security policy can be recognized as economic security factors such as ensuring the global economy and financial stability, energy security, openness of foreign markets. While the open market principles of neoconservatism provide opportunities for economic cooperation, there have also been destructive views on energy security. The intensification of competition for oil and gas, the main energy sources, has further strengthened the energy security factor. As the country’s development and economic development depended directly on hydrocarbon resources, it necessitated the need for neoconservative views to influence the formation of security approaches aimed at further enhancing U.S. energy capabilities. In this regard, it has been concluded that several military actions of the US administration in the Middle East under the influence of neoconservatism are mainly related to energy security interests.

In recent years, the concept of energy security has historically been formed in the context of geopolitical competition between the world’s major powers, and has become even more relevant in the context of resource disputes between Western energy importing countries and OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries).

The authors of the book “Energy and Security: The Path to a New Foreign Policy Strategy” interpret energy security as the provision of access to energy resources necessary for the development of national power. According to Lee Hamilton, president of the Wilson International Science Center, “energy security is the second most important component of the national security policy after national defense. According to the scientist, all countries of the world, including the United

States, should be involved in strengthening energy security.

One of the main skills of U.S. neoconservatives is not to lose the advantage, especially in regions with high energy potential, such as the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. The growing demand for oil and gas resources in the world has undoubtedly intensified the geopolitical and geoeconomic competition in these regions. By the beginning of the new century, an energy security paradigm had emerged in the security system.

In general, the concept of energy security consists of components such as energy resources, price, supply and transport security, which should be approached in terms of its components. Energy security is not only determined by indicators such as the depletion or non-availability of energy resources, rising prices. In this context, the energy security of different states or groups of states, regions can be defined differently. In particular, the energy security of exporting countries is a state of stable reserves, diversity of supply opportunities and protection from internal and external threats to their position in the world energy market.

The urgency of the issue of energy security is a serious concern for countries that consume leading energy sources, such as the United States. In recent years, there has been a growing call from U.S. political circles, particularly neoconservatives, to develop sound strategies on the geopolitical and geoeconomic importance of oil and gas-rich regions in times of high influence.

The fourth priority of U.S. national security policy is to include views on international security. In particular, according to neoconservative views, US hegemony is the basis of international security. In this regard, attention will be paid to the prevention of regional conflicts that negatively affect national stability, strengthening the alliance of partner countries, promoting democracy in the world, weakening the impact of non-democratic regimes on international security and political change, combating radical Islamic extremism.

The neoconservative approach to protecting national security from threats through international security includes ideas such as the priority of the United States, its "choice," and its unique "responsibility" for deciding liberal-democratic values around the world.

Formed under the influence of the ideology of U.S. neoconservatism, the formation of national security policy during the presidency of J. Bush (2001-2009) was influenced by various political-theoretical schools and concepts. However, it was mainly influenced by two political and ideological trends: neoconservatism and neoliberalism, which emerged on the basis of the development of the principle of liberal internationalism.

In the 1990s, representatives of both directions brought their positions closer together.

While the U.S. policy of international supremacy and hegemony has traditionally had a negative connotation in the United States, neoconservatives have sought to prove that "American imperialism" benefits the world. At the same time, they tried to legitimize the U.S. national security policy. It should be noted that these views, assessed by the elite of the U.S. community of neoconservative experts, have influenced the formation of national security. They not only provided a "scientific basis" for the U.S.'s desire for global dominance, but also suggested ways to strengthen it, legitimizing it in the eyes of the public.

The main goal of U.S. national security policy during the period under review was to strengthen its dominant position in the global political system. The basic tenets of national security policy were set out in the September 2002 Bush Doctrine. It should be noted that the authors of the strategy did not make a clear distinction between internal and external security. As the U.S. actively participates in world politics and economics, it is not surprising that the concept of security has been interpreted in terms of the sustainability of the existing system of economic and political relations in which the United States has a leading position. From an economic point of view, the US project "for the whole world" was based on the principles of neoliberalism, ideologically - the idea of democracy, and politically - the idea of combating terrorism. Attempts by other members of the world political system to offer alternatives to democracy and the free market, in particular authoritarianism, radicalism and protectionism, have been identified as a major threat to national security.

Supporting opposition movements and establishing democratic regimes in other countries through direct military intervention was seen as the most effective way to ensure U.S. internal security.

Thus, after the Republican administration came to power, neoconservatives began to argue that concepts such as "stability" and "norm" and "good neighborliness" should not be given too much importance. At the same time, they believe that in the modern world, mechanisms such as "hold", "restriction", "realism", "collective security", "confidence-building" and "consensus" no longer work. In their view, all treaties and agreements are aimed at limiting and controlling U.S. military forces.

During the last Republican administration "the ideas put forward by neoconservatives have been adequately implemented. So the task now is not to complicate the situation, but to lose the results. These results have been important for both Republicans and Democrats. Especially after the - Arab Spring".

In the system of neoconservative views aimed at ensuring international security, the issue of radical Islam and the behavior of non-democratic regimes play an important role. Especially after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there was a sharp change in attitudes towards Islam. The 9/11 phenomenon is changing U.S. attitudes toward threats.

In general, the influence of U.S. neoconservative ideology on the formation of national security paradigms is most evident during the presidency of presidents elected by the Republican Party. In particular, security approaches in the post-2000s have been shaped by the political views of the junior Bush administration and the neoconservative community. The principles of neoconservatism demonstrated the foundations of a unique integral security paradigm under the influence of traditional realist and idealist approaches to security. That is, in the structure of national interests, neoconservatives combined and combined realistic elements (power, intervention) with idealistic elements (character of political systems, values, ideas, loyalty to historical traditions, freedom). Idealistic elements undoubtedly take precedence in their interpretation of national interests. Pursuing an idealistic policy leads to the application of double standards. In particular, the United States has sometimes turned a blind eye to violations of democratic values and human rights when it is in its best interests. Moreover, the mere inculcation of democratic ideas into the world through violence is not in line with democratic principles. Paleoconservatives R.Kirk and P.Buchanan, representatives of classical conservatism, have drawn attention to this issue, criticizing the behavior of neoconservatives. Hence, the national security approaches of neoconservatism move away from the value-ideological paradigm and show the rejection of the traditional approach to the concept of sovereignty. This is because the idea of exporting liberal values, in turn, requires entering into a conflict with national sovereignties. Thus, the ideology of neoconservatism in the United States includes elements of the classical paradigms in the theory of international relations - political realism and liberalism.

However, US neoconservative initiatives today caused negative results, first of all, the negative attitude of the world community towards the United States, a decline in the image of Democratic leadership.

Thus, the assessment of the role of neoconservative ideas in ensuring national security is reflected in the following principles: first, international relations are anarchic, and historical experience shows that military power remains a decisive factor in interstate politics. As a means of ensuring security and foreign policy, power must be used first, not last. Second, international law cannot be effective in ensuring justice and security.

International organizations cannot be an instrument of regulation of foreign relations and foreign policy. Third, the internal nature of a particular system of government influences foreign policy, so it must be based on liberal-democratic principles. Because democracies around the world are less likely to clash, and the tradition of democratic statehood is a guarantee of international security. Fourth, the interdependence of society and national interests in the form of governance is important. A healthy society needs to understand and comprehend its foreign policy goals. This encourages an understanding of internal decay and external risks. Fifth, the United States must rely on its universal values, the principles of natural law, and strive to lead and survive in a democratic world as a state with modern armed forces and leverage.

Based on the discussion of this issue, the following general conclusions can be made:

First, in the eyes of neoconservatives, national interests are based on the U.S.'s commitment to fundamental ideas and self-respect;

Secondly, in the views of the ideology of neoconservatism on U.S. national security, approaches such as external threats, the geostrategic situation in international relations, the nature of world politics predominates. Therefore, the influence of neoconservatism's foreign policy goals on the formation of U.S. national security paradigms is evident;

Third, in the ideology of neoconservatism, security is interpreted as a category of value, manifested as a single system in which the factors of national interest, national security and military power are integrated;

Fourth, the influence of neoconservative ideology ideas on the formation of U.S. national security strategies was observed during the Republican administration and formed the theoretical basis of the security paradigm;

Fifth, the urgency of the energy security factor in the U.S. national security system has begun to be seen as one of the modern U.S. foreign policy directions, influencing neoconservative foreign policy decision-making. Neoconservative ideas served as the basis for the realization of geoenergetic interests;

Sixth, the main foreign policy approaches of neoconservatism served as a theoretical basis in the formation of U.S. national security strategies.

In particular, skepticism about the effectiveness of international norms in ensuring national security and national interests, the threat of non-democratic states, the need to combat international terrorism and "radical Islamism" and the elimination of threats to national security through international military force. based on opinions.

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the ideological foundations of neoconservatism ideology were accepted as a theoretical source for the newly formed U.S. national security strategy. In particular, the anarchic nature of international relations, the reliance on military force for security, the ineffectiveness of international institutions in combating security threats, authoritarian regimes and the understanding of “radical Islam” as key threats, the spread of democracy as a factor in global cultural development and stability. Such approaches have served as the political and ideological basis of the U.S. national security concept.

