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Abstract
This article analyzes the peculiarities of US government, political elites and changes in governance, including the US Democratic presidential election victory and its impact on neoconservative domestic and foreign policy, and the impact of the new democracies’ political decisions on the development of neoconservative ideas. It also assessed the peculiarities of the political processes under President Barack Obama and the trends in the development of neoconservative views.
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1. Introduction
According to traditions and principles, rules and paradigms associated with Public Administration, power varies both in terms of structure and content. That is, there is a law of constant exchange of power. The struggle for power as a means of obtaining a specific superiority of members of society determines the content of political processes. And the political ideology is a concerted basis of the strategy and management of a particular social group struggling for power. They seek to protect national interests on the basis of those or those ideas, to prove alternative variants and models of the development of society. In a word, political ideology is a system of ideas that becomes the basis for those subjects who are fighting for power. In the conditions of the XXI century, neoconservatism also reached the level of transformation into an ideology of State Administration on the basis of new era calls and "concerns" about the negative impact of global problems. As we have already considered, in the first decade of the century, the US participation in international politics and foreign policy were fully based on neoconservative ideas.

2. Materials and methods
It should be noted that the exchange of power of the political elite of Democrats and Republicans for the national interests of the United States is manifested as an object of necessity. To clarify this more comprehensively, "the elites are divided into two important types - the "Foxes" (the "soft" method of leadership – negotiations, side-presses, persuasion, etc.) and the "Lions" (sharp and determined individuals, mainly relying on force), and through their circulation, that is, regular exchange, the society develops"[1;42].
By the end of Bush's reign (2008), his rating has fallen to a very low level. The forces that have been criticized for their influence, particularly the neoconservatives, have been severely criticized. On the eve of the elections, the performance of the entire Republican Party declined and the problems of the party's domestic policy became apparent. John McCain's foreign policy approach to the 2008 election was not much different from that of George W. Bush. He also demonstrated his continued commitment to the Iraq war and his harsh attitude toward Iran. Democratic nominee Barack Obama offered alternative tools of US leadership. He promotes the concept of "soft power" in foreign policy, that is, non-military diplomatic instruments.

Acquiring and controlling strategically important natural and energy resources, maintaining strong links with allies in different regions, would certainly be a priority for the US foreign policy of the new Barack Obama administration.

With the rise of anti-Americanism throughout the world, Democrats' arrival to the US government in early 2009 has been seen as a political strategy to prevent internal ideological and political confrontation in the United States. The support of this strategy by US neoconservatives has demonstrated the peculiarity of the nationwide consensus. This consensus and US national interests have prompted the new government, particularly President Obama, to address the following issues: First, reinventing the United States' global leadership position amid rising anti-Americanism sentiment during the Republican government, overcoming the consequences of the policy of confrontation in the West and the Islamic world; Second, the growing international systemic crises despite the temporary fall in oil prices and the continuing competition for oil and gas resources, the need to continue a policy of US involvement in the process; Third, the high potential for further development of national militaries in the Middle East, especially the increased threat of nuclear weapons, implies that the new government needs to pursue a traditional "containment" policy.

As a result of the recent Republican government's implementation of the ideas created by neoconservatives, the United States has strengthened its strategic position in the world. Of course, it has not been easy to achieve this through proving the strategies and concepts that have been formulated over many years. Nevertheless, the United States proves that it is the only powerful state in the world. The forthcoming political situation also necessitated the use of "soft" strategies in US foreign policy in order to maintain these advantages and accomplishments and lay the foundation for future strategic objectives. The arrival of Democrats under the leadership of Barack Obama has been driven by the need to address a number of global issues that are of concern to the international community, as well as the need for policy-making in partnership with the international community. We know that US Democracy has prioritized human
rights, compliance with international law, and shared issues. That is why the need for international support and confidence in the international community to address a number of US foreign policy issues - such as Iran's nuclear program and international terrorism - has been urged to stabilize US neoconservative strategies for a while. It is well known that according to neoconservatives, all contracts and agreements are aimed at "limiting and controlling" US forces rather than supporting world order[23;34].

In his pre-election speech, Obama said that he would focus on stabilizing the situation in Iraq and Afghanistan, improving Israeli-Arab relations, and addressing internal challenges in the face of economic crises. From the outset, the Obama administration has begun to reconsider its domestic and foreign policy approaches. In 2007, it was revealed that the two-party commission, operating under the Center for Strategic and International Studies, headed by R. Armitage and J.S. Nye, relied on the concept of soft power. At the heart of it is the need for the US to abandon the weaponry factor in promoting democracy, human rights and civil society in achieving its goals[2;82].

At the same time, global challenges require cooperation with international institutions and large competitive entities. In the field of national security and defense, measures will be taken to reduce, minimize military expenditures and to use more effective means of the modern era. Of course, this position of the Obama administration has been criticized by neoconservatives. Efforts have been made to recognize the crucial importance of the military factor without the use of the soft power tool. R. Kagan points out that the world order of the XX-XXI centuries was dominated by American power[3].

According to Muravchik, communication with the enemy is necessary, but only to tell them that we are thinking and fighting. Continuing this view, W. Kristol argues that if the US wants a peaceful and stable state, it must have sufficient military superiority to cope with the major threats, to win the war they need, and to serve as a police force in the international community[4].

3. Discussion

In his role as President, Obama began his political career with the steps of democratic liberals. In particular, he put forward an initiative to improve relations with countries such as Iran and Syria in resolving the Middle East.

Following the war in Iraq, the government began to raise the issue of limiting the US military, which is a powerful force and a universal instrument. With the decline of US popularity and the activation of other major powers around the world, the idea of “Pax America” became popular within expert groups. This,
in turn, coincided with neoconservatives' short-term "polar situation". It became even clearer that the "Benevolent hegemony" of the United States was not viable. As Kagan points out, “history is back”, stopping competition between big powers is just a short departure from the norm[5]. But such changes did not change the logic of neoconservative ideology. Instead, they focused on the new long-term goal - the struggle to maintain a liberal world order. In this regard, the transformation of N.Podhoretz's concept of the "Fourth World War" into the idea of confrontation between Democrats and autocrats, a key form of conflict in the 21st century. In general, neoconservative views have not changed the message of necessity for messianism, and they have been able to form new medium and long-term goals.

One of the most important tasks facing the Obama administration was addressing Iran's nuclear problem. Despite sanctions, Iran has continued to build centrifuges to enrich uranium. Despite Iran's explanation for using the program for peaceful purposes, further action would have allowed Iran to acquire nuclear weapons. This, in turn, has a serious impact on security in Central Asia and the Middle East. At the same time, Iran has repeatedly expressed open hostility toward Israel's closest ally, even to "extinguishing Israel"[6]. The United States has therefore sought to resolve Iran's nuclear problems through multilateral negotiations as part of its soft power approach.

The appointment of the US president as special envoy to the Middle East and Iran, D.Ross, an advocate of neoconservative views, was also an important indicator for future Iranian-US relations. Ross also served as US ambassador to the Middle East during Clinton administration. At the same time, it supported the idea of conducting military operations against Iraq, and its strong stance on Iran is also important in analyzing its impact on neoconservative strategies. Clinton's views on the new government team also show a stark reaction to Iran. It appears that the new government is seeking to normalize relations with Iran and that the international community will pay more attention to these processes.

Well-known political scientist Zbigniew Brzezinski also said that the US should enter into negotiations with Iran as soon as possible. In addition, the peculiarities of interstate relations have also been linked to the foreign policy strategy of the new Iranian president. Iran's new leadership welcomes a policy of relative conciliation with the international community over its nuclear program. Known for his moderate views, President Rouhani has sought to formulate a democratically balanced policy in dealing with the United States over its nuclear program.

On the one hand, the collective approach to the issue has brought it under international control, and on the other, negotiations have given the US the
opportunity to renew its leadership claims. Negotiations with Tehran in 5 + 1 format began in 2005. And it is characterized by an effort to be an important foreign policy initiative for the Obama administration. Ten years later, the formation of a joint action plan was seen as a foreign policy success of the government. Under this agreement, certain terms and conditions were in place for the parties. International sanctions have been relaxed in return. Democrats regarded the agreement as a major achievement, while Republicans regarded it as a foreign policy crisis.

And the neoconservatives are totally against the process, and admit that the agreement completely undermined the US leadership. They are skeptical of Iran's adherence to the agreement. According to them, Iran may at any time be able to secretly violate the terms of the agreement. On the contrary, it will allow Iran to deviate from time to build nuclear weapons[7]. Neoconservatives argued that the region's stakeholders, particularly Saudi Arabia and Israel, were not involved in the deal. Keeping nuclear industry in Iran, in turn, means recognizing Iran's nuclear status and posing a real threat to Israel[8]. As a result, it is detrimental to the US-Israeli relations, which was evident during the Obama administration[9].

According to J. Bolton, the Iranian agreement did not change the Iranian behavior, which in fact was an important goal for Washington. It still remains a major supporter of international terrorism, such as Hezbollah, which represents Iran's interests in Libya, Syria and Iraq. During Reagan's presidency, the situation with Iran's inclusion in the list of terrorist sponsors has not changed[10]. Neoconservatives have instructed us to return to the sanctions regime. According to Bolton, changing the regime in Iran is not the US goal, but the main goal is to change the behavior of the Iranian government[11]. This approach shows that on the one hand, there is a gradual withdrawal of the idea of using force to change the regime, and on the other, neoconservatives understand that Iran's role in the region and its military potential limit its use of force tactics. As such, it has been recognized that more soft power is effective. In general, efforts to warm the US-Iranian relationship have come amid growing tensions between Sunni-Shia tensions in the region. It is safe to say that the US democrats' internationalization policy has been linked to the need to balance the allies and the opposition forces in the region and keep them to the highest level of tension.

In 2009, there was a simultaneous change of governments in the United States and Israel. It was expected that the Likud party leader Benjamin Netanyahu's coming to Israel's political leadership and A. Lieberman, the leader of the Israeli House of Commons and a strong Arab policy, would play a key role in Israeli-US relations. As we know, Benjamin Netanyahu led the Israeli government during the Clinton Democrat government in the US. In addition, the new
government has made a significant number of Israeli advocates and Jews among the political elite community. Although the new Israeli government has stressed the need to negotiate with the Palestinians, it has been shown that concessions are not ready for various benefits. In particular, the arrival of US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to the post of US Secretary of State, and the arrival of Lieberman, a pro-Arab foreign policy advocate for Israel, would impede the opportunity for finding a better solution. Indeed, no significant progress has been made in dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian issue since the Democrats came to the US government. However, the US leadership has sought to restrain Israel's harsh actions. Of course, there are good reasons. In other words, the wave of colorful revolutions that began in 2011 drew the attention of all political leaders to the "Arab Spring." At the same time, the source of confrontation in US-Israeli relations during the Obama administration was the disagreement over the construction of settlements on the west bank of the Jordan River and the position of East Jerusalem. At the same time, the issue of recognizing Palestinian statehood has caused much controversy. Although the government used the principle of "two countries for two nations"[12] in its policy, this was impossible. And neoconservatives have sharply criticized the government's approach to Iran and Israeli statehood. Interestingly, about 80% of Jews in the United States endorsed the establishment of a Palestinian state[13]. And 46% of Israeli Jews were pro-choice. About 60% of the Jews favored Israel, while 60% of American Jews responded positively to the Iranian nuclear agreement[14]. Generally speaking, US neoconservatives are more closely aligned with the Israeli Jewish views.

The success of the Iraqi operation has not been achieved, even during the Democrats' second term in office. Iraq has become a failed state. The emergence of al-Qaeda in Iraq and later ISIS has made the whole region a global jihadist land. The need for a neoconservative approach to the issue has been highlighted. Democrats have been criticized for their ineffective tactics in Iraq. On the other hand, however, there is a consensus that instability on the eastern Mediterranean is likely to be an important political target for future neoconservative practice, justifying their coming to power.

Neoconservatives have also sought to be moderate in Middle Eastern politics, and have also taken into account the need for a reassessment of the ideas of democratization of the region, based on the domino principle, based on the policy of regime change in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, these ideas were not completely abandoned. At this time, neoconservatives criticized decisions to reduce military in Afghanistan and Iraq. It has been repeatedly mentioned that the preservation of military presence in these two countries is an effective strategy for democratization, given the peculiarities of the region's "militaristic Islam" ideology. A letter addressed to the president by the Foreign Policy Initiative also
said that the reduction of military presence in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of troops would increase the support of the Taliban and other opposing forces such as Pakistan[15].

The shrinking military contingent in Iraq has also had a significant impact on the effectiveness of democratic institutions in the country. It was noted that all efforts made by the US are losing their value. At the same time, neoconservatives have not abandoned the idea that Iraq should be viewed as a democratic model for other Middle Eastern countries, including Iran. The democratic reforms in Iraq were an example of how democracy can be resolved in the multi-faith, multi-ethnic Arab world[17].

In the Middle East in 2011, the so-called "Arab Spring" was welcomed by neoconservatives. In other words, they viewed these events as the basis for the development of the whole region. They described the US position as non-interference in these processes. Noting the insufficient support of the Syrian and Libyan opposition, the opponents in those countries have acknowledged that they are struggling with a permanent military training[18].

According to Abrams, Syria remains the only ally of Iran in the Arab world. Through it, Tehran will be able to supply weapons to Hezbollah and go to the Israeli border[19].

The emergence of ISIS in Iraq was seen as a consequence of the withdrawal of US troops, as predicted for neoconservatives. While a number of political figures and international experts regarded the emergence of ISIS as a consequence of US policy in the Middle East and the war in Iraq, the neoconservative views were completely different. In particular, they regarded the emergence of ISIS as a consequence of the military invasion of Iraq, the destruction of existing socio-political differences and institutions, but rather the failure and diminished military presence in the country. If more measures were taken to increase the number of military forces, this would have prevented the Iraqi Sunni from joining ISIS. In Syria, neoconservatives have found the most effective use of military force in fighting ISIS in Syria. Cooperation with Iran in this regard is equivalent to recognizing Iran's regional hegemony[20].

Neoconservatives have not changed their skeptical attitudes towards radical ideologies and liberal values in the region. In their view, the views of radical religious (Islamic) movements are in conflict with the universal values and multiculturalism of the region. According to the neoconservative publicist M. Rubin, jihad is not a search for the truth but a struggle for the supremacy of Islam.
And this struggle has its own anti-Western character. Although Osama ben Laden was killed in 2011, the fight against terrorism will not end[21].

Neoconservatives take seriously the efforts of focusing on narrow radical groups in the region and eliminating them. In their view, only a small number of radicals are postponing the democratization process throughout the region.

According to US neoconservatives, the "polar situation" has been lost due to Clinton's inability to make a decisive decision, the mistakes of the Bush presidency, and the ideological and strategic failure of Obama. Nevertheless, neoconservatives are at the forefront of the US leadership and the need for a global police officer. The main task now is to maintain a "liberal world order" that covers the United States and its allies.

Assessing the arrival of the new Obama-led Democrat government in the United States and the impact of the US on neoconservative ideas, it is not right to recognize only Republicans as conservative politicians. Democrats support such a policy. In this context, the Obