



The Principles of the U.S. Foreign Policy and the Factors Influencing its Formation

Mohammad Hossein Nejati

Master's degree in International Relations, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, Allameh Tabatabai University, Olympic Village, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

The value system and national characteristics that shape a nation's identity as a nation-state usually give rise to and influence that nation's foreign policy, which is then theorized, formulated, and put into practice on the ground in accordance with the achievement of that nation's short-, medium-, and long-term objectives. The United States of America is not an exception as a superpower in the world order. This study aims to identify the key elements of American foreign policy's theoretical and philosophical underpinnings with the help of the descriptive-explanatory approach and a theoretical viewpoint. To prioritize and emphasize each of these elements and influencing factors at any given time, it also studies and explains each of their nature and philosophical traits. The research's findings also demonstrate that the three main pillars of American foreign policy's philosophical and theoretical framework after World War II were national interests, including economic interests, security interests, and ideological interests, along with American identity and values. These three elements, which have been influenced by doctrines of presidents, exceptionalism and self-superiority, neoconservatism, belief in a historical mission in relation to world leadership, efforts to provide the best and most effective foreign policy strategy to secure interests and America's national security, and the spread of liberal democratic values in the world, have led me to this conclusion.

Keywords: Principles, foreign policy, United States of America, national interests, value bases, American identity

DOI Number: 10.48047/NQ.2022.20.20.NQ109240

NeuroQuantology2022;20(20): 2384-2395

Introduction

The value system and national characteristics that shape a nation's identity as a nation-state usually give rise to and influence that nation's foreign policy, which is then theorized, formulated, and put into practice on the ground in accordance with the achievement of that nation's short-, medium-, and long-term objectives. As a global superpower, the United States of America is not an exception to this law. This nation attained a strong economic foundation after creating its industry-focused economy during the 19th century, which is the primary requirement for carrying out a comprehensive and dynamic foreign policy. Additionally, after the United States' victory in the war with Spain in April 1898, Spain relinquished Puerto Rico and the Philippines to the United States. It acknowledged Cuba's independence with the help of the United States. The United States abandoned the Monroe Doctrine, which was the cornerstone of the tradition of isolationism in this country's foreign policy and looked inward and concentrated the

presence and influence of the United States in the American continent. The United States recognized beyond the American continent as worthy of its political, economic, and military presence and influence. (2021: 4728; Nejati). The U.S. have regulated the type of international relations and interactions with other players in the field of international politics, and from this area, the macro approach of this country to the field of international politics has been formed and divided during the past two centuries based on the traditional and four schools dominating the field of foreign policy of this country and also under the influence of the structural determinations of the international system, public opinion and, as a result, the dominant discourses on the different governments of this country in the form of doctrines and military and national security strategies and strategies. Fighting terrorism, defending national interests and security, and spreading liberal values and democracy outside the sphere of western civilization by the United States in the first two decades of the 21st century has given the



internationalization movement a structural and culture-oriented identity. This identity was first given by the United States' active and decisive role in World War II, followed by the Cold War and its defense of Western-American liberal values. Although it is important to note that during this time, each of the vital and defining elements of American foreign policy have been given more and clearer priority and importance compared to other elements, which has been visible in the doctrines of the presidents of the United States of America. For instance, the weight, impact, and unique position of each of these crucial elements can be assessed and explained in relation to Bill Clinton's doctrine of humanitarian intervention, George Bush Jr.'s presentation of the doctrine of war with terrorism and the spread of democracy worldwide, and finally Donald Trump's doctrine of muscular nationalism. After the Second World War, "the United States of America's foreign policy has three separate and different areas, which are the area of critical policy, the field of structural policy, and the field of strategic policy," with national interests, American identity, and value foundations serving as the three main components of its philosophical and theoretical framework (Nejati, 2021: 4730). "In each region, one of the two executive and legislative branches enjoys a function that derives from the character of that political domain, in terms of the nature of the power, tools at their disposal, and amount of influence" (Dahisyar, 2012: 121). Therefore, to prioritize and highlight each of these components and influencing variables at any given time, it is required and inevitable to examine and explain their nature and philosophical features. Doing so will help to provide a better review and is more thorough than United States foreign policy. Different political and military doctrines and strategies have been developed and planned under each of this nation's presidents, and they have been operationalized and put into action in various geographic locations depending on the geopolitical wealth, the severity and scope of the threats it poses, and the need for American intervention in that region based on the values and morals this nation holds dear.

1- Principles of foreign policy of the U.S.

1.1. American identity

"Identity in its philosophical sense is everything that makes something what it is," claims Alexander Wendt (Metalabi, 2013: 148). Identity has a conceptual and intersubjective aspect in the

constructivist theoretical dictionary, which serves as the central tenet of their theoretical philosophy. It is handled socially and within the context of the shared knowledge of international players. Accordingly, they define, govern, and express their political and social behavior, approach, and attitude toward diverse internal and external processes and phenomena at the sub-national, national, and transnational levels. Thus, unlike the view of structuralists, identity is not a fixed, certain and exogenous thing from international interactions, but society and social relations play an irreplaceable and critical role in the formation and definition of different human identities, that historical background and culture are two main and life-giving elements in the emergence of a social identity from a racial, strong or national perspective. The "American identity" is composed of a number of elements, like any social identity. The Anglo-Protestant culture is the dominant cultural current in America, and every subculture is heavily represented within it. Immigrants have cultivated this culture as the foundation of American identity for more than four centuries (Huntington, 2004: 93). As a result, the following are the primary elements and components of this culture: Two humanistic values resulting from religious reform in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: 1. Protestantism 2. Humanistic values 3. British customs relating to human rights, such as freedom and justice 4. The rule of law and methods of government following the social and political upheaval in Britain, dubbed "London's Glorious Revolution" in 1668, 5. English language, 6. Renaissance Europe's literary and cultural legacy.

In addition to the aforementioned, the ideal is one of the primary components of the American national identity, which is crystallized in terms like "American life" and "American dream," and which nurtures a new political and social discourse in its womb, with the "salvation" and "progressiveness" of this holy ideal serving as its most significant features. The American ideal has been described by researchers in a variety of ways, but their core ideas are quite similar. Myrdal makes reference to "human dignity," "basic human equality," and "the innate right to freedom, justice, and equal opportunity" in this context. Thomas Jefferson also mentions "the equality of human beings" and "the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" in the Declaration of Independence (Metalabi, 2013:



151). The American ideal is based on "human equality," "freedom," "justice," "democracy," "non-discrimination," and "rule of law," according to Samuel Huntington, the founder and theorist of the clash of civilizations thesis: "Americans have offered an ideal-based description of their national identity that stresses uniqueness and convictions like the promise of the divine and the construction of a city on high" (Huntington, 1999: 38). It follows that the American identity plays a crucial and key part in the formulation and construction of the decisions and strategies that make up American foreign policy. Accordingly, the United States' approach to world issues, challenges, and crises, as well as its foreign policy toward various international actors at any given time and in the near and far reaches of its geography, have all been driven by a sense of leadership, a desire for nationalistic supremacy, or a sense of duty toward other countries and different societies. These values include human rights, freedom, and democracy. For this reason, the social psychological perspective should be used to describe and assess the significance and conceptual position of this essential component in the eyes of the American political elites and social masses.

1.2. Value bases

Two distinct notions that connect to one another and overlap both utilize the word "value." The first idea, used by political figures in either positive or negative situations, is that: there is utilization of democracy, justice, freedom, power, etc. A individual, organization, or society may decide to accept or reject particular objectives, strategies for accomplishing them, norms, and values based on a criterion or basis for judgment. Values impact political conduct in the latter meaning. "Personal values are viewed by psychologists as standards that direct perception, judgment, and action in all facets of life" (RATHBUN, 2016: 127). Adapting the historic remark made by "Madeleine Albright," the first female secretary of state in the political history of the United States and a former secretary of state under Bill Clinton, who described the United States and its people as an inevitable nation at the helm of the free world, the main characteristics of this nation, namely "being savior" and "being progressive," in the form of a strategic culture, play an important and crucial role in relation to the type of behavior and performance of this nation in the field of international politics. This nation can be seen as

embodying a global ideal that is institutionalized in the body of the cultural and value system of this superpower of the international system. Because of this, Americans think that their ideas and worldview are distinctive, and they have a holy duty to advance and disseminate American principles like liberalism and democracy throughout the world. No contemporary idea has been more ingrained in the minds of educated Americans as the notion that governments may become democratic anytime, anywhere, and under any circumstances, according to Jane Kirkpatrick (Shahabi, 2021: 496). Indeed, the founding fathers of the United States of America spoke of the construction of a city atop a hill, whose foundation and existence, in their opinion, depend only on the fight for freedom and the formation of a progressive and distinctive constitution. A populist and pluralistic political system was eventually established as a result of this, which had its roots in the prosperous and constructive experiences of ancient civilizations and advanced nations as well as in the intellectual pursuits and theoretical schools of its thinkers. Through the legislative bodies (Senate and House of Representatives) and an independent judiciary known as the "American Court of Justice," it is subject to the oversight and judgment of regular individuals both at the domestic and international levels. "The political elites of this nation feel that America should construct symbols that represent the will of the people and establish a society in which democratic ideals predominate. As a consequence, the greatest way to combat the adversary on the global stage is to serve as a role model by improving the home situation and succeeding in winning people's pleasure (Deshyar, 2008: 42). In its own unique way, expresses the position and significance of this nation-value state's foundation and intellectual framework in the manner in which it approaches and maintains stability toward the political, social, and historical processes, phenomena, and events of its own and other societies, as well as how this approach and stability are expressed and actualized in this nation's domestic and foreign policy.

1.3. National interests

As a political realism, Hans Morgenthau holds that a nation's foreign policy should be guided by its own interests, and that politicians, policymakers, and decision-makers in the area of foreign policy always consider these interests and base their



judgments on them. They worry about how their actions will impact their country's power, security, and national interests at various times, particularly in urgent crises. Harvard University's Jeffrey Frieden, a professor of international politics, asserts that "sub-permanent interests that regulate its creation define national interests" (HAN WU, 2017: 393). Additionally, he suggests that "in the first instance, we should look at interest groups, political parties, and bureaucracies that interact with one another in the formation of national interests" (HAN WU, 2017: 393), arguing that the value bases taken into account by these strata are also involved and effective in the process. National interests are typically broken down into three groups: economic, security, and ideological.

1.3.1. Economic interests:

From American taxpayers to multinational corporations, the category of economic interests in the United States encompasses a wide range of financial interests and investments of natural and legal entities at the national and transnational levels, where we observe a type of entanglement and integration of interests and capital. The goal and nature of the market economy is to establish and expand free trade to the furthest reaches of the globe, allowing for the breach of rigid national borders as well as the material cost as well as the impetus for unilateralism and recourse to intensify war and conflict for them as much as possible. As a part of the macro security policy of this superpower, to restrict and mitigate the role of governmental players in the economic sphere and, moreover, to provide the essential foundation in order to create and sustain American economic hegemony globally. Therefore, all businesses and sectors in the United States are prepared and eager to join the free market. Although the government has taken steps to help the health, transportation, and agricultural sectors, these actions only serve to provide the groundwork for their active participation and presence in the short- and medium-term free market. Additionally, "building a new age of global economic prosperity through the formation of financial markets and free trade" is stressed in the 2006 US National Security Strategy paper (US National Security Strategy, 2006: 2). On the other hand, when Donald Trump became the 45th president of the United States in 2016, we saw the birth and implementation of aggressive mercantilism in this country's field of foreign policy, with China and its

foreign policy in the field of economics as the target of its assault. Additionally, he offered the following arguments to support his opposing viewpoint on the globalization phenomenon: "1. The United States has taken on a lot of duties across the world by forging military alliances. 2. The United States has not profited from the global economy" (Wright, 2016). Moreover, under his administration, the United States withdrew from a number of international accords, including NAFTA, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Paris Climate Agreement, and UNESCO. By taking these actions, he hopes to persuade other members of the organization to fully uphold their obligations and to respect American national sovereignty. He also hopes to pressure international organizations to modify their organizational charters in order to accept the change in the balance of payments in the field of commercial profitability in favor of the United States. Economic diversity has a lot of wiggle room to reshape global economic equations and has influenced the course of international trends and events. It has enabled the balanced development of industrial sectors, services, and new technologies and raised the gross domestic product to a level of eighteen and a tenth trillion dollars (Deshyar, 2015: 22). The type of approach and the necessary and necessary measures to provide it, in the framework of the US national security strategy documents, have been developed and operationalized by various presidents and governments from both the Democratic and Republican parties, based on a specific political and security strategy. As a result, it can be concluded that economic interests are considered an important and integral part of America's national interests.

1.3.2. Security interests:

Threats and instability in these nations can have major security repercussions for the United States since the US Army maintains military bases and installations in more than 120 nations. To be able to reserve the right to decide for oneself in respect to international situations, the United States has devoted around 3.5 percent of its gross domestic product, or more than eighteen trillion dollars, to military costs. This military budget is over 600 trillion dollars (Dahshiar, 2015: 30). The quantitative and qualitative state of the nation's military forces and their use in every region of the world's geography, which is considered to be the main source of danger and



threat to the interests and national security of the United States, has been on the agenda of the statesmen of this country since the end of World War II, particularly in the first two decades of the third millennium. The United States would employ military action unilaterally if required and when our vital interests demand it, according to Barack Obama's May 2014 West Point speech, for instance. Indeed, Obama's change strategy was centered on how to safeguard American strategic interests, how to employ tools and techniques to accomplish the nation's national security objectives, as well as paying attention to and influencing the global security environment. As with his predecessors, Donald Trump also prioritizes national objectives that are consistent with foreign policy activities, such as "protecting the country, creating prosperity, keeping peace through force, and advancing America's influence in the globe" (US National Security Strategy, 2017: forward). As a result, one of the key and crucial indications in the White House's macro security policy is the reliance on military force and hardware orientation in the context of national security plans during the administrations of many presidents.

1.3.3. Ideological interests:

The way of life, moral principles, worldview, and aspirations of a nation are all examples of ideological interests. These things come from an intellectual and ideological framework that can be applied to the outside world, but they may conflict with the ideological interests of other countries and societies. These types of interests frequently connect to governmental structures, political systems, and citizen civil rights, such as freedom of religion, social and political rights, and rights of ethnic and religious minorities, among other situations. Through various security strategies in the political, military, economic, and cultural spheres over the past century, the United States of America has consistently attempted to position itself as the leader and leader of the free world and to confront rival ideologies like fascism, communism, and radical Islamism. The principles of Western liberal democracy, which are compatible with this nation's cultural inclinations, will ultimately prevail across the entirety of the globe. We have seen American presidents develop and present a variety of doctrines in order to accomplish this goal, such as Woodrow Wilson's doctrine under the slogan "Making the world safe for democracy," George Bush's doctrine under the slogan "New Order," a

world governed by the United States, and Donald Trump's doctrine under the slogan "muscular nationalism; under the motto of America first," as was previously mentioned. The first thing that can be inferred from their titles is that they all have some sort of ideological content, whether it be pluralistic or reductionist, and that this ideological content is created and put into practice in order to protect American interests or ideals. For instance, George W. Bush said that one of the reasons for our invasion of Iraq in March 2003 was to liberate the people there from the rule of a brutal tyrant, despite the fact that doing so had no positive implications for America's economy or national security. Additionally, he says that "by removing tyrants and establishing free and democratic societies, America should bring about international peace. The Bush philosophy therefore has stronger missionary origins than intellectual ones. (Nejati, 2018: 38). Therefore, it can be said that ideological interests are a fundamental component of American national interests. This not only establishes a worldwide mission for the United States of America to organize public opinion in order to embrace and propagate American principles across the world. Instead, it is a requirement and a sort of moral justification to stabilize and uphold America's status as the only superpower in the world order. The principles of Western liberal democracy, on the other hand, have not been protected or propagated by several American presidents, most notably Donald Trump. Furthermore, they only attempted to protect the interests and national security of this country and exclusively viewed the field of international politics from the perspective of economics and business logic, relying on the raw power and unmatched capabilities of the United States in the economic and military fields. Indeed, the most significant objective of the Trump administration's foreign policy was to achieve American exceptionalism and restore the grandeur of the United States, which was seen by him and his fellow intellectuals as a moral value and a holy ideal. In conclusion, the three fundamental pillars of American national interests—economic, security, and ideological—are a reflection of the unity of American principles, interests, and identity, which is the impetus behind American internationalism.

2. Effective factors in the formation of the foreign policy principles of the U.S.



2.1. The feeling of being special and exceptional

The Declaration of Independence of this country, which was issued in 1776 AD, is largely regarded by Americans as the foundation of their superiority and uniqueness as a nation. They are granted full civil, political, and citizenship rights in accordance with the first ten articles of the "Declaration of Rights," an amendment to the country's constitution. Because of this, they think that "their country holds the legacy of previous civilizations and should attempt to make the riches of its civilization permanent and immortal" (Mozaffarpur, 2008: 68). Additionally, Madeleine Albright, a former secretary of state under Bill Clinton, refers to the United States and its people as an inevitable nation and the leaders of the free world. The Puritan religious leaders also said that "We Americans are a particular and chosen people, we are the Israel of our day" during the early phases of the American Revolution (Salimi, 2013: 201). As a result, the United States has been progressive, unique, and exceptional based on the historical heritage left by its founders and the political, social, and intellectual elites' attitude toward American society, civic culture, and American principles. This sort of observation and intellectual understanding is presented in the political culture of the globe under the label of "American exceptionalism," which should become universal and inspire other countries and human communities. In other words, it was decided that the United States could have significant influence on global political, economic, social, cultural, and military developments and steer the global landscape in the direction of its interests and desires.

2.2. Neo-conservatism trend

Michael Harrington was the first to use the word "neo-conservatism," which has its origins in the ideas of German political philosopher Leo Strauss. Strauss emigrated to America in 1937 and worked as a professor of political sociology at the University of Chicago. He watched the fall of the Weimar Republic and believed that it was caused by the simultaneous entrance of communism and Nazism. He argues in his book "On Tyranny" that democracy requires tenacity and will to preserve and stabilize it. If not, it will experience the same destiny as the Weimar Republic. Following Leo Strauss's passing in 1973, his supporters split into two factions, the West Coast Straussians and the East Coast Straussians, led by Harry Jaffa and Alan Bloom, respectively. The West Coast Straussians, who back Donald Trump, believe that the United

States was established on the basis of classical philosophy and that the country's future rests only on the nation's devotion to its religion. Contrary to East Coast Straussians, who favor George W. Bush, they think that the thought of late thinkers like "Thomas Hobbes" and "John Locke" is the basis of American nationalism. Its continued existence rests on adhering to the principles and standards outlined in the US Constitution. Additionally, Irving Kristol, who is regarded as the adoptive father of this school of thought, classified neoconservatives as liberals who had reached a brick wall and had cut themselves off from liberalism and the left as a result (Metalabi, 2013: 166). It is important to note that American neo-conservatives have sided against realist viewpoints as well. In their eyes, American foreign policy has to be morally transparent and not only based on partisan and national interests. Neoconservatives like "Paul Wolfowitz" and "John Bolton" gained more clout in the American government after the September 11 attacks, particularly under the administrations of George W. Bush and Donald Trump. The manner in which American foreign policy dealt with diverse international entities, such as states and international organizations, closely matched the approaches and positions taken by this American political spectrum. These fundamental ideas and presumptions of this novel and profoundly ingrained philosophy can be summed up as follows:

- A steadfast confidence in American hegemony and supremacy in all spheres;
- A commitment to globalism and efforts to ingrain American principles across the world
- relying on military might and other forms of physical force to defend American interests and ideals, such as imposing liberal democracy on nations and civilizations that are hostile to American hegemony.
- Giving family and religion a significant societal role;
- Ignoring international organizations, treaties, and agreements

Generally, it can be said that the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of neo-conservatism are founded on the fusion and assemblage of some realist and liberal aspects.

Accordingly, we saw a new paradigm called "liberal realism" arise alongside neorealism and neoliberalism to dominate American foreign policy in the first decade of the twenty-first



century and throughout the George W. Bush administration. As a reflection of the values-based basis of American foreign policy, he went on to become a scholar in the fields of political science and international relations. Neo-conservatism may thus be referred to as one of the components of this country's foreign policy identity in the international system owing to the significant and thought-provoking impact it had on the new course of American foreign policy in the third millennium.

2.3. Constant tension between isolationism and one-sidedness

What is the best and most effective course of action for the United States of America in terms of its foreign policy? Additionally, how can the principles that the country holds dear be universalized while still effectively serving its interests and ensuring its national security? Additionally, how can the strategic uncertainty surrounding this superpower's primary foreign policy approach be resolved after fascism, communism, and terrorism have been totally defeated as dangers and challenges to American values, interests, and national security? Therefore, political leaders, thinkers, and strategists of this country's foreign policy and national security have mostly advocated the two geopolitically focused tactics of isolationism and unilateralism. It has been developed and deployed in the form of national security doctrines and tactics based on their worldview and value system as well as the favorable circumstances impacted by the structural parameters of the international system and the internal facts of the American political system. Isolationists typically offer a narrow definition of American national interests, limiting them to the country's citizens' civil and political liberties, economic prosperity, and physical security. They also call for a scaling back of the US's global security commitments and a return to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. This school of strategists is in favor of aggressive economic diplomacy and, from an economic standpoint, thinks that the geo-economy should be the fundamental objective of American foreign policy (Nejadi, 2018: 30). Or, to put it another way, "this strategy specifies interests and power in establishing a rich and transformed society and avoiding militarism, which is the inevitable result of engagement in the global arena, and so views America to be distinct from other global participants" (Deshayar, 2017: 12). The

unilateralist approach, on the other hand, sees America as a warrior and a rescuer factor with ideological and strategic sway over the nation and the power and capability to exercise unchallenged hegemony at the level of the international order. The advocates of this approach think that only American global dominance can sustain and ensure global peace and security. They promote the maintenance of American global dominance and the creation of a unipolar order. According to the adherents of this school of thought, maintaining the United States' status as the only superpower, preventing the rise of a new hegemonic political-military power in Eurasia, and preserving American influence in the Middle East are among the fundamental goals of this nation's foreign policy (Nejadi, 2018: 31). Because of this, the United States extends its commitments and interests thousands of kilometers beyond the geography and territory that it claims as its own. The whole world is therefore seen as its geostrategic domain. In other words, the area of the world is regarded as the United States of America's geopolitical depth based on the unilateralism approach.

2.4. Belief in a historical mission concerning the world leadership

Americans, particularly neo-conservatives, believe that the United States is the world's rescuer and the Messiah of the 20th and 21st centuries, charged with carrying out a divine and historical mission, the success of which will determine humanity's freedom and pleasure. As a result, the Protestant-Evangelical movement, a right-wing American Christian organization, emphasizes the need of promoting American ideals abroad. He views military force, on the other hand, as an effective and essential lever and instrument that is required to achieve a strong and muscular foreign policy that will result in the extension and stabilization of American ideals in the globe and protect our nation's interests and national security. The United States has been given a mission by God to liberate mankind from tyranny and decadence, according to the philosophical perspective of this Christian movement, which has provided the neocons with their ideological sustenance and social barrier, and everything that stands in the way of this nation and its sacred duty is referred to as "the devil" and either must be utterly annihilated or absolutely surrendered. According to this distinction, the United States is seen as the leader of the free world and is beneficent and



libertarian, while on the other side is the camp of evil and tyranny, which opposes this divine mission and American hegemony. This kind of perspective and manner of thinking is rife with identity and racial content and aims to create a global civilization based on humanist principles that emerged from European religious reform. The primacy of the human being, his or her social rights and basic necessities, as well as the English school of government that has been modified and adapted into an American version, are other important aspects of this civilization. As a result, in keeping with the accomplishment of this divine and historical mission, we are currently witnessing the creation of a kind of cultural war map in the form of a conflict between good and evil, which "Samuel Huntington" has expertly portrayed under the heading "clash between civilizations" as the theoretical architect of this apocalyptic conflict. We may use George W. Bush's pronouncements following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks as an illustration. At the time, he spoke of the start of a "new crusade" and referred to "Iran," "Iraq," and "North Korea" as the "axis of evil." It is also conceivable to draw attention to the sort of attitude that "Ronald Reagan" had against the former Soviet Union, calling the regime there a "evil empire" and something that was "absolutely terrible." As a result, "George Herbert Walker Bush," the President of the United States, "addressed the world to the notion of the New World Order as the national security policy of the United States after the Cold War" in a radio broadcast on the weekend in April 1991. The United States of America now has the right to lead the unipolar system more than any other country because of its unmatched economic and military power, he continued, adding that the world has concluded that neither a multi-polar system nor a bipolar system can guarantee world peace and security (Salimi, 2013: 204). Furthermore, according to "John Eikenberry," "The United States considers itself the "Leviathan" of the world and feels it is required to utilize all available tools to combat evil." (Moshirzadeh, 2017, 164). This leads to the conclusion that the United States of America's foreign policy is a complete reflection of its national values and features, since this nation's national identity is built on a modified national-religious culture. An identity that stresses American uniqueness and urban light on top of the hill while concealing a transnational and universal ideal at its core. The hegemonic and

leading nature of American foreign policy in the realm of international politics is therefore well explained by these arguments and assertions.

2.5. Emphasizing the spreading and institutionalizing the values of liberal democracy in the world

The cornerstone of American efforts to extend and sustain their preferred norms and values throughout the globe is "liberal democracy," which they base on their superiority as a people as well as their superiority as a culture and civilization. Two theoretical approaches have therefore developed among the politicians and philosophers of this nation in order to achieve this ideal aim, with the first highlighting the United States as a "model." He thinks that in order for the United States to serve as an example for other nations, it must strengthen itself and promote its principles by building effective administrative and legislative institutions. In other words, only by holding up the United States as an effective role model and encouraging other cultures to adopt it can American principles be propagated and institutionalized. According to this school of thinking, other civilizations and nations should model themselves after the city that shines on top of the hill instead of engaging in political and military activity or presence abroad. On the other hand, another theory takes a combative stance and contends that America should play a larger role in international politics than that of a role model in order to advance liberal democracy around the world. It places a focus on military exploits and active presence in many regions of the world, and in keeping with the accomplishment of this historical task, it assigns the United States of America an interventionist role. Additionally, according to Henry Kissinger, Americans saw themselves in the world system either as a role model or as a freedom warrior. Due to American political and military doctrines and strategies during the last two centuries such as the Monroe Doctrine, Woodrow Wilson's doctrine under the title of "making the world safe for democracy" along with his 14 principles, Harry Truman's policy of blocking the influence of communism, George Bush's doctrine Under the title "New World Order under the leadership of the United States" and the development of the doctrine of "Humanitarian Intervention" by Bill Clinton, it is an example and manifestation of the importance and special place of the principles and values of the United States, especially the



values of liberal democracy, in the foreign policy of this country.

2.6. Doctrines of presidents

James Monroe, the fifth president of the United States, who served from 1817 to 1825, is credited with coining the phrase "doctrine" for the first time. The acts and political stances of a statesman, which may be identical to those of statesmen before and after him, are typically not referred to as doctrine. Instead, the creative aspects of his activities and policies that make lasting contributions are referred to as his philosophy. The national security strategy and national defense strategy of the United States are compiled and presented by the president and the defense minister, respectively. The doctrines of American presidents are another format for

expressing this country's foreign policy. It is briefly stated in these documents and differs from both of these. Instead of the plethora of important topics that most presidents must deal in the global context, they may concentrate on a president's top foreign policy goals. Additionally, the president or his administration seldom releases or announces presidential doctrines, and they rarely result in legislation or executive orders (Paterson, 2018: 14). They really consist of a number of public statements that outline the president's and his administration's top foreign policy goals. The following table introduces and explains some of the presidential philosophies of the United States in order to better grasp the situation:

President	Doctrine	Description
George Washington	Avoiding permanent alliances	Due to the recurrent battles on the European continent, George Washington advised his compatriots to stay away from partnerships with European nations. The adoption of a passive and neutral stance toward European nations and events in the East Atlantic, which persisted for over 150 years, was the most significant legacy of his theory for American foreign policy.
James Monroe	Hegemony of the Western Hemisphere	According to his philosophy, Monroe intended European colonial nations to refrain from meddling in the internal affairs of nations in the Western Hemisphere. By making this pronouncement, he hoped to stop Russia from expanding on the Northwest Pacific Ocean and stop Spain from reentering the region and attempting to impose its will on the newly independent nations of South America (Paterson, 2018: 15).
Harry Truman	Barrier to the penetration and containment of communism	Truman backed nations who fought communism as the Cold War got underway. "Free peoples that fight armed minorities or foreign forces," he pledged, will be supported (Paterson, 2018: 50). In order to achieve this purpose, the US dispatched military personnel, supplies, and money to Iran, Turkey, and Greece. The Cold War grand strategy of the United States against communism was built on the principles of the Truman Doctrine.



<p>Bill Clinton</p>	<p>Humanitarian intervention</p>	<p>The Rwandan genocide and the Serb massacre of Bosnians occurred at the same time as Bill Clinton's presidency. As a result, the White House was required to play an active and accountable role under the strain of American public opinion and media pressure. Additionally, based on the notion of a "New World Order led by America," which was declared to be this nation's national security plan following the Cold War, Bill Clinton said: "We shouldn't try to do or be everywhere since we can't. But we must be ready to act when our beliefs and interests are at stake and we can make a difference " (Paterson, 2018: 51). He therefore presented his philosophy as "humanitarian intervention."</p>
<p>George W. Bush</p>	<p>advance in war and make enemies regret</p>	<p>When asked about the predominance of militarism in American foreign policy following the events of September 11, 2001, Bush responded: "If necessary, we will employ force. This episode has taught us a valuable lesson about how to handle threats. "We must eliminate these dangers before they become a threat to us" (Nejati, 2018: 36). Thus, the four fundamental tenets of George Bush's philosophy are "preemptive strike," "unilateralism," "promoting democracy," and "war on terrorism."</p>
<p>Barack Obama</p>	<p>Pivot to Asia</p>	<p>The Asia-Pacific area is where the US military is mostly deployed, according to this doctrine. Many interconnected issues determine how America's continental approach shifts from the Middle East to the Pacific. The first component is a result of the global military situation, particularly that of the United States, going through a qualitative transition and a quantitative adjustment. The character and responsibilities of armed troops are actually changing, in addition to their geographical location. The second element is the requirement for the creation of a global military-security alliance centered on China in order to manage and restrain this rising military and economic might. The failure of American political and military policy in the Middle East area makes up the third component.</p>
<p>Donald Trump</p>	<p>Muscular nationalism</p>	<p>Trump, unlike past American presidents, never strove to defend or advance the principles of Western liberal democracy in the world since he lacked administrative expertise in government affairs and only viewed the sphere of international relations from the standpoint of economics and commercial logic. He made "interests" the central tenet of his foreign policy theoretical thought and</p>



		relied only on the use of power to protect American interests and national security. Trump's top foreign policy objective was to restore America's grandeur and fulfill the concept of American exceptionalism, and he did so by relying on the country's unmatched economic and military strengths. In the realm of foreign politics, he launched a fresh intellectual and political movement known as "Trumpism," which was the spearhead of its assault on liberalism and globalization. In other words, Trumpism is a tendency that aims to rewrite the rules regulating the international system and establish the role and status of each nation and international organization in the realm of international politics. It is also a type of self-directed strategy. The words "pragmatism" and "strong nationalism" are key descriptors of his political philosophy.
--	--	---

As a result, it can be said that the doctrines of American presidents reflect their worldview and value system. In the majority of cases, "national interests and security" have been emphasized as the president's top foreign policy priorities. The presidents of the White House have also highlighted hardwareism and the use of military might as a necessary and effective weapon in the direction of promoting and safeguarding the principles of liberal democracy and defending human rights.

Conclusion

Throughout its history, American foreign policy has been influenced by a variety of schools of thought and theoretical frameworks. Each of these or a combination of them, depending on the nature and structural underpinnings of the international system and the internal data of the American political system, has at some point emerged as the dominant paradigm of American foreign policy. Besides, the discourses dominating the White House in the form of presidents' doctrines, worldview and value system of political elites, theorists and strategists of foreign policy and national security along with the interests and interests of other groups involved in making foreign policy decisions, such as: lobby cartels, multinational companies, non-governmental organizations, public opinion and the media have played a vital and central role in shaping international interactions and the foreign policy of the United States in various periods. After the Second World War, the pluralistic and "principle of checks and balances"-based structure of American foreign policy adopted an interventionist and hegemonic approach, which

also experienced ups and downs and fluctuations during the administrations of various presidents, including both democrats and republicans. Therefore, in order to provide a better and more thorough evaluation of the nature of American foreign policy, it is essential and inevitable to root and explain the philosophical characteristics of the core values that guide this nation's foreign policy as well as the key influences in order to prioritize and emphasize each of them at any given time. According to the findings, "American identity" and "value grounds" were the other two primary tenets of the philosophical and theoretical framework of American foreign policy after World War II, along with "national interests including: economic interests, security interests, and ideological interests." These three elements are impacted by things like "exceptionalism and self-superiority," "theoretical approaches like neo-conservatism," "belief in a historical mission in relation to world leadership," "efforts to provide the best and most efficient strategy in the field of foreign policy, in order to secure the interests and national security of America and to spread and expand the values of liberal democracy in the world," as well as "the doctrines of presidency." Each president and his aides, such as the foreign minister, the defense minister, and the national security advisor, are guided by a set of political and military doctrines and plans that establish the importance, influence, and distinctive positions of each of these critical elements.

References

- Deshyar, Hossein (2008), *Foreign Policy and Grand*



Strategy of the United States of America, Tehran: Qoms Publishing House.

- Deshyar, Hossein (2008), *American foreign policy: Liberal Realism*, Tehran: Khat Sevom Publishing.
- Deshyar, Hossein (2019), *American foreign policy in theory and practice*, Tehran: Mizan publication.
- Deshyar, Hossein (2015), *Trump and the centrality of economic and military capabilities in the realm of foreign policy*, International Relations Research Quarterly, Volume 1, Volume 22, pp. 15-34
- Salimi, Hossein (2013), *a comparative study of American and Chinese strategic culture*, Strategic Studies Quarterly, 17th year, 3rd volume, pp. 197-235
- Shahabi, Ruhollah (1400), *America's policymaking in the path of its reconstruction (with a political sociology approach)*, Iranian Sociological Quarterly (scientific-research article), 4 (2), Summer 1400, pp. 489-511.
- Moshirzadeh, Hamira (2012), *The turn in the foreign policy of the United States and the invasion of Iraq, the fields of domestic discourse*, Politics Quarterly (Magazine of the Faculty of Law and Political Science), 37 (2), Summer 2012.
- Melabi, Masoud (2012), *The Foreign Policy Identities of the United States of America and Barack Obama's Government*, International Political Research Quarterly, Volume 17, pp. 145-176.
- Muzaffarpour, Nematullah (2008), *Application of Ideology in American Foreign Policy*, Quarterly Journal of American Studies and Israel Studies, Middle East Studies Center.
- Nejati, Mohammad Hossein (1970), *US geopolitics and national security strategy: the administrations of George Bush and Barack Obama*, first edition (2019), Rah Danesh Scholars Publications
- Huntington, Samuel (2004), *Challenges of Identity in America*, translated by Reza Golshan Pajoh and colleagues, Tehran: Abrar Contemporary International Studies and Research Institute.
- Huntington, S., (1999), "the Lonely Superpower". *Foreign affairs*. 78 (2): 35-49.

- HAN WU, CHARLES CHONG (2017), *Understanding the Structures and Contents of National Interests: An Analysis of Structural Equation Modeling*, the

Korean Journal of International Studies Vol.15, No.3 (December 2017), 391-420

Available at

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14731/kjis.2017.12.15.3.391>

- Nejati, Mohammad Hossein (2021), *Trump's US Policy, International Agreements and the Islamic Republic of Iran Foreign Policy*, Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education ISSN: 1309-4653, Scopus Q4

Available at

<https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmat/article/view/9644>

- Paterson, Pat (2018), *Origins of U.S. Foreign Policy*, William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (February 2018).

- RATHBUN, BRIAN C (2016), *Taking Foreign Policy Personally: Personal Values and Foreign Policy Attitudes*, International Studies Quarterly (2016) 60, 124–137

Available at

https://people.fas.harvard.edu/~jkertzer/Research_files/Schwartz_ISQ.pdf

- Wright, Thomas. (2016), *the 2016 presidential campaign and the crisis of US foreign policy*.

Available at <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/2016-presidential-campaign-and-crisis-us-foreign-policy>.

- U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS 2006) <https://history.defense.gov/Portals/70/Documents/nss/nss2006.pdf?ver=2014-06-25-121325-543>

- U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS 2017) <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>