REFERENCES

1. Daalder I., Lindsay J. (2005). *America Unbound*. - Washington, P.50-58.
2. Kagan R. (2008). *The Return of History and the End of Dreams*. - New York: Alfred A Knopf, P.3.64.
3. Kagan R. *Why America Must Lead*. www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/leadership/why-america-must-lead
4. Kagan R., Kristol W. (2000). *Present Dangers: Crisis and Opportunity in America's Foreign and Defense Policy*. - San Francisco: Encounter Books, Kindle Edition, P.291.
5. Kalicki J.H., Goldwyn D.L. (2005). *Energy and Security: Toward a New Foreign Policy Strategy*. Washington - Baltimore, P.9.
6. Kirkpatrick J. (1983). *The Reagan Phenomenon and Other Speeches on Foreign Policy*. - Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, P.3-16.
7. Kristol W. *Memorandum to: Opinion Leaders. Subject: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty*. <http://www.newamericancentury.org/defoct2799.htm>
8. Morgenthau H. (1962). *The Impasse of American Foreign Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, P.191.
9. Muhammadsidiqov, M. (2018). The influence of “religious factor” on ethno-political and confessional conflicts in Muslim countries. *The Light of Islam*. Vol. 2018: Iss. 1. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/iiu/vol2018/iss1/18>
10. Rodionovsky M. (2008). Influence of A.Wohlstetter , on the development by the neoconservatives of the US foreign policy and national security strategy. *Bulletin of the Chit State University*, 6 (51), 177.
11. Samarov R. (2010). *Methodological bases of security*. Tashkent. Academy, P.17.
12. Schmidt B., Williams M. (2008). *The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neocoservatives Versus Realists*. Security Studies, 17(2), 196.
13. Schmitt G., *Memorandum to: Opinion Leaders, Subject: NATO enlargement. What is the “Threat?”*. <http://www.newamericancentury.org/nato-19971013.htm>
14. Turaev Abrar Salokhiddinovich, Abdusamadov Farrukh. (2020). *The Impact of Changes in Public Administration on the Development of Neoconservative Ideas in the United States*. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(3), 8113. Retrieved from <http://sersc.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article/view/8387>
15. Turaev, A. (2019). Islamic factor in neoconservative foreign policy of the USA in the Middle East. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (2), 175-178.
16. Vaisse J. (2010). *Neoconservatism: The History of the Movement*. - Harvard: Harvard University Press, P, 236.
17. Azimov H.Y. (2019). The emergence of the Syrian crisis and the impact of the external forces on it. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*. № 4 (6). Pp. 92-97.
18. Veselovsky S.S. (2009). *Multilateral cooperation in the fight against transnational terrorism*. M., P.122.
19. Muhammadsidiqov, M. (2016). *The Evolution of Islamic Politicization Process*. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*. Vol.4 (Nov/Dec 2016). Available at: pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c85f/0282346d200850b1d9ceb8bf95b2bfdde7de.pdf
20. Muhammadsidikov, M. (2015). *Özbekistan'da toplumsal yaşamın ana özelliği hoşgörü*. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 0 (54), 7-14. Available at: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ataunisobd/issue/2811/37766>
21. Muhammadsidiqov, M. (2015). *Stability of North African Region*. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*. Vol.3 (March-April-2015). Available at: <http://ijmcr.com/stability-of-north-african-region/>
22. Muhammadsidiqov, M. (2019). *Problems of regulation of secularism and religious principles in Arab countries*. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*. No. 4(6). Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/problems-of-regulation-of-secularism-and-religious-principles-in-arab-countries>
23. Pulatkhodjaev Z.S. (2019). *Modern initiatives of Uzbekistan to strengthen integration in Central Asia*. *Theoretical and Applied Science*. Philadelphia, USA. No. 06 (74). P. 516-518.
24. Saydaliyeva N., Nazirov M. (2018). *Features of the state youth policy in Uzbekistan*. *Paradigmata poznani. Paradigms of knowledge*, (Czech Republic). No. 06 (74). P. 117-120.
25. Idirov U.Yu. (2019). *Development of modern innovative bases of democracy as a leading factor of enhancing the possibility of sovereign political development*. *European Science Review*, Vienna. No. 7-8. P. 41-46.
26. Nazirov M.M. (2014). *The Conceptual Basis of Contemporary Political Processes in Uzbekistan*. *Contemporary Central Asia*. India, New Delhi. Vol. XVIII, No.2&3. P. 32-46.