

JEL F52

AMERICAN SECURITY REDEFINED

Lefko T.J.,

*Doctor of History, Professor, University of Minnesota, President of the International Business Development Council, Inc, Minnesota, USA
lucera2008@yandex.ru*

Galas M.L.,

*Doctor of History, professor, chief researcher of the Department of political science of the Finance University, Moscow, Russia
lucera2008@yandex.ru*

Abstract. Describes a problem in establishing modern national and international mechanisms for stabilizing the economic, social, political, social and cultural spheres of civil society, State of the world community. Emphasizes the role of the preventizacii risks and threats to human security, society, nation.

United States national stability picture historically as solutions to racial problems, the formation of moral values based on Christian religious beliefs, build democracy and national and civil compromise, the development of capitalism and the formation of the modern economy. Discusses the prevailing stereotypes in American society on national security, which are reflected in social behavior, Outlook, international politics. Examines the problem of transforming real threats to national security doctrine of constant imminent threat. World United States control reduction psychologically many citizens and political structures, business, authority is perceived as a threat to stability and safe development. In real time with the United States, as a nation of rigid military force lose their former position. Question about replacing such stiff soft force, based on the achievements of the culture, the Democratic Organization of society, prospective financial technologies. Brought to the fore the problem of terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, extremism, cyber and biological threats, climatic cataclysm, economic inequality, global migration and displacement. **Keywords:** security; concept of protection and survival; humanity; American public; politics of democracy; compromise; social organization; governmental institutions; economic and informational inequality; political action committees; nuclear proliferation and terrorism; Islamic fundamentalists; refugees; rational understanding; cooperation.

ПЕРЕОСМЫСЛЕНИЕ АМЕРИКАНСКОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ

Лефко Тодд Джефри,

д-р истории, профессор университета Миннесоты, председатель Совета по развитию международного бизнеса, Миннесота, США

Галас Марина Леонидовна,

д-р ист. наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Департамента политологии, Финансовый университет, Москва, Россия

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается проблема создания современных национальных и международных механизмов стабилизации экономических, социальных, политических, социокультурных сфер жизнедеятельности гражданского общества, государства, мирового сообщества. Подчеркивается роль превентивации рисков и угроз безопасности человека, социума, нации. Национальная стабильность Соединенных Штатов Америки выстраивалась исторически по мере решения расовых проблем, формирования нравственных ценностей на основе христианских религиозных убеждений, построении демократии и национального и гражданского компромисса, развития капитализма и формирования современной экономики. Рассматриваются сложившиеся в американском обществе стереотипы национальной безопасности, которые нашли отражение и в социальном поведении, мировоззрении, международной политике. Анализируется проблема трансформации реальных угроз национальной безопасности в доктрину постоянной

неминуемой угрозы. Психологически сокращение мирового контроля США многими гражданами и политическими структурами, бизнесом, властью воспринимается как угроза стабильности и безопасного развития. В реальном времени США как государство жесткой военной силы утрачивают свои былые позиции. Ставится вопрос о замене такой жесткой силы мягкой, основанной на достижениях культуры, демократической организации общества, перспективных финансовых технологиях. На первый план вышли проблемы терроризма, исламского фундаментализма, экстремизма, кибер- и биологических угроз, климатических катаклизмов, экономического неравенства, беженства и глобальной миграции.

Ключевые слова: безопасность; концепция защиты жизни; гражданин США; политические принципы демократии; компромисс; организация социума; правительственные институты; экономическое и информационное неравенство; агитационно-пропагандистские комитеты; распространение ядерного оружия и терроризма; исламский фундаментализм; беженцы; рациональное мышление; сотрудничество.

Security is as basic as humanity. The concept of protection and survival has existed throughout history.

What has been sought is an expectation of stability. Humans have determined their security is based upon perceived risk. Physical, psychological and metaphysical fear develops both individually and collectively, affecting all participants in a different manner. American stability came from distance, a similar racial mix in power, the dominance of Christianity as a main religion and the belief that the common politics of democracy, compromise, capitalism and opportunity would produce loyal citizens.

This basis in belief was mostly effective in the past. The issue is whether these same domestic and international perceived protections of the past remain as the base of stability.

This risk is affected by an interaction of public and private policies, social organization, culture, expectations, our ability or lack of control over perception. Stability for some produces fear in others. We create the expectations of stereotypes of threat, based upon our information, Dan Ariely notes "Expectations also shape stereotypes. A stereotype, after all, is a way of categorizing information, in the hope of predicting experiences. It must be built upon what is seen before. For that reason, stereotypes are not intrinsically malevolent. They provide shortcuts in our never-ending attempt to make sense of complicated surroundings....But because a stereotype provides us with specific expectations about members of a group, it can also unfavorably influence both our perceptions and our behavior" [1].

Stability produces little guarantee of security. It is possible to have stability in a police state, with controls over decisions, but that is not long term security. The greatest and most feared danger comes not only from unknown terrorists, but the potential of the state performing the role of terrorist.

Risk may not determine reality. Terrorists have always utilized fear as a basis of their potential threat. As the Chinese philosopher Sun Tsu noted "Kill one, frighten ten thousand". Immediacy of threat has made symbolic brutality, combined with full-time media coverage into a perceived and imminent threat. Reality becomes perception, even if statistical probability is remote. Groups such as ISIS and others gain power from redefining violence previously aimed toward armies, is now aimed at noncombatants. The society becomes the target, thus removing the distance between soldiers and civilians.

Second, violence is not aimed at large numbers, but becomes symbolic, for dramatic purpose. It is the potential of the threat which becomes the reality of the threat [2].

We understand that the sun will eventually burn-out, but it is not an immediate concern. Understanding of a threat will not guarantee protection.

What we secretly fear is that we are moving toward a world in which there is no real security, and that increased risk and vulnerability will define and shape our future. If security is defined as control over perceived risk, our definition is changing, because the issue has become our ability and political will to control the new risks of the modern world. We have entered what David C. Ranney and others term "The New World Disorder" [3].

What has changed in the United States and many other societies is the interpretation and level of risk. The growing complexity and interaction of life has produced an interaction of potential threats, creating what some have called «a crisis of crises.» Psychological pressures become intertwined, with an assumption that we possess lessened control over our future.

The French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre noted that "we are our choices". It is the potential damage

to these choices which new concepts of security will shape and reflect.

What is occurring in the United States as a redefinition of security. The nature of American security, once clear and understood is changing. Protected by oceans and distance, and then by economic and military might, the nature of security in the U.S. now faces multiple perceived threats, which lack simple answers.

As the late Professor John Briscoe noted, "One decade ago, the cogitations of national security bodies were largely concerned with two issues: nuclear proliferation and terrorism. Today, there is broad agreement that a range of environmental issues constitutes a third strand and that water looms larger in these concerns" [4].

Americans now spend officially over \$600 billion per year on defense for military and defense. This is a low figure, because the idea of protection has changed and many of the old systems no longer protect against newer challenges. The former CIA Sovietologist Melvin A. Goodman in 2013 noted that "The United States, with its emphasis on power projection has created a global system of more than 700 military bases and facilities. There was no strategic planning for creation of this network: we did it because we could, and never bothered to examine the consequences or the costs. The U.S. military presence overseas, designed to strengthen our security, has proved counterproductive" [5].

In this new world, we cannot buy guaranteed safety. Currently over 16% of the US federal information budget is spent on cybersecurity. Private American firms now devote over \$65 billion per year to cybersecurity, an issue which has become center to protection. The former Wall Street Journal writer Ann Hagedorn wrote that the private contractor Booz Allen was performing a new role in national security. "...whatever the company's label, its newsworthiness in 2013 gave the American public a glimpse of some of the basic features of the privatization revolution in their government, As threads of secrecy unraveled, Americans learned that nearly 70 percent of their nation's intelligence budget was outsourced to private firms, and at the National Security Agency, Booz Allen was conducting massive surveillance of citizen's phone calls and internet usage, accumulating what was called 'metadata or data about data' [6].

We now demand that military and economic institutions designed for the past shape the future The political scientists Joseph S Hacker and Paul Pierson state that In an evolving world, social institutions

need to adapt if they are to continue to serve their basic needs... "The crisis of public authority is a consequence of orchestrated, persistent efforts to tear down government and a long spiral of silence in response" [7].

How we design new domestic and international institutions will determine our success in providing systems producing both security and freedom. Many of these military, economic and political institutions are in process of discussion and determination. It is this period of functional adaptation that our major danger appears, for public reaction is that basic protection cannot be provided and that governance has failed.

The old answers of large armies and atomic bombs have been replaced by questions of terrorism, climate change, cyber and bio-threats and economic inequality. In the past, American hard power, with the military and soft power, with movies, fashions, technology and control of international governance and financial institutions guaranteed continuation of an American world.

This assumption of lack of control operates both on individual and societal levels. We seek protection from threats, and if culture and governmental institutions do not provide that protection, our faith in these institutions becomes threatened. Current polls reveal that positive ratings in the American Congress is now only 14.5 percent.

The noted military historian and analyst Thomas M. Barnett observes that America's perceived power, responsibility and role has changed when he states: "Remembering that disconnectedness is the ultimate enemy, American can, by extending globalization in a fair and just manner, not only defeat the threats it faces today, but eliminate in advance entire generations of threats that our children and grandchildren would otherwise face. In short, there is simply no possibility of keeping the threat outside, over there anymore. If we as a nation accept the logic of globalization's advance, our definition of 'us' must include all of 'them' who now feel left out of globalization's benefits, as well as the them who would employ all manner of violence to deny its advance. This historical process is neither forced assimilation nor the extension of empire, but the expansion of freedom first and foremost» [8].

With lessened faith, we seek answers and leaders from those whom we would ignore. Non-democratic movements of nativism, anti-immigrant and hatred flourish. Leaders such as Marie Le Pen in France, Donald Trump in the U.S, Victor Orban in Hungary, or the Alliance for Deutschland in Germany emerge.

What is as damaging as terrorism to societies is this loss of faith in institutions and the ability for governance. Issues have arisen on the proper role and responsibilities of individuals, in an era when many consider Washington to be a dysfunctional process.

What has become necessary is a public discussion and a politics based on the balance and interaction of the individual and governing institutions. This discussion is slowly emerging.

The New York Times Editorialist Bob Herbert suggests "The United States needs to be reimagined. What it has been doing for the past several decades has not worked for the majority of its people. A huge and growing segment of the American population has been left out of full participation in the society, as a result of joblessness, underemployment, inadequate education, and political and economic inequality. Opportunities of kinds have been constrained. The great promise of America, which has always viewed itself as a vibrant, upwardly mobile, fair, and just society, has been undermined by the self-inflicted wounds of near-perpetual warfare, irresponsible and grotesquely exploitive economic behavior, and political dysfunction" [9].

It has become more difficult to believe you are secure in a growingly insecure world.

New discussions on privacy versus security become basic, with Wikileaks, the Panama Papers and Edward Snowden. Conflicts over the growth of access to information, as opposed to state control has become relevant, with fights between Apple and the FBI, or governments around the world seeking control over the internet. Factors of quality, quantity, role and relevance of information from all sources reflect issues relating to security which are now basic [10].

We have always had conflict over the necessity of national secrecy as opposed to privacy rights for individuals and corporations. Former U.S. Senator and sociologist Daniel Patrick Moynihan observed "American society in peacetime began to experience wartime regulation. The awful dilemma was that in order to preserve an open society, the U.S. government took measures that in significant way closed it down" [11].

What has changed is the ability of technology to invade our previously considered realm of privacy. We begin to question if institutions can protect our safety and information. The growth of video surveillance, alarm systems in homes and police camera, along with the internet of things raises the concept that Big Brother is no longer fiction.

If our institutions can no longer protect us, what belief in existing systems remain. It is this faith in systems and institution which terrorists seek to destroy.

How we define truth and reality becomes more difficult when millions of bloggers and producers of information have few gatekeeper for analysis, as opposed to presentation of personal prejudice and unproven theories. For many, selective information channels become support for pre-existing positions, not for decisional analysis and thoughtful consideration.

The biologist Edward O Wilson noted that "We are drowning in information, while starving for wisdom" [12].

The reality is that we have created Smart Cities, Smart Grids and Smart information systems, without creating the required smarter decision makers. We develop Big Data, but without an ability for quality understanding and analysis. As Hirose Inose and J.R. Pierce state in "Information Technology and Civilization": "Where is the information we have lost in data" [13].

With an ever present news cycle, the concept of time for consideration changed. The older idea of days or months for reaction becomes instantaneous. The irony becomes that as our time horizon becomes shorter, the impact of our decisions becomes longer and more impactful. We make decisions on warfare or climate change without a full analysis of secondary or tertiary impact. This process of increased speed of reaction without full consideration produces the politics of temporary time span. Time becomes telescoped into political time frames being the next election and popular reaction, or corporate focus on the quarterly financial returns, not on long term investment.

It is the relationship between shorter time spans and increased impact that the force of impact multipliers increase. All threats contain the essence of continuing implications. Each threat has secondary and tertiary consequences. Changes in law, political reactions, new technologies and public attitudes become shapers of future decisions.

Security becomes more complex, when reflecting joint processes of both globalization and tribalization. Some functions become international, such as the Blue Helmets of the United Nations, international agreements on climate change or the growth of the International Criminal Court. The complexity of twenty-eight nations of the European Union requiring unanimity on many decisions, limits previously domestic decisions.

Globalization becomes a threat to many in the world, fearful of migration of those who are seen as potential dangers, unfair trade, centralization of decision-making in the hands of the powerful and growing economic and informational inequality. Movements of trade, travel, communication and access by those threatening centralized control systems create new attention to the weakest links in the chain which provided security [14].

Connections with other nations implies an interdependence. Interdependence implies potential limits upon the ability for Washington to act alone for desired outcomes. This becomes unsettling to an American public which assumed that Washington could act alone to determine world events. For many, connections reflects potential weakness: an idea, which political leaders in the United States of America do not publicly discuss. Networks had existed in the past based upon American definition. The new networks reflect changes of world power which is frightening for many Americans.

Networks and connections produce complexity. The economist John H. Miller observes "When complexity abounds, there be dragons... we have entered into a new age of complexity" [15]. We are not comforted by threatening institutional dragons.

These personal and national changes to established cultures provides the context to losses in past beliefs of security. Fear arises from a loss of control, and undefined futures.

The intellectual discussions in the United States focus upon the interaction of America with the world. A neo-isolationism develops, after unsuccessful wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and a seemingly unresolvable conflict in Syria.

Current arguments over new trade agreements between the U.S. and the Atlantic and Pacific regions reflect widely divergent views on the benefits of globalization, trade and the form of interaction for perceived American benefit.

A growing sense of economic inequality produces a belief that the old rules have changed. Gaining an education, working hard and playing by the rules has created the reality of the wealthy not playing by the same rules and benefiting not from production of value, but from an increased control over finance. Questions over the future and legitimacy of capitalism acting as a force for maintenance of power by a small class reinforce the lack of trust in government and political institutions. The reality that fifty wealthy individuals now provide fifty percent of the political action committees, funding

special interests becomes the sign that perhaps democracy is for sale.

The issue of security becomes internalized, with the society believed to have the resources for fairness, economic growth and renewal, but lacking the political will. Increases in the loss of governance create domestic attitudes that Americans are under attack from both internal and external dangers. In this atmosphere of fear, reasoned thought becomes the victim.

The assumption of an improved future provided economic security in the past. This past security has been replaced with major questions whether the future will be an improvement. For a country based upon eternal growth, which guaranteed a middle class life, the "New Mediocre" changes the basic assurance which provided a basis for faith in America and capitalism.

As risk analysts Dennis Chesley and others have observed "A new global economic order is now emerging to replace the one that has existed since the end of World War II. For the foreseeable future, the global economy will be defined by a complex and continuous shifting set of economic relationships. They will be increasingly interconnected, to be sure, but with ever-changing rules for conducting business across borders"... There are "three basic trends: the dispersion of economic power, the continuing evolution of state-directed growth models, and the accelerating disruption felt by business from technological change" [16].

The new security reflects the threat of instability and lack of predictability. Risk now comes from physical threats, but also from the disruption of economic assumption and faith in established systems to protect the future.

Migration becomes both a shaper and reflector of this perceived danger. Not only religious and ethnic differences become basic, but they provide a focus of blame for those economically displaced or threatened. There are over eleven million illegal aliens in the United States, and their existence is seen in every community. Acceptance of Syrian refugees are opposed by most American governors, even though any potential migrants are vetted for two years by authorities. Mexicans become the image of migrants into the US, even though they are only about 28 percent of the 42.2 million foreign born in the US.

Americans accept European, Indian or Chinese skilled — professionals, but psychologically reject many Muslims from the Middle East or Africa. The

nation which was founded upon migration, not has developed a drawbridge mentality toward many immigrants who came later than the major periods of movement, or were restricted from visas by restrictive legislation.

At the same time, the demand for movement of functions and institutions to a smaller geographical, ethnic or social level are reflected in attempts at Brexit, Grexit, Scotland or Catalonia seeking independence or the dreams of a Kurdistan.

The shifting of functions and determination of which level best controls and performs governance is reflective that in areas of climate, responsibility to protect, trade beneficial to all and migration, we lack the international architecture allowing both full discussion and resolution of many issues.

Complexity of defined enemies creates confusion on how to best use resources.

We long for the Manichean days when Communism and Capitalism could be defined as Moscow or Washington. National capitals of Berlin or Tokyo became understood as symbolic threats during past wars. Defined geography reflected friends and enemies, for relationships were those of established states.

National threats were understood. Relationships were often based on the assumption of rationality by foes. Between Russia and the U.S., Mutually Assured Destruction provided a protection against irrational acts destroying mankind.

What has not become fully considered is how to deal with threats from both state and non-state actors. Threats from Al-Qaeda, ISIS, the Taliban, Al-Shabab or countless other non-geographically based movements have arisen for America, along with continuing demands of how to deal with Russia, China, Iran and many nations previously allies, such as Saudi Arabia or Israel.

Joseph S. Nye, Jr, the top American analyst of the concept of power observes: "The diffusion of power form governments to non-state actors, both West and East, is putting a number of transnational issues like financial stability, climate change, terrorism, and pandemics on the global agenda at the same time it tends to weaken the ability of all governments to respond. Since no one state can deal successfully with these transnational issues acting alone, even a superpower will have to work with others" [17].

The exact location of non-state actors cannot be determined geographically, as we did in the past with Russia. Fears of domestic terrorists based in fundamentalist theology provide new issues of "we

versus them", when 'them' are your fellow Americans. Domestic terrorists are often not Islamic fundamentalists, but citizen militias, filled with hate of governments, immigrants, and social changes which alter the America they believe existed in the past. Mathew Burrows, former Counselor in the U.S. National Intelligence Council discussing fundamentalism and terrorist, that "Ideology is likely to be particularly powerful and socially destructive when the need for basic resources exacerbates already-existing tensions between tribal, ethnic, religious and national groups" [18].

Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center noted there were about 150 such hate groups in 2008. The figure has grown to around 1000 indigenous American hate groups. With hundreds of thousands of members. Fights between the militias and federal agents in Ruby Ridge, Idaho or Waco, Texas or the 1995 bombing of the court house in Oklahoma City were precursors to a new "Second Wave" of conspiratorial groups, spread by interaction on the internet and social media [19].

How to control non-state actors is a challenge to security which interacts with freedom of information, civil liberties and how to develop multicultural societies.

The American writer Tom Friedman notes that international relationships are now defined by questions of interest, values, leverage and capacity and intent. Security becomes defined on a national level. New questions of what are American interests around the world, is Washington the international policeman determining world security or how is analysis provided for realistic costs and benefits for American action in hundreds of potential military or economic decisions. Friedman notes that Washington does not have the power of singular action as it did in the past to shape the decisions of others. As Fareed Zakaria notes, "The Rise of the Rest", other international actors provide limits and shape U.S. actions.

Security increases questions of which actions reflect idealistic values, rather than the realism of much of present international diplomacy and actions. George W Bush sought to create the Middle East in an American image of democracy. As Bush stated in his January 2002 State of the Union address, "History has called America and her allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight" [20].

The basic definer of U.S. security in the past was assumption of American control over the decisions

of others. If control changes, as it has, then past concepts of security require examination.

These older notions are now being redefined. Issues of changes in economics, finances, information strategy, climate change, water, bio-security and migration have become new elements, along with military strength and investment.

What Bush did not understand is that changes in American power altered factors of military leverage over societies fighting asymmetrical warfare, or where the institutions basic to democracy did not exist. America lacked the capacity to shape Iraq and Afghanistan and eventually, much of the intent to continue this battle was lost. One Taliban commander noted that “Americans have the watches, we have the time”. The assumption of many in the world is that Americans have short attention spans, and will lose interest. This changes how other nations and movements define dealing with the U.S., and changes potential responses by America.

Ian Bremmer states “Unfortunately, as we’ve learned in recent years, the United States isn’t very good at building open democratic societies in hostile faraway places, and the expense is not worth the effort even if it were not with urgent needs at home. We have more than enough power to destroy states, but we don’t have the resources we need, including U.S. public support, to rebuild them. U.S. withdrawal, always a mere matter of time, leaves vacuums of power in its wake, not matter how much we’ve spent to create the illusions of change. Terrorists know that recapturing safe havens is simply a matter of waiting us out or of moving across the border toward the next target of opportunity” [21].

One of the major American frustrations regarding Syria is that Washington lacks the leverage, the intent and the capacity to resolve the conflict to Washington’s satisfaction. Economic historians John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge state that democracy’s former status as the best form of government is being challenged. “Today many people are having second thoughts. Democracy seems to be responsible for the problems of bloat. Politicians bribe their way into office with other people’s money and voters put off difficult decisions. Democracy is also becoming increasingly dysfunctional as the West confronts the problem of scarcity. Can a democratic system really confront bad choices? Can it deal with scarcity as well as abundance? The West’s greatest advantage in the battle with the Asian alternative is increasingly looking like a handicap” [22].

Issues that were assumed suddenly become questioned. In the past, loyalty to America was assumed, if you were an American. If residence does not reflect loyalty or citizenship, as in the past with communism, or currently with fundamentalist ideas of Ummah, an international Islamic community which transcends existing state borders, then older definitions have become questioned.

The power of America was based on military, economic and cultural unipolarity, which no longer exists. This reality is difficult for the American mind, where generations have assumed that the world was shaped by and reflected values of liberal democracy and capitalism.

Other factors have arisen when dealing with security. Older concepts of civility and compromise now lessen in politics increasing dogmatism and enforced ideology. Many congressional campaigns now are in districts favoring one party or the other. Challenges are from the extreme of the party base, not from the center. The tone has changed from the past, where those different from the majority were changed by schools, workplace or common language to become Americans. Now, with whites facing a future before 2040 of being a plurality, but not a majority of the nation, many whites fear that any move toward allowance of varying cultures, languages or religions will more rapidly change the power structure.

The danger that many fear from those different is made into reality by the actions of the political majority. Attempts by Donald Trump to refuse entry into the U.S. by Muslims reinforces the sense of separation and makes real the ISIS declaration that Islam will never peacefully co-exist with the West. The nation and world becomes redefined as separate and unable to become equal. With a loss of compromise, the idea of being either a friend or enemy quickly reduces those different to enemy status.

We have entered an era in which the relationship between American and many Western individuals and their government is being questioned. In the new world, security’s redefinition is forcing both citizens and nations to make difficult decisions.

People seek security. They are willing to sacrifice their freedoms, if they believe this will provide a longer term renewal of freedom and protection. The issue becomes in the modern world how to provide the society where freedom is a defender of security. The United States seek to provide this balance, but without clear directions as to a successful balance. As the noted military analyst Andrew Bacevich notes:

“If America has a saving mission, it is first and foremost to save itself. To provide the internal economic, intellectual and military strength to be a model for the world and shape by example” [23].

The United States is redefining the concept of security. This is not easy, for it challenges the basic bedrock of American life. It forces discussions and decisions which are uncomfortable. Joseph S. Nye, Jr states this reality clearly when he notes that what is required now is “Smart Power.”

This Smart Power would being “with an understanding of the strength and limits of American power”. Preponderance is not an empire or hegemo-

ny. The United States can influence but not control other parts of the world. Power always depends upon context, and in the context of transnational relations (such as climate change, illegal drugs, pandemics and terrorism), power is diffuse and chaotically distributed. Military power is a small part of the solution in responding to these new threats. These solutions require cooperation among governments and international institutions” [24]. The future will be determined by rational understanding both of threats and the required actions to overcome these challenges. The world depends upon this new understanding.

REFERENCES

1. Dan Ariely. Predictably Irrational. The Hidden Forces That Shape our Decisions. Harper Perennial, New York, 2009, p. 212.
2. Jessica Stern and J.M. Berger, HarperCollins. ISIS, The State of Terror. New York, 2015, p. 10.
3. David C. Ranney. The New World Disorder-The Decline of U.S. Power, CreateSpace. Independent Publishing Platform, 2014.
4. by John Briscoe, in Daedalus. Water Security in a Changing World // *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Summer, 2015, Theme of Issue On Water, p. 24.
5. by Melvin A. Goodman. National Insecurity-The Costs of American Militarism. City Lights Books, 2013, p. 372.
6. Ann Hagedorn. The Invisible Soldiers-How America Outsourced Our Security. Simon and Schuster Publisher, 2014, p. 241.
7. Joseph S. Hacker and Paul Pierson Making America Great Again. Foreign Affairs, May/June 2016, p. 73.
8. Thomas M. Barnett. The Pentagon's New Map, War and Peace in the Twentieth-First Century. Penguin Books, 2013, pp. 4, 10.
9. Bob Herbert. Losing Our Way, An Intimate Portrait of a Troubled America. Anchor Books, New York, 2014, p. 245.
10. Robert Scheer. They Know Everything About You. Nation Books, New York, 2015.
11. Daniel Patrick. Moynihan Secrecy: The American Experience. Yale University Press, 1998, p. 154.
12. Edward O. Wilson. The Unity of Knowledge. Regnery Press, Washington, D.C., 2015, p. 323.
13. Shawn Dubravnac. Digital Destiny. Regnery Publishing, p. 105.
14. Joseph E. Stiglitz. Making Globalization Work. W.W Norton and company, New York, 2006.
15. John H. Miller. A Crude look at the Whole-The Science of Complex Systems in Business. Life and Society. Basic Books, New York, 2015, p. XIX.
16. Dennis Chesley. Global Power Shift. Miles Emerson and John Garvey in Strategy and Business, Summer, 2016, p. 45.
17. Joseph S. Nye, Jr. Is The American Century Over. Polity Press, Malden, Massachusetts, 2015, p. 95.
18. Mathew Burrows. The Future Declassified-Megatrends That Will Undo the World Unless We Take Action. Palgrave Macmillian, New York, 2014, p. 37.
19. Kevin Sullivan. Primed to Fight the Government // *Washington Post*, May 21, 2016.
20. The State of the Union Address, President George W. Bush, January 29, 2002.
21. Ian Bremmer Superpower-Three Choices for America's Role in the World. Portfolio Penguin, New York, 2015, pp. 60–61.
22. John Micklethwait, Adrian Wooldridge. The Fourth Revolution-The Global Race to Reinvent the State. The Penguin Press, New York, 2014, p. 247.
23. Andrew J. Bacevich. Washington Rules, America's Path to Permanent War. Metropolitan Books, 2010, pp. 237–238.
24. Joseph S. Nye, Jr. The Future of Power. Public Affairs, New York, 2011, p. 231.