

A NEW STRATEGY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE SOUTH CAUCASUS: PRIORITIES AND OUTLINES

1. THE NEW AND OLD STRATEGIES NAT. U.S. SECURITY (THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC ASPECTS)

After 16 months of Obama's cabinet in late May 2010, the president's administration had to prepare and approve a new 60-page document - the National Security Strategy of the United States [1]. The previous strategy was published by Bush Jr's administration, on September 20, 2002 and was one of the first attempts to formulate a doctrine of security as a world power after the attacks of September 11, 2001. It's interesting that the conclusion of the document says about the U.S. involvement in war, as well as the continuing economic crisis. The strategy shows a comprehensive list of threats to U.S. national security, which along with the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and nuclear weapons, terrorism and the increase in cyber crime also includes immigration and energy component. The document says that the U.S. will focus on counterterrorism as well. The new doctrine states that the climate change and U.S. dependence on fossil fuels are characterized as the fundamental problems of national security. The basis of this document is primarily a pragmatic understanding of the essence of U.S. strategy in the world, and presents its goals proceeding from the realities of present. Some aspects of the new strategy are radically different from the ones stated in the previous document, thus are of great interest to it. In particular, Barack Obama's advent made some significant adjustments in global strategic paradigm of the USA. Its main foreign policy objectives and the new administration is formulated as follows: 1) to restore America's standing in the world, 2) initiate a dialogue with friends, partners and opponents on the basis of mutual respect, 3) to begin mutual cooperation and establish partnerships [2]. The cardinal difference between the new national security strategy from the so-called "Bush Doctrine", which formally establishes the right of America to wage war on the pre-emption against countries and terrorist organizations that pose a threat to the U.S., is based on the emphasis of unilateralism. Among other things stated in the strategy "The U.S. should reconsider its leadership in the world to build and strengthen the sources of our strength and influence." However, in practical terms the strategy says that America must first recover its own economy based on its power. The company aims at working closely within the U.S. "Big Twenty," which is playing an increasing role in modern conditions. Regarding issues of international cooperation and obligations the document notes the need for closer cooperation with all partner countries that play a key role in different regions of the planet. Among the key countries (the countries of influence "- NSC) such as China,

India and Russia, have emerged Brazil, South Africa and Indonesia, which, as noted, may cooperate in different range of issues both as bilateral and the global agenda. The new strategy also states that the U.S. will continue to assist in the processes of democratization and the establishment of stability in Eastern Europe. In particular, it means the promotion of democracy in the Balkans, assistance in resolving conflicts in the Caucasus and Cyprus, as well as the continuation of strategic cooperation with Turkey for the stability in the region. Consequently, the special significance in terms of a new strategy for U.S. Foreign Policy was to hold the South Caucasus, giving priority and importance of its geo-economic and geo-political factors. The South Caucasus region is also important as there intersect the interests of not only the superpowers of the United States, Russia and the European Union, but the fact that it is directly related to the Middle East, particularly Iran, which has been recently considered one of the most vulnerable parties in the US Foreign Policy. In essence, the South Caucasus is very stressful and conflict region, which incorporates many of the most difficult and dangerous ethnic, national and supra-national conflicts. "American exceptionalism" - the desire for "moral leadership in the world" are the ideological basis of U.S. Foreign Policy [3]. Therefore, a new administration in this sense is no different from the previous one. It changed only tools for the realization of this oneness. Power politics into the background and its place is occupied by diplomacy and reliance on reliable and long-term unions [4]. According to team members for Barack Obama, foreign policy of the Bush administration was overly ideological and made unwarranted emphasis more on military force rather than diplomacy. To strengthen the international influence under the current leadership of the country, it is necessary that the American Foreign Policy to be based on a combination of principle and pragmatism, and not on excluding rigid ideology, emotions and biases [5]. The U.S. claims to global hegemony turned unanticipated costs in the form of: 1) the sharp decline in U.S. influence in the world and 2) the desire allies to distance themselves from costly military-political initiatives in Washington, and 3) the sharp polarization of American society over the war in Iraq, and 4) the moral-psychological fatigue of armed forces personnel and their families, and 5) significant depletion of the logistical and financial base of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Recall that the U.S. National Security Strategy 2006 (NSS-2006) was announced as one of the main goals of U.S. military policy to achieve victory in Afghanistan and Iraq [6]. However, the changes in international environment, political and military leadership of the country have made some changes in Washington's strategic goals. Today Americans consider their future seriously and for the first time in recent years has gone real process of critical rethinking of the dominant development paradigm of the country [7]. In June of 2008, the U.S. Department of Defence issued a new "national defence strategy of the U.S. (FNL-2008). Initially, the document was perceived by experts as a "document-wills of the

Republican administration of George Bush." However, after a speech of US Defence Secretary, Robert Gates, at National Defence University on Sept. 29, 2008 during which the FNL-2008 was presented as a "balance of the future military policy of the state, allowing to link the capabilities and needs the U.S. to use military force, the new strategy was to acquire political future.

After the approval of Secretary Gates, Secretary of Defence and the administration of Barack Obama's FNL-2008 has become a strategic U.S. document, the essence of which is the following: 1) to balance the possibility of U.S. military forces, to solve problems in the current conflict with their ability to deal with other sporadic problems, 2) balance of military, economic and military-technical capabilities of the state to provide armed forces with arms and military equipment for the action, as in large-scale wars, and in low intensity conflict, and 3) to find a reasonable balance between positive and negative features of the culture of War [8]. The current head of the White House, during his speech at the UN General Assembly on September 23, 2009 announced that Barack Obama believes that democracy can not be brought into any country from outside. Each country must find its own way, and none's path is perfect. Each country needs to follow a path that is rooted in the culture of its people. This approach is radically different from the main foreign policy goals of the previous administration. George Bush believes that America must play the role of "world policeman." Barack Obama understands that the implementation of such a global control in the U.S. already requires sufficient resources. He acknowledges that the United States alone can not cope with global problems. Therefore, according to Barack Obama, it is necessary to form "a broad global coalition under U.S. leadership. This would allow Americans to have at its disposal all necessary resources to address global problems and achieve goals that meet primarily the strategic interests of America [9]. In addition, the protection of human rights in a particular state United States will now be viewed through the prism of "principled pragmatism, suggests a differentiated approach depending on local conditions and political power [10].

2. THE U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE REGIONAL GEO-POLITICAL ACTORS IN THE SOUTH CAUCASUS

2.1. US-Turkish Relations in the Regional Context

Strengthening of U.S. positions in the South Caucasus is one of the key elements of the U.S. global strategy. One of the principal actors in the region (Turkey) is perceived by the USA as a key geopolitical center of the South-Caucasian region, which is able to make the necessary contribution to the achievement of US goals in the region [11]. Internal political and geostrategic features allow Turkey to see its "bridge" between the West and the Islamic world and the leading regional factors. It is no accident that in his speech to the deputies of Turkish Grand National Assembly, Barack Obama said, "that from

now on American relations with the Muslim world will be built not only on the basis of the overall fight against terrorism, but on the basis of broad cooperation based on mutual interests and mutual respect that will facilitate the approval and serve as the guarantor of peace and security in the region"[12]. It is obvious that Turkey will play a great role in the implementation of this cooperation, particularly the role of "an important element of rapprochement of the West and the Islamic world to strengthen U.S. forces in the region." However, the future strategic plans of the United States have changed slightly with some changes associated with the process of normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations and the deterioration of Turkish-Israeli relations.

Armenian-Turkish rapprochement is ongoing and it is far from clear what its results could be. As the political process unfolds, the efforts to understand it show certain trends. As to experts from other countries, they often have insufficient knowledge of the underlying issues. The main goal of this part of paper is to identify the basic parameters and trends of Armenia and Turkey in a short or medium term. The history of Armenian-Turkish relations is centuries long and difficult including the Armenian Genocide of 1915 committed by the Young Turks of the Ottoman Empire and forced deportation of Armenians from Western Armenia. Their present stage is perceived by external observers as absolutely unique just because the current political situation placed Armenian-Turkish rapprochement in the media spotlight and attracted the attention of leading world powers. However, in domestic perceptions in Armenia and Turkey, the rapprochement neatly fits into the centuries-long paradigm of mutual relations, extending even to the roles played by external actors whether regional or international [13]. Until the start of what later became known as "football diplomacy," Turkey had been putting forward a number of preconditions for normalization of mutual ties with Armenia, which concerned the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, the recognition of mutual borders, and the activities of the Armenian Diaspora aimed at the international recognition of the Genocide. After the Russian-Georgian war, President Gull's visit to Yerevan and the election of Barak Obama who publicly acknowledged the 1915 Genocide of Armenians while still a senator, a new situation emerged in the region. Although secret Swiss-mediated negotiations had been ongoing for a few years, it was only in the early 2009 that brought the first results. On April 22, 2009 the Foreign Ministers of Armenia, Turkey and Switzerland issued a joint statement, according to which the two neighbours agreed on a "Road Map" of concrete steps towards normalization of bilateral elections without preconditions. The statement was welcomed by officials in Washington, Brussels and even Moscow but lead to the deepest ever crisis in Turkey-Azerbaijan relations. Baku's strong nervous reaction was apparently unexpected by Ankara, causing it to come up with excuses: Prime Minister Erdogan thus made a speech at the Parliament of Azerbaijan in which he tied normalization with Armenia to the settlement of

conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. On August 31, 2009, the Foreign Ministers of Armenia, Turkey and Switzerland pre-signed the texts of two Protocols on the establishment of diplomatic ties and opening of mutual borders. Armenia reacted once again; this time, Armenia's President Sargsyan said in December 2009 speech that Turkey should fail to ratify the Protocols "in a reasonable amount of time" and continue procrastinating; Armenia would revoke its signature under the Protocols. Turkish leaders formally strengthened its position in the context of the regulation of relations with Armenia in their numerous statements that can be reduced to the idea: nothing outside of preconditions. Apparently, the initially planned tactics of the Turkish leadership were not long in coming, and all interested in the issue of an early normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations have become a superpower to make very clear that the Turkish ruling elite would never go in spite of the interests of the younger brother - Azerbaijan. However, the vector of international diplomacy towards the Armenian-Turkish relations began to move vigorously to the starting point, in view of the world's geopolitical interest of actors to give an early final solution to this issue. It is no secret that at the present stage of political development of the United States was the second act of open political action, which involves strengthening the process of using the genocide as an instrument of pressure on Turkey. Previously, it seemed that they had acted in a latent form, trying to forcibly drag Turkey into a new process of regional policy - the opening of the Armenian-Turkish border, a decision or freezing regional conflicts and the creation on this basis South Caucasian confederation with the participation of Turkey, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. In essence, such a confederation was to act under the auspices of Turkey, and in contrast to Russia. Turkish society tends to preserve and enhance the close friendship at the same time, to preserve the fraternal relations with Azerbaijan. Moreover, the Turkish top political and government circles still hopeful for implementation of the "Pan-Turkic Ideology", which further underlines the reluctance of Turkey to improve relations with Armenia against Azerbaijan's interests. From this perspective, the application of Ankara in different margins on the implementation of several new political mission, under different scenarios under the pretext of normalizing relations with Armenia are only indicative and declarative nature in the face of world opinion and the superpowers [14]. Relations between Turkey and Israel at the moment are not experiencing the best of times. Despite the fact that Turkey is the first Muslim state that has recognized Israel in 1949, relations between countries in the current geopolitical situation in the Middle East can be regarded as strained. The main reason for a "cooling" of relations in the early twenty-first century is the change in the external course of Ankara, after coming to power, Justice and Development Party, in 2002 whose leader is Tayyip Recep Erdogan, the head of the Turkish government. Although the ruling party is positioning itself as a moderate Islamist, Erdogan's foreign policy and is increasingly pursuing a policy

of active rapprochement with the rest of the country's Islamic world, which in turn determined the change in policy toward Israel, especially during the recent events in the Middle East. Israel's actions during the Second Lebanon War were perceived in Turkey as extremely negative. August 3, 2006 Human Rights Commission of the Turkish Parliament described the fighting Israel in Lebanon as "state terrorism and genocide." The head of the commission, Mehmet Elkatmysh, said that Israel "makes the Middle East into a sea of blood." [15]. For example, May 31, 2010, Israeli military captured six ships fleet, which were sent to the Gaza Strip, loaded with humanitarian aid and building materials. According to preliminary data, during the operation 10 people were killed. Ankara has also demanded an urgent meeting of the UN Security Council. The U.S. administration expressed concern about the past and regrets the loss of life, and the European Union and the Russian Foreign Ministry condemned the Israeli side [16].

Basically, strengthening of the Turkish factor in the region corresponds to the fundamental principle of the foreign policy of Barack Obama's administration. Nevertheless between U.S. and Turkey are still controversies over some of the regional problems of the South Caucasus. For example, between Iran, the United States and the Republic of Turkey, there are profound differences. Iran is one of the foreign policy priorities of Obama Administration. According to the United States, Turkey underestimates Western concerns about Iran's nuclear program. In addition, Turkey, which is a non-permanent member of UN Security Council, does not support the imposition of sanctions against the Islamic republic. U.S. Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs, Philip Gordon, commenting on the US-Turkish relations, said that Turkey should now expand cooperation with Iran [17]. The U.S. believes that an Islamic state must have a hydrostatic pressure to force him to cooperate with the international community and to show that otherwise, the leadership of Iran will be punished. However, Turkey which is continuing to act in its interests has concluded several agreements with Iran in the energy sector, demonstrating its independence and desire to enhance the credibility among the Muslim countries. Washington's reaction has been restrained and was as follows: the current Turkish policy toward neighboring countries is not a surprise for the United States. Yet Washington expects Turkey to share Western concerns about Iran's nuclear program. In addition, the United States have a positive attitude to the idea of storing the Iranian enriched uranium in Turkish territory and believe that for such purposes, Turkey is the most reliable and secure country. As for the position on the Middle East conflict, the administration of Barack Obama recognizes the full right of Israel to ensure its own security, taking into account "legitimate political and economic aspirations of the Palestinian people." According to statements by Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, the Obama administration is with deep sympathy for the desire of Israel to secure itself against Hamas rockets, and

invites the group to renounce violence and recognize Israel [18]. American leadership is closely following the situation in the region and hopes that the policy of the Turkish government's "zero problem with neighbors" will spread to the State of Israel. It should be emphasized that the continuing difficult situation in the Middle East increasingly raises U.S. interest in developing cooperation with Turkey in a broader format [19]. Therefore, recently it has started dialogues about the Armenian Genocide as a rod for the U.S. against Turkey.

2.2. The South Caucasus as a Sphere of Interest of the United States and Russia

2009-2010 years were marked by advances and important events in many areas of international relations. Historic protocols signed between Turkey and Armenia, have intensified the process of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict started in "reboot" of the US-Russian relations. In 2010, the interrelated processes in the Caucasus promise new dynamics, including by improving US-Russian relations. The United States and Russia can exert the greatest influence on the situation in the South Caucasus region, which has acquired considerable importance for them in recent years. The positions of Moscow and Washington agree on the settlement of the protracted in the region of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict more than ever. Both countries now have a need to strengthen their positions in the South Caucasus, and each one strives to be the main mediator in the protracted conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, pursuing its own interests. Nagorno-Karabakh conflict bodes Russia diversification of economic relations with Armenia, unblocking the railway, which invested large Russian investments. Moreover, it is a chance for Moscow to return the image of a peacemaker, shaky after Russia's intervention in the Georgian-Ossetian war in August 2008. After Russian's "victory" in the Georgian war in August 2008, its most ambitious, reaching military reform programme since 1945 was detailed. In reality the "lessons learned" from the war served as a catalyst to commence the new reform agenda announced by Defence Minister Anatolia Serdyukov in October 2008, which proposes to transfer the armed forces from a mobilization to a permanent readiness basis, structured around more brigades while seeking to drastically modernize equipment and weapons more suited to fighting a large-scale conventional war that never happened [20]. U.S. is more interested in the security guarantees of energy supplies, which will pass through the South Caucasus. "Blue" Dream USA - implementation of projects and the diversification of gas supplies from Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan depends on investors' confidence in security of supply. Washington and Moscow, despite its influence on Armenia and Azerbaijan are not able to have a serious impact on the political situation in these countries. Therefore, the improvement of Russian-American relations creates a rather good background for the settlement of Nagorno Karabakh problem. The first serious sign of positive dynamics of a historic signing of the tenth day of October by the foreign ministers of Armenia

and Turkey in Zurich protocols on the normalization of relations between the two countries was with the support of both the U.S. and Russia. Another point of intersection of interests between Russia and the United States in the Caucasus could become the Gabala radar station. Following the historic failure of the U.S. administration to deploy in Europe, the third site to appear on the agenda of several options for missile defense architecture: the creation of a collective set of strategic missile defense in Europe, the creation of defense against intermediate- and short-range forces of NATO and the U.S., the creation of exclusively American missile defense system, but without reference to irritating Russia points near its borders. In this regard, the radar station in Gabala, perhaps, until most likely the objects mentioned in connection with the possible inclusion of Russia in the system of global missile of defense. The Russian station is on duty in the territory of Azerbaijan, close to Iran. As an additional element of observation, it can be convenient for the U.S. and Russia in different variants of missile defense architecture. Gabala radar station in any case may be subject to a demonstration of the first joint defense project – the U.S. and Russia. However, given the outdated technical condition of the station in Gabala cooperation will be more symbolic than practical. Russia in response that the U.S. administration has revised the plans to deploy missile defence system near Russian borders, ready to sacrifice some of their allied commitments to Iran. It is obvious that Russia's efforts will be directed to the fact that in Iran there was a nuclear bomb, as it will become a serious destabilizing factor in the region. Moscow, as one of the major regional players, is not interested in the emergence of major armed conflicts that could seriously affect the stability of the South Caucasus. Russia today is prepared to support some sanctions and to provide more serious pressure on Iran so that the Islamic republic to abandon its nuclear weapons program. It fits in the "reset", and in the Russian view of the South Caucasus region [21].

2.3. Iran as a New Political Direction of U.S. National Strategy in the Caucasus Region

Political relations between Iran and the United States began in the mid-to-late 19th century but had small importance or controversy until the post-World War II era of the Cold War and of petroleum exports from the Persian Gulf. Since then, an era of close alliance between Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi's regime and the American government was followed by a dramatic reversal and hostility between the two countries after the 1979 Iranian Revolution. Opinions differ over what has caused the decades of poor relations. Iranian explanations include everything from the natural and unavoidable conflict between the Islamic Revolution on the one hand, and American arrogance [22] and desire for global hegemony on the other [23]. Other explanations include the government's need for an external bogeyman to furnish a pretext for domestic repression against pro-democratic forces and to bind the

government to its loyal constituency [24]. Since 1995, the United States has had an embargo on trade with Iran [25].

During the last presidential campaign in the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI) Americans do not take into account the special civilian mentality of Iranians, whose main feature is the desire to defend their interests in dealing with hostile pressure from outside. "Currently, the Persian national psychology is a fusion of great imperial nationalism and Shiite chosen" [26]. In the speeches of Iranian President Mahmud Ahmadinejad on foreign policy topics often heard argument on equitable relations between states. The President says he wants to coexist peacefully with all other states. The only exception is Israel. In relations with the United States declared coldly: "We do not need a relationship with them." Consideration of the Europeans of Iran as an independent geopolitical "pole", opposing the U.S. is politically meaningful design for several reasons. Iran is not considered in Europe as a state capable long enough to take political initiatives aimed against U.S. hegemony in the Middle East and neighboring regions. Also, Iran is not considered to be self-sufficient in the field of defense, economy and effectiveness of foreign policy. European circles that control the intellectual center and the media created the impression that the current political regime in Iran is short-lived and will be remedied in the near future.

Considering the prospects of Iran-US relations, Ahmadinejad said he sees no prerequisites for their change in the direction of normalization. Moreover, he said, "before the Americans imposed on Iran to break ties between two countries, and now George W. Bush sought to impose their recovery, but in both cases pursued one goal - to destroy the Islamic regime." The President of Iran believes that Washington should take the first step toward easing tensions. The main condition for this is the unconditional lifting of economic sanctions and the return of frozen Iranian funds in U.S. banks. "But even in this case, the decision on retaliatory step toward left for Iran". U.S. President George W. Bush in a speech that had no direct bearing on the situation in Iran, announced the creation of "Corps active response", which will blitz through "fraternal peoples" who have decided to take the path of democracy. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, seeking to extend the thesis of an American president, immediately announced that patronage, which is now the U.S. will carry over all the democratic movements in the Middle East. Committed to democracy above all else, and it can not be stopped, even if it causes a destabilization within the state and lead to civil war". Despite the absence for more than 25 years of diplomatic relations between Iran and the United States in 2004, their trade links continued. The volume of trade between the two countries amounted to about \$ 240 million, up 14% less than the previous year. U.S. President George W. Bush has decided to extend for one year (until March 15, 2006) operating in the United States so-called national emergency powers against Iran. These powers, introduced by

presidential decree number 12957 on March 5, 1995, provide for the U.S. tough political, economic and trade sanctions against Tehran. In an accompanying letter to U.S. Congress on the decision, President Bush declared that Iran's policy continues to create "an extraordinary threat to national security, foreign policy and economy of the United States".

The U.S. administration is finalizing a campaign of additional measures to pressure the military-political leadership of Iran in order to change certain aspects of Iran's domestic and foreign policy in a favourable direction for the United States without having to resort to military force [27]. According to it and hiding behind false slogans against terrorism, the U.S. killing of any innocent people in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as to encourage Israel to destroy the Palestinians. According to the head of the country, the United States themselves are a source of international terrorism and its sponsor, and Washington's foreign policy is aimed at establishing an absolute global domination. In this regard, Khomeini urged the Muslim world to unite and assist the United States opposition everywhere and by any means. It is obvious that such rhetoric leader of Iran is anti-Iran propaganda due to Washington on the Iranian nuclear program, including the requirement to refer the matter to the UN Security Council, which will continue to be the most serious irritant and a source of deterioration in bilateral relations. Thus, Iran does not become an object of much political attention of European states. France, Germany and Britain will try to use Iran as a factor in the dialogue with the U.S. and its Middle East policy. The leading European nations agree to U.S. demands for the elimination of Iran's nuclear program. In the foreseeable future foreign policy of the Iranian government toward the U.S. will not undergo significant changes. At the same time, its implementation will take a more rigid and less flexible than it was during the reign of former Iranian President M. Khatami [28].

Such a confrontation with Turkey at a time when not to normalize relations with Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan will lead to the depletion of Iran's resources and only create favorable conditions for Iran's enemies. But the Iranians understand that in the region of possible big war. "And if Iran can not fight now, it does not mean that Iran would not fight ever, if they are affected by its national interests". Iran sees the possibility of confrontation between Turkish expansion in the fact that the concerned states in the region should develop cooperation in all areas and to show Turkey and Israel, our solidarity with each other. Needed to prepare the conditions and the political arena in order to announce the establishment of a military bloc in case Turkey, Israel and their partners will take such a step. Before the events of "September 11" United States had a great opportunity to initiate a pan-Arab military alliance, thus outperforming other initiatives. U.S. attempts to forcefully establish a regional anti-Iraqi coalition in late 2001 - early 2002 failed, which is a sign of fundamental changes have occurred in the Middle East. Simultaneously, the

Iranian-Iraqi and Iraqi-Syrian contacts [28]. In the secret policy of developed projects to create an Iranian-Iraqi-Syrian "Axis", which surely will take a positive attitude towards Russia. This is very dangerous for the U.S. and Americans will not allow such an easy design of the alliance. US-Iranian relations are largely dependent on the development of internal political processes in Iran. Consideration of this issue is an important task of political scientists and analysts around the world. From a competent exposition of the problem and the fidelity of the predictions depends on the success and respectability of the leading research centers and the media.

2.4. The "Armenia-Azerbaijan-Georgia " Trajectory in the New U.S. Foreign Policy"

Essentially at this stage there is a huge gap between the new U.S. policy and the real situation. U.S. does not yet have a new policy with respect to the three South Caucasus countries - Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. And how would this region had no importance for Washington, it is for him still considered to be minor, and it is, unfortunately, at the bottom of the list of U.S. foreign policy priorities. The fact that the U.S. had not yet begun to not only conduct, but even to develop a new policy toward the Caucasus due to three reasons. Firstly, the new Barack Obama administration is busy "more important things, primarily related to the economic recession in the United States and the impact of the global financial crisis. Secondly, Obama's Administration strongly delayed the appointment of new officials from the Democratic Party, which has not yet been made or confirmed the appointment of the key figures at the State Department, National Security Council and Pentagon, which usually takes the region on a daily basis. Third, the United States is constantly distracted from the region a number of challenges, including attempts to "reset" or reshape the US-Russian relations, efforts to address two priorities of American foreign policy that directly relate to these three countries. That's in particular the problems of instability in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Essentially, after Turkey became a demonstrably delay the ratification process of the Armenian-Turkish protocols and after the official Yerevan has frozen the process the United States began to reconsider their tactical goals with respect to Turkey, which is reflected also in Yerevan. Although Armenia in its culture and art is the ancient Christian and Indo-European civilization, but the U.S. is primarily a country through which you can send not only the energy resources of Azerbaijan to Western countries, but also a country which is at the right time can be a buffer zone against Iran. Armenia, although in its strategic direction is pro-Russian orientation, however, occupies an important place in U.S. strategic policy. In essence, the U.S. is important opening of the Armenian-Turkish border and the establishment of direct dialogue between Armenia and Turkey, where the role of host will be given to Turkey as a member of NATO.

The U.S. can also take advantage of unresolved Karabakh conflict to their advantage in the struggle with Iran, because they know how important is this zone for the Iranians. On the other hand, there is also an important goal is that with the approach of Armenia in his side, will actually be weakened by the Armenian-Russian relations, and thus lost the influence of Russia in the region.

Georgia in this sense has a lot of vital importance, because on the one hand, the current political order in this country is opposed to Russia's top leadership that was begun with the coming to power, Mikhail Saakashvili, and aggravated after the Russian-Georgian war. However, the U.S. is still not in a hurry with the question of Georgia's integration into NATO. Georgia to the United States is an area that will always keep Russia at a distance, weakening its role in the region. Washington essentially strives to make the South Caucasus as a kind of Confederation under its aegis, thereby weakening the position of Russia in this area. So the U.S. is still not in a hurry in the matter of Georgia.

Azerbaijan to the United States is important in three key positions. On the one hand, it's energy resources, which play a very important role in the geo-economic and geopolitical strategy of any country on the other hand it is an important geographical area, which may be a territory for transit and the country that would weaken Russia's position in the region. But most important - is a tripartite alliance between Turkey and Israel, which is aimed at westernization of political processes in South Caucasus and the Middle East. This alliance, though lately significantly weakened due to the establishment of strained relations between Turkey and Israel, but it is a priority in U.S. national security strategy [29]. It is evident that Azerbaijan is in no hurry to NATO, and it would be ready to adopt the draft "neutrality in exchange for peace in Karabakh. But the question is - will offer whether Russia is in no hurry Azerbaijan into Euro-Atlantic structures, as they require membership in the country of deep democratic reforms - establishing a society of political pluralism, respect for human rights, rule of law, free markets and social justice, and all of these requirements are a threat to the authoritarian regime of the country [30].

Nevertheless, the U.S. regional policy in the South Caucasus has five fairly serious shortcomings:

1. Inconsistency, since American interests, seems to lack of institutionalization, which only exacerbated the delay in the appointment and confirmation in office of officials, decision makers in the region. So a visit to Turkey, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama in April 2009 should be followed by more concrete and specific policy decisions, ranging from the problem of Kurdish separatism in Turkey, to unadjoined problem Demystifying legitimate concerns of Turkey about the situation in Iraq.
2. Poor attention to domestic problems in each of the three states in the region, which only reinforces the impression of readiness of the U.S. to apply double

standards on democracy for the sake of short-term objectives in the energy sector or security.

3. Lack of consensus on how to be with Georgia after the August war in regard to how the aspirations of Georgia to NATO, and the growing instability of its domestic political field. Moreover, now that Georgia is no longer the main "center of gravity" of the West in the South Caucasus region, the U.S. needs to either create a new mechanism for realization of their interests in regard to Georgia, or to find the region a new "center of gravity, and so that is not overly to provoke Russia and did not pose a threat to its position in the region.

4. Time prediction has not come yet, but a little more, and will later carry out significant changes of regional policy in the backdrop of growing frustration, which replaced a major fundamental change in the expectations of early U.S. policy after eight years of Bush that caused in the region, the general discontent and disgust. Now, in anticipation of change and new perspectives, many are turning to the European Union and its Eastern Partnership".

5. Outdated regional energy strategy based on old and poorly reflects the reality current conditions and needs, which only exacerbates the lack of consensus on regional energy security and jeopardizes current initiatives, such as the gas pipeline project "Nabucco".

CONCLUSION

In light of the lack of change in U.S. policy towards South Caucasus, it makes sense to highlight some important trends emerging in the space of the region, each of which affects the interests and actions of the United States, which's acting in the region, sometimes as an active and sometimes as a passive player. To U.S. interests, these trends are often contradictory impulses, resulting in the U.S. attitude toward the South Caucasus, mainly based on the approach to the region as part of a wider "geopolitical mosaic, at the same time taking into account the specifics of its member countries in respect of which U.S. policy is put in front of a separate set of goals and challenges.

However, if you look at the issue more widely, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the U.S. approach to the South Caucasus is also determined and a determination to stop "provoking unnecessarily" Russia and try to take into account their interests and influence. The most significant regional trends, impacts on U.S. policy - is the normalization and development of Armenian-Turkish relations, which involves the establishment of normal diplomatic relations, opening the Turkish-Armenian border and establishing diplomatic bilateral relations.

U.S. tried to infiltrate into the process of trying to catch up with Russia, which was originally at the field of a diplomatic victory, encouraging the Armenian-Turkish process and even contributing to its advancement. Overtaking the U.S. policy was also due to their dissatisfaction and concern about the

proposals by Turkey "Platform of Stability" for the region, since before her nomination for Turkey's leaders have not only consulted with the American leadership, but did not even put it aware of this project. In addition, the U.S. acted more indirectly, by actively participating in the "secret" diplomatic meetings of Turkish and Armenian officials in Switzerland, which culminated in the signing of the assistance and under considerable pressure from the USA 22-23 April 2009 Tripartite Declaration, which stated a readiness to develop relationship and reported acceptance of the road map for normalizing relations between Armenia and Turkey. However, despite the fact that a short statement of 95 words truly reflects the possibility of a truly historic breakthrough in relations between Armenia and Turkey, the language contained therein, as well as the time of its publication led to a number of serious problems. This statement, issued several days before the next anniversary of the Armenian Genocide on April 24 and gave the impression that Armenia supports Turkey's attempts to exert pressure on Barack Obama, the fact that he has not fulfilled his campaign promise to recognize the Armenian Genocide during the traditional speech on April 24. Obama's speech was considered as an attempt to put pressure on all parties in order to induce them to move forward to signing an agreement on the normalization and does not allow the process to go into decline. It is obvious that the U.S. is currently governed by a number of broader geopolitical interests associated with the two main political priorities: the stabilization and security of Iraq and Afghanistan. On this basis, the U.S. policy was delivered a few new challenges for each field of action. In the case of Iraq agreed to restore military relations with Turkey, in parallel scattering Ankara fears about the possible emergence of Kurdish "proto-state" in northern Iraq. Thus, the United States expects to support stability in Iraq by Turkey and realize their plans for the search in Iraq. In addition, the willingness of Obama Administration to begin a dialogue with Iran could also be viewed as a significant factor in resolving the problem of stability and security in Iraq. In the case, Afghanistan and the U.S. have other problems, which are defined more military, in particular the need to use air space and ground communications through Central Asia and the Caspian "air corridor", which requires bilateral agreements with several Central Asian countries, such as Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, etc. as well as the consent and active cooperation of Azerbaijan. In this sense, cooperation with Russia is essential for successful operations in Afghanistan. Since there is a problem with the use of the "Manas" airport in Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan gained strategic importance for U.S. military planning, which only strengthened the position of Azerbaijan in U.S. policy toward the South Caucasus. Another important trend affecting U.S. policy in the South Caucasus, is connected with the attempt of the Obama administration to improve relations with Iran and to develop a new policy under which a dialogue with Iran that will not only be a means of solving current problems, especially regarding increasing pace in Iran's

nuclear program but also a common approach to regional security, based on common interests. Despite the fact that U.S. actions in fact already underway in the political decision to establish cooperation with Iran, this process is still in its infancy and is likely to be postponed until the results of the next presidential election in Iran. In practice, the effectiveness of such policies will increase significantly if the U.S. would be able to take advantage of two key factors: excluding Iran from the Turkish regional "platform of stability" and a deep distrust and anger of Iran toward Russia.

ENDNOTES

- [1] Official Website of the Strategy nat. U.S. Security, May, 2010 (http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf)
- [2] Official Website of the U.S. State Department, 30.04.2009 (<http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2009/April/20090429143944dmslahrellek0.4691431.html>).
- [3] Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones. *The CIA and American Democracy* (Third Edition). Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 2003, p. 216-229.
- [4] Ignatov, O., U.S. foreign policy: new priorities (<http://www.russ.ru/pole/Vneshnyaya-politika-SSHA-novye-prioritety>) (In Russian).
- [5] Hillary Clinton spoke about foreign policy, Barack Obama, 14.01.2009 (<http://www.mideast.ru>) (In Russian).
- [6] Official Website of White House. The National Security Strategy, March 2006 (<http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2006/>)
- [6] Travkina N. National Security Strategy of the United States: The economic dimension //Russia and America in the XXI century, № 2, 2009 (www.rusus.ru) (In Russian).
- [8] Sizov VI, National Defence Strategy U.S. - 2008: Results and Prospects? //Russia and America in the XXI century, № 1, 2009 (www.rusus.ru) (In Russian).
- [9] Obama's speech at the UN and the security of the modern world //Tomorrow, № 41 (829), 07.10.2009.
- [10] *The Los Angeles Times*, 20.12.2009 (<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinionla/la-ed-rights20-2009dec20.0.5354514.story>).
- [11] Brzezinski Z., *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its strategic imperatives*, M., 1998, p. 55-56 (In Russian).
- [12] Official Web-site administration of U.S. President (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/foreign-policy%20>).
- [13] Iskandaryan A., Minasyan S. Pragmatic Policies vs. Historical Constraints: Analyzing Armenia-Turkey Relations. Yerevan, January, 2010, p. 5-6
- [14] Melikyan R. Armenian-Turkish political tandem - props identity. The "Novosti-Armenia" News-Agency, 26, 01, 2010, (<http://www.newsarmenia.ru/analytics/20100126/42192399.html>) (In Russian).
- [15] Suleymanov R. Turkish-Israeli relations at the present stage. Institute for Middle East. (<http://www.iimes.ru/rus/stat/2007/06-03-07b.htm>) (In Russian).
- [16] VOICE OF AMERICA, News-Agency, 31.05.2010, (http://www.voanews.com/russian/news/israel_turkey_2010_05_31-95272244.html) (In Russian) (In Russian).
- [17] Demirtaş S., "Disagreements outweigh agreements in US-Turkish ties," says diplomat, *Hürriyet Daily News*, Ankara, 15.11.2009.

- [18] Hunter J. Obama Adopts the Bush Doctrine // "The American Conservative", 03.12.2009, (<http://www.amconmag.com/postright/2009/12/03/obama-adopts-the-bush-doctrine/>).
- [19] Turkey-EU-Armenia: opportunities challenges. Interdisciplinary research. YSU Press, Yerevan 2009, p. 42-52.
- [20] ACNIS at 15 the power of New Ideas. – Armenian Center for National and International Studies (ACNIS), Yerevan, 2009, p. 397.
- [21] Gasimova A. "Inosmi.ru" News-agency. 11.01.2010, (<http://www.inosmi.ru/caucasus/20100111/157484356.html>) (In Russian).
- [22] Q&A With Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister for Americas Affairs, The Wall Street Journal, 2 April 2009, (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123861706862379499.html>)
- [23] Sajapour K. "Reading Khomeini: The World View of Iran's Most Powerful Leader". Carnegie Endowment. For International Peace, Washington D.C., Moscow, Beijing, Beirut, Brussels. March, 2008.
- [24] The New Republic, Charm Offensive by Laura Secor April 1, 2009.
- [25] Islamic Revolution of 1979, "Iran Chamber Society" News-Agency, 14 November, 2010, (http://www.iranchamber.com/history/islamic_revolution/islamic_revolution.php).
- [26] Sazhin V. "Presidential elections in Iran: The Inside», (www.imes.ru) (In Russian).
- [27] Saviano R. Steadfast in Protest, OBS, Annual Report 2009, p. 311-319.
- [28] Girakosyan R. Kavkaz-2008. Yearbook of the Caucasus Institute. - Yerevan, the Caucasus Institute, 2010, p. 181-187 (In Russian).
- [29] ИА "Interfax-Azerbaijan" New-Agency, (www.interfax.az/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=18570&Itemid=0) (In Russian)
- [30] Caucasian Neighbourhood: Turkey and South Caucasus, p. 31-40 (In Russian).

ԱՄՆ արտաքին քաղաքականության նոր ռազմավարությունը Հարավային Կովկասում. գերակայություններն ու շրջագծերը

Հոդվածում մանրամասն ներկայացվում են ԱՄՆ արտաքին քաղաքականության նոր ռազմավարության հիմնական ուղղությունները Հարավային Կովկասում, առանձին վեր են հանվում և հիմնավորվում տարածաշրջանում ԱՄՆ ռազմավարական մոտեցումները տարածաշրջանային երկրների հետ, վերջիններիս փոխհարաբերությունների դինամիկ և ստատիկ քաղաքական զարգացման ընդհանուր պատկերը պատմական և արդի ժամանակաշրջանում: