

аймара – коренного населения Америки. Поэтому правительство Боливии в большинстве своём состоит из представителей метисов и индейцев [3, с. 77–78].

Уже во второй половине 2015 г. наблюдался очередной кризис левых, который связывали с победой оппозиции на выборах в Аргентине, импичментом президента в Бразилии и внутривластным кризисом в Венесуэле [6, с. 146].

Кризис левых радикалов наблюдался ещё раньше. Так, например, правительство Э. Моралеса в Боливии выяснило, что идеологическая дружба с Венесуэлой, Кубой и даже Россией не позволяет решить экономические проблемы. К тому же отношения с США были прерваны, когда Моралес со скандалом выслал американского посла с обвинением в подготовке государственного переворота. Но в 2009 г. из-за серьёзных экономических проблем Боливия подписала соглашение для улучшения двухсторонних дипотношений. Таким образом, авторитет Моралеса сильно подорвался [7, с. 21–22]. Стоит заметить, что до этого Э. Моралес и вице-президент Г. Линера заявляли о национализации всех ресурсов государства, в том числе редких металлов и энергоносителей [3, с. 77].

«Новые» левые, которые отличаются от прежних, теперь должны сражаться на два фронта: защищать свои антикапиталистические цели борьбы за будущий мир, а также защищать свои традиционные задачи – аграрную реформу, антиклерикализм, уважение к минимальным свободам. По мере роста влияния «новых» левых в Латинской Америке ученые сформулировали гипотезу о том, что «цивилизация планеты конституирует себя сейчас как подлинный мировой авангард антисистемных и антикапиталистических движений» [8, с. 60–63]. В 1920-е гг. центр этой борьбы находился в Советском Союзе, в 1960-е гг. – в Китае, сейчас же он перешёл в Латинскую Америку. Поэтому не случайно, что антисистемные и «новые» левые движения насчитывают значительное количество крупных отрядов на просторах Латинской Америки, например: движение достойных индейцев повстанцев-неосапатистов в Мексике, движение безземельных крестьян в Бразилии, индейцев Эквадора и Боливии, колумбийские и перуанские индейские движения, движение шахтёров, занятых и безработных в Аргентине [8, с. 63–65].

Кризис затрагивает все континенты планеты. Латинская Америка, являясь частью мирового экономического процесса, идёт к экономическому спаду, росту безработицы, девальвации национальных валют, то есть – экономическому кризису, который оказывает огромное влияние на политическую сферу региона. Кризис затрагивает не только леворадикальные, но также левоцентристские и правые режимы. Несмотря на это популярность левого радикализма в Латинскоамериканском регионе хоть и спала, но не столь критично, как это кажется. Общественная сила и влияние современных антисистемных движений Латинской Америки настолько огромные, что они смогли свергнуть местные правительства, непопулярных президентов и губернаторов, пересекать черту политических мер, которые были направлены противоположно интересам социальных низов. Все действия происходили мирно, хотя и путём мобилизации радикально настроенных масс. Идеология левых проделала огромный путь развития и эволюции через подпольную борьбу, череду кризисов и революции, став своеобразной «визиткой» этого региона.

1. Белоглазов, А. В. Феномен «левого поворота» в странах Латинской Америки в 1998–2012 годах / А. В. Белоглазов, А. В. Масленников // Вестник Чувашского университета. – 2013. – № 1. – С. 3–11.
2. Каллагова, З. М. «Левый поворот» Латинской Америки / З. М. Каллагова // Этносоциум. – 2015. – № 5. – С. 169–171.
3. Коларов, Г. Эво Моралес – лидер левых политических сил в Боливии и Латинской Америке / Г. Коларов // Научно-аналитический журнал «Обозреватель». – 2015. – № 4. – С. 71–82.
4. Неверов, К. А. «Старые» и «новые» левые в Латинской Америке: пример Бразилии и Венесуэлы / К. А. Неверов // Terra Humana. – 2013. – № 4. – С. 100–104.
5. Пашенцев, Е. Н. «Левый поворот» и медиавойны в Латинской Америке / Е. Н. Пашенцев // Государственное управление. Электронный вестник. – 2015. – № 51. – С. 283–316.
6. Попова, Л. Л. Глобальные и региональные факторы эволюции левого радикализма в Латинской Америке (начало XXI века): дис. к-та полит. наук: 23.00.03 / Л. Л. Попова. – СПб, 2016. – 236 л.
7. Райхель, Ю. Левый радикализм в Латинской Америке теряет популярность / Ю. Райхель // Политические изменения в Латинской Америке. – 2013. – № 13. – С. 20–23.
8. Рохас, К. А. Латинская Америка на распутье. Социальные движения и смерть современной политики / К. А. Рохас. – М.: Круг, 2012. – 160 с.
9. Sader, E. Avanzar contra la corriente / E. Sader // La Jornada [Recurso electrónico]. – Modo de acceso: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2015/11/01/mundo/019a1mun>. – Fecha de acceso: 20.11.2017.

## US SECURITY STRATEGY IN THE XXI CENTURY

G.A. Piskorska, N.L. Yakovenko (Киев, Украина)

The contemporary situation of international system of securing peace and stability is the common problem of modern international relations in general and one of the key parameters of assessment the effectiveness of the foreign policy of any state. Results of internal and external security strategies of the states depend not only on those foreign political resources a state has at its disposal, but on that how wisely those resources are used.. The most significant and generalizing document giving the whole picture of US apprehension of its foreign policy, is the US National Security Strategy causing a rising interest of many foreign and American experts to it, whose research deals with the analysis of US foreign policy and security strategies.

The Analysis of foreign and security strategies are given in general and special research papers of such scholars as J. Nye, R. Armitage, Z. Brzezinsky, R. Keygan, P. Keohane, A. Cohen, J. Arquilla, R. Shafranski, M. Libicki, F. Fukuyama and others, as well as O. Bakhtiyarov, O. Bodruk, V. Golovchenko, A. Gutsal, D. Dubov, O. Zernetska, Ye. Kaminsky, B. Kantselyaruk, O. Lytvynenko, Ye. Makarenko, S. Nedbayevsky, M. Ozhevan, I. Pogorska, O. Potekhin, G. Pocheptsov, M. Ryzhkov, O. Sosnin, S. Fedunyak, S. Shergin, I. Khyzhnyak, L. Chekalenko etc.

It is worth to mention that the Security Strategy of Nixon Administration was the first to be presented, and in 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Law was approved according to which "National Security Strategy" became an obligatory document for every new US presidential administration. The USA builds its security strategies basing on the concept of absolute and total domination (leadership) from the position of force which is grounded on principles of absolute predominance in military, technological, economic information spheres. In the complex of contemporary instruments of the US security policy, the important role also belongs to non-military methods – economic, financial, scientific and technological, information, cultural and others which are conventionally united by the "soft influence" conception which gives much more possibilities for a state to appear not only a "centre of gravity" for other actors of international relations, but also to exert effective "non-power" pressure on them.

As experts consider, the phenomenon of power in the international background is first of all the ability to influence on the behaviour of another state in the desirable direction, the ability to establish different forms of dependence of one state onto another (direct, indirect, mediated forms, those reached by force, persuasion, promises of privileges, deprivation of obvious privileges, creation of certain conditions etc.) where the only alternative exists, the only way to settle down the conflict and contradictions, the only way out of the situation which had been created. In this case the obvious fact is that such an influence may be exerted by different methods, not only the use of military potential, military pressure, threats or declaration of war.

It is the US experience in elaboration and realization of national security and foreign policy strategies which appears the most demonstrative one in the given context.

The problems of correlation of "soft" and "hard" influence methods in security policy were especially critical during George Bush Junior presidency in the context of "the axis of evil" suppression, which mainly contained the Middle East states (Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, states of Arabia, Iraq, Iran). Within the framework of the project the priority direction appeared neutralization of despotic and aggressive regimes threatening peace and security of the USA and the whole world. In the Introduction of the US National Security Strategy 2006 the very first line indicates that America is at war: "This is a wartime national security strategy required by the grave challenge we face – the rise of terrorism fueled by an aggressive ideology of hatred and murder, fully revealed to the American people on September 11, 2001. This strategy reflects our most solemn obligation: to protect the security of the American people" [1, p. iii]. The Strategy goes on with stressing America's unprecedented opportunities to lay the foundations for future peace through the ideals that have inspired its history – freedom, democracy, and human dignity and are increasingly inspiring individuals and nations throughout the world. And because free nations tend toward peace, the advance of liberty will make America more secure. It is concluded that to realize these opportunities, the way of leadership and confidence is to be chosen while giving up three evils: isolationism, protectionism and passive defence.

US President mentions the two founding pillars of the National Security Strategy. According to him, the first pillar is promoting freedom, justice, and human dignity – working to end tyranny, to promote effective democracies, and to extend prosperity through free and fair trade and wise development policies. Free governments are accountable to their people, govern their territory effectively, and pursue economic and political policies that benefit their citizens. Free governments do not oppress their people or attack other free nations. Peace and international stability are most reliably built on a foundation of freedom [1, p. iii].

The second pillar of American strategy is confronting the challenges of the time by leading a growing community of democracies. Many of the problems we face – from the threat of pandemic disease, to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to terrorism, to human trafficking, to natural disasters – reach across borders. Effective multinational efforts are essential to solve these problems. "Yet history has shown that only when we do our part will others do theirs. America must continue to lead", the Strategy says [1, p. iii].

The document clearly determines the tasks of the US foreign policy. According to it, the USA must: champion aspirations for human dignity; strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against it and its friends; work with others to defuse regional conflicts; prevent its enemies from threatening it, its allies, and its friends with weapons of mass destruction (WMD); ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade; expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy; develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power; transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century; and engage the opportunities and confront the challenges of globalization. Thus, the National Security Strategy singles out priorities of state policy in terms of politics and its instruments which are used to oppose principal threats for the US national security. American foreign policy which was traditionally based on combination of national security strategies and global democratization, appeared to be unable to favour realization of American ambitions during George Bush Junior's presidency who in January 2006 officially

declared the concept of “transformation diplomacy” but failed to transform authoritarian regimes into stable democracies.

Realization of new “smart power” concept was embodied in the US National Security Strategy which was released in May 2010 and where principles of securing American geopolitical interests in the modern world are determined. The essence of new American consensus strategy (drafters are J. Nye and R. Armitage) lies in a combination of “hard” (military) and “soft” (cultural) power transformed into a common effective strategy of the US activities at the international stage aimed at returning American status of the intellectual leader and support of the US image and reputation basing on the idea of “global welfare” [2].

Nevertheless the document is notable for its declarative characteristics, while failing to expose a number of real policy aspects; at the same time the 2010 National Security Strategy together with other doctrinal documents (“4-year Military Policy Review”, “Nuclear Policy Review”, “Review of Approaches towards Anti-Missile Defence”, “Strategy in Cyber Security Sphere” etc.) presents a rather comprehensive idea about political priorities of American leadership. Traditionally, American approach towards national security problem was limited by international aspects, as problems of domestic policy and economic development were not considered to refer to the US national security sphere; however B. Obama Administration diverged from such strict differentiation and extended the meaning of national security [3].

B. Obama is supporting the idea of the USA historical mission – to guarantee global security, but in contrast to the White House predecessors Obama’s National Security Strategy recognizes the great significance of partnership and pays much attention to the civil dimension to counterbalance the military one, emphasizes the importance of dialogue and strengthening international institutions.

Thus, in the 52-page document, as analysts consider, the attempt is done to reconcile idealism of Obama’s company and reality of his confrontation with uneasy and insecure world. America is described as “war-hardened” and “disciplined by devastating economic crisis”; the conclusion is made that the USA is unable to carry the burden of long-term wars in Iraq and Afghanistan having at the same time other duties. Critics of Obama reproached President with his desire to apologize for America’s failures and to express complete readiness for giving up the role of the only superpower. “However for Obama’s team it is a document which describes the world as it is and marks the end of illusions era when Washington preferred using “hard” power to reach results” [4].

National Security Strategy contains a number of important innovations of tactical and strategic nature: in particular, for the first time the Strategy brings forward the idea of integrating main instruments of American might – diplomacy, armed force, economic instruments, intelligence, means to secure internal security [5]. Moreover, while analyzing the document it is possible to single out four strategic aspects: economic prosperity; promotion of “universal values”; strengthening of world order on condition of American leadership in solving significant international problems. The Strategy was of a comprehensive nature and appeared the attempt to integrate internal and international aspects of national security considering that the sharpest systemic crisis causes “overload” of American forces while trying to consolidate the unipolar world, as none of the states is able to fully secure international responsibility.

In the document, the problem of internal security concerns revival of American economy (for the first time, the task of doubling American export by 2014 and some part of capitals in GNP, is included into national security sphere), its capability for innovations as a basic foundation of American power and competitiveness, solving the problem of state budget deficit [6]. Problems of education development, health protection, science and technology are especially stressed. Thus, the point is the rise of US intellectual potential due to “full education of the whole American population” and numerical increase of people with higher education by 2020. Considering intellectual integral part of “soft power” National Security Strategy regarded scientific and technological achievements as an instrument for securing priorities of US security; at the same time the Strategy was aimed at protection of American troops against asymmetrical information attacks; fulfilment of treaties on control over the newest weapons and their non-proliferation; prevention of terroristic attacks the US territory; prevention and cessation of epidemic spread; protection of information infrastructure, means of transport and communication.

The document emphasized the leading role of military factor (“hard” power) in security strategy, as the US intends to maintain its military leadership and capabilities to confront threats of any potential enemy. So, the point of “hard” power to be used by Washington is not fully omitted in the Strategy, that is the right of Washington to resort to one-sided military actions: “When all other methods are used force will sometimes be necessary to confront threats. Before fighting a war we will thoroughly weigh the pros and cons, value and risks of actions and inactivity ... We will strive for a wide international support, in particular of such institutions as NATO and UN Security Council. The USA keeps its right for unilateral actions if it is necessary to protect our state and our interests, but we will seek to adhere to norms regulating the use of force” [7].

The document gives a vision of B. Obama’s administration as to US role in the polycentric system of international relations where the priority of collective actions of world community within the framework of International law is proclaimed, the necessity of strengthening international institutions is stressed, recognition of rights and duties of all states concerning progressive development of mankind is declared, necessity of interaction with American allies – NATO member states, Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan, Southern Korea, Australia etc. – is emphasized. In Obama’s Strategy special attention is paid to numerical increase of the new “centres of influence”, with whom the US is to act reciprocally. Among them China, India, Russia and

regional “centres of influence” – Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria and Kenya – are mentioned.

The Strategy marks the “diffusion of economic force in the world”, which means solving global financial and economic problems with assistance of G8 (seven Western states plus Russia) and G20 where almost all new “centres of influence” in the unipolar world towards the strategy of securing US leadership are included. It means that the US is moving from the strategy of “the only superpower” in the unipolar world towards the strategy of securing US leadership in the polycentric system of international relations [8]. The mentioned document may cause critical comments concerning the change of recent US foreign political course, its readiness to give up the role of the only superpower, but for Obama’s team this is the document symbolizing US withdrawal from the doctrine of “deterrence” to “smart power” doctrine [9; 10; 11].

Meanwhile the new Strategy pays attention to those national security aspects which were beyond essential importance in previous Strategies.

In 2010 National Security Strategy, the problem of cyber nets protection is mentioned together with the US protection from biological attacks, while the penetration of cyber nets into the everyday life of American society is defined as “dependence” on them, as “the cosmic space and cyber space are capable to exert their influence on the everyday life and military operations”. Besides, cyber attacks are referred to as one of the key problems of the US internal security: “Cybersecurity threats represent one of the most serious national security, public safety, and economic challenges we face as a nation ... The threats we face range from individual criminal hackers to organized criminal groups, from terrorist networks to advanced nation states. Defending against these threats to our security, prosperity, and personal privacy requires networks that are secure, trustworthy, and resilient. Our digital infrastructure, therefore, is a strategic national asset, and protecting it – while safeguarding privacy and civil liberties – is a national security priority. We will deter, prevent, detect, defend against, and quickly recover from cyber intrusions and attacks...” To explain the position of Obama Administration, the certain part titled “Secure Cyberspace” is given where it is indicated that threats in cyberspace are one of the most serious threats to national, social and economic security the US is facing: “The very technologies that empower us to lead and create also empower those who would disrupt and destroy. They enable our military superiority, but our unclassified government networks are constantly probed by intruders. Our daily lives and public safety depend on power and electric grids, but potential adversaries could use cyber vulnerabilities to disrupt them on a massive scale. The Internet and e-commerce are keys to our economic competitiveness, but cyber criminals have cost companies and consumers hundreds of millions of dollars and valuable intellectual property”. Thus this high level of technologies gives certain advantages to US armed forces, but it does not secure official governmental networks against constant non-sanctioned penetration.

According to the analysis, the problem of democracy and human rights protection is traditionally presented in National Security Strategy: firstly, the problem of human rights protection in the USA is constantly stressed; secondly, for the first time the importance of economic and social rights and liberties, poverty annihilation are indicated; thirdly, it is asserted that the USA will not impose its model of democracy, but will base itself upon proper examples and discuss human rights even with “non-democratic regimes”. Thus, for Obama Administration, the strategy of “smart power” is a priority, which embraces diplomacy, national values, scientific and technological innovations and security, which prove the US strive to support international order able to solve global problems.

In February 2015, the latest National Security Strategy was issued in the USA [12]. In the President’s report, the approaches of Administration are formulated towards political, defence, economic and other aspects securing US wellbeing and security, adapted to current and potential threats and challenges. According to existing practice, the points of the latest Strategy will favour corresponding changes in the Washington international political course aimed at the most effective promotion of American interests abroad at regional and global levels. A comprehensive program of interaction with the rest of the world in its current position, has been suggested. In the document, a desire to change the world order with force methods yields to realizing Russia’s global role and entering the world stage of such states as China and India. US foreign policy is expected to be adapted to new evolutionary threats including cyber wars, epidemic diseases, ethnic conflicts etc.

Mighty and efficient armed forces are still regarded as the main guarantee to preserve the US influence in the world despite the point concerning complex approach to providing security of the state which means constant composition of political-diplomatic, military, ideological and other instruments to exert influence on the situation.

In the introductory part of the document, it is affirmed that among the American political elite there is a consensus concerning the US world leadership. The strategy sets out the principles and priorities that describe how America will lead the world toward greater peace and a new prosperity. The aims of leadership or national interests are indicated here – “security of the USA, its citizens and American supporters and allies; a strong, innovative, and growing U.S. economy in an open international economic system that promotes opportunity and prosperity; respect towards universal values at home and around the world; advancing an international order that promotes peace, security, and opportunity through stronger cooperation to meet global challenges”.

The drafters of the document consider that “the United States will ensure its leadership being an example for other states”. That is “strength of American institutes of power, our adherence to Law are vivid examples for all democratic governments. If we are firm with our values at home we will be effective while promoting them abroad. Following international norms and standards enables us to expect similar actions by other states”.

The USA intends to deter Russian aggression, carefully watch its strategic abilities and help allies and partners oppose pressure exerted by Russia in the long-term period if it is needed. In 2015 US Budget, expenditures for opposing “Russian pressure” were considered. In his budget address B. Obama declared that Russian aggressive actions caused officials to include into budget propositions on political, economic and military support of NATO allies and European partners. B. Obama mentioned that the USA will help governments of those states which appeared main “pressure targets” on the part of Russia. At the same time America will have the door open to further cooperate with Russia in common interests if the RF chooses another way – the way of peaceful cooperation respecting sovereignty and democratic development of the neighbouring states.

“Russian aggression in Ukraine made it clear that European security and international rules and norms aimed against territorial aggression, are not reliable. In response we won the international support of Ukrainian people who had made a choice of their future and are developing democracy and economy”, the National Security Strategy says.

Meanwhile in 2016 a well-known analytical centre ‘Council on Foreign Relations’ (CFR) underestimated the priority of the Ukrainian conflict for the US foreign policy in its report on “Research on preventive priorities-2016” [13]. The CFR experts included the Ukrainian conflict into the second-important group of alarming situations in the world, whose prevention might have been a priority for American diplomats. For all this, CFR experts determined the following priorities of the US foreign policy: the civil war in Syria, armed attack against the USA or its ally with mass victims; the conflict with Southern Korea or within it because of Korean nuclear or ballistic weapon test; the EU political instability; Libya defragmentation; conflict between Israel and Palestinian territories; political violence in Turkey; instability in Egypt; violence and instability in Afghanistan; further defragmentation in Iraq.

The US leadership undertook to support international stability, collective efforts of the world community in the struggle against terrorism, al-Qaeda, IGIL in the first place, to prevent terrorists’ access to nuclear materials, in the struggle against proliferation of mass destruction weapons, consolidate world community efforts aimed at the reduction of negative results of climatic changes and prevention of dangerous diseases. While solving these problems, the main role is to be played by armed forces as they are to remain ready to oppose any threats including spheres of anti-missile defence, cybeseurity, struggle against terrorism, deterrence of aggression and liquidation of natural calamities consequences. The USA will retain its military presence abroad to protect American citizens and their interests, give humanitarian aid and increase potential of foreign partners necessary while conducting mutual operations.

However the use of force is not the only effective method to confront challenges or the only means to involve the USA into world affairs. On the contrary, the priority instruments in the given sphere are diplomacy and selective use of economic sanctions which remains an effective method to exert influence on irresponsible subjects of international relations and also to do away with criminal and terroristic networks.

The US leadership is based on reliable partners. “We will continuously expand the scope of cooperation to encompass other state partners, non-state and private actors, and international institutions – particularly the United Nations, international financial institutions, and key regional organizations. These partnerships can deliver essential capacity to share the burdens of maintaining global security and prosperity and to uphold the norms that govern responsible international behavior”.

The US will lead with a long-term perspective. In the same way as the United States favoured the correct development of international processes last century, at present it is obliged to influence on their progress and character, while improving forms and methods of influence to keep its leadership. According to the Strategy, Washington is responsible for energy security of our allies in Europe and in other world regions. “The challenges faced by Ukrainian and European dependence on Russian energy supplies puts a spotlight on the need for an expanded view of energy security that recognizes the collective needs of the United States, our allies, and trading partners as well as the importance of competitive energy markets”.

Washington takes one more obligation – “We will ... continue to look for ways to support the success and ease the difficulties of democratic transitions through responsible assistance, investment and trade, and by supporting political, economic, and security reforms. We will continue to push for reforms in authoritarian countries not currently undergoing wholesale transitions. Good governance is also predicated on strengthening the state-society relationship. When citizens have a voice in the decisionmaking that affects them, governments make better decisions and citizens are better able to participate, innovate, and contribute”. In this connection the United States will go on searching for rational decisions in all directions of its foreign political course using necessary diplomatic and other instruments.

As the birthplace of the Internet, the United States has a special responsibility to lead a networked world, to ensure security of the cosmic space (“we must join together to deal with threats posed by those who may wish to deny the peaceful use of outer space”) and also are space and seas.

Ukrainian analysts mention that the particular feature of all US National Security Strategies is their global nature considering the fact that after the World War II the United States gained the position of a world leader and one of force centers at the world stage [14]. New Strategy of B. Obama is of a comprehensive nature and presents an attempt to consolidate internal and international aspects of national security considering that the most acute systemic crisis demonstrated the overwork of the US activities in its attempt to consolidate the unipolar

world, as no country in the world is able to secure full international responsibility. In political struggle for leadership, among the world community “soft power” strategies have become extremely important. These strategies are regarded as state documents of historical and political significance because as long as they are used they have experienced constructive changes (from “hard power” strategy to “soft” and “smart power” strategies) caused by new challenges and threats to international peace and stability.

As American experts consider, “smart power” concept which is the basis of B. Obama Administration, will favour progress in US foreign political course aimed at global leadership in particular, while combining diplomatic, economic and military potential. To our mind, “smart power” ideology serves the main imperative of the United States at the international scene: protection of national interests in essentially new context of external political influence.

1. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2006) [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/nss2006.pdf>. – Date of access: 30.01.2016.
2. Nye, J. S. A smarter, more secure America. Report of the CSIS Commission on Smart Power [Electronic resource] / J. S. Nye, C. Cohen, R. Armitage. – Mode of access: <http://csis.org/publication/smarter-more-secure-america>. – Date of access: 30.01.2016.
3. Дудейран, Ю. У США оприлюднили нову стратегію національної безпеки [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Дудейран. – Режим доступу: <http://www.radiosvoboda.org/content/article/2054788.html>. – Дата доступу: 30.01.2016.
4. Макаренко, Є. А. Ризики і перспективи політики безпеки адміністрації США в умовах «перезавантаження» міжнародних відносин / Є. А. Макаренко // Актуальні проблеми міжнародних відносин. (Інститут міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка). – К., 2010. – Випуск 94. Частина I. – С. 11–16.
5. Обама добивається безпеки путем мира и сотрудничества [Електронний ресурс]. – 27 мая 2010 года. – Режим доступа: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-russian/2010/May/20100528130723arrud0.915127.html>. – Дата доступа: 30.01.2016.
6. Введение президента Обамы к Отчету о стратегии национальной безопасности [Електронний ресурс]. – 28 мая 2010 года. – Режим доступа: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-russian/2010/May/20100528114736ejavosson05478632.html>. – Дата доступа: 30.01.2016.
7. Шамшур, О. Початок ери Обама. Зовнішньополітичний вимір [Електронний ресурс] / О. Шамшур. – Режим доступу: <http://www.zn.ua/1000/1550/64642>. – Дата доступу: 30.01.2016.
8. Рогов, С. Американское лидерство в многополярном мире. Основы «Стратегии национальной безопасности» Обамы [Електронний ресурс] / С. Рогов. – Режим доступа: <http://www.centrasia.ru/newsA.php?st=1276462800>. – Дата доступа: 30.01.2016.
9. Обама відмовляється від ролі «світового жандарма» [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.newsru.ua/press/28may2010/obama.html>. – Дата доступу: 30.01.2016.
10. У США нова стратегія безпеки [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.unian.net/ukr/news/news-378925.html>. – Дата доступу: 30.01.2016.
11. Нова стратегія безпеки США в баченні Обама [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://otherside.com.ua/news/detail.php?lang=1&id=83241>. – Дата доступу: 30.01.2016.
12. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2015) [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015\\_national\\_security\\_strategy.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf). – Date of access: 30.01.2016.
13. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR): Preventive Priorities Survey: 2016 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://www.cfr.org/conflict-assessment/preventive-priorities-survey-2016/p37364>. – Date of access: 30.01.2016.
14. Концептуальні засади розвитку системи забезпечення національної безпеки України : аналіт. доп. / О. О. Резнікова, В. Ю. Цюкало, В. О. Паливода, С. В. Дрьомов, С. В. Сьомін. – К. : НІСД, 2015. – 58 с.

## РЕГИОНАЛЬНАЯ ДИСПРОПОРЦИЯ ФЕДЕРАЛЬНЫХ ЗЕМЕЛЬ ФРГ В КОНТЕКСТЕ МИГРАЦИОННОЙ СИТУАЦИИ НАЧАЛА XXI В.

Т.Г. Хришкевич (Псков, Россия)

В сентябре 2017 г. в ФРГ прошли очередные федеральные выборы. Нестандартный характер традиционному мероприятию придали затянувшиеся переговоры по формированию правящей коалиции. Преодолеть политический кризис и угрозу новых выборов удалось только спустя четыре месяца 7 февраля 2018 г., когда был опубликован коалиционный договор ХДС/ХСС и СДПГ. Сложившийся со значительными трудностями союз очередной большой коалиции стал отражением всех самых острых нерешенных проблем Германии. В определённой степени споры двух партнёров вращались вокруг миграционной ситуации предыдущих лет. В результате VIII раздел договора «Управление иммиграцией» («Zuwanderung steuern – Integration fordern und unterstützen») был полностью посвящен поддержке иммиграции, что стало следствием кризиса беженцев, поразившего Европу в 2014-2016 гг.

Договор поставил перед новым правительством широкий спектр задач. Например, расширение гуманитарного участия в финансировании и деятельности УВКБ и Мировой продовольственной программы, расширение обязательств по поддержанию мира (включая укрепление международных полицейских миссий); торговую и сельскохозяйственную политику и пр. А также внутривнутриполитические, преимущественно связанные с ситуацией на рынке труда страны: разработка законодательства, регулирующего миграцию и интеграцию её в рынок труда и ориентированного на потребности экономики: «Решающими факторами, которые следует учитывать при переезде в Германию, являются потребности нашей экономики, квалификации, возраста, языка и доказательств конкретной работы и обеспечения средств к существованию». Правительственная коалиция обозначила размер квот на прием от 180 000 до 220 000 человек ежегодно [7, s. 102-108]. Таким образом, миграционная ситуация теснейшим образом связана с социально-экономическим положением, которое имеет в Германии ярко выраженный региональный оттенок.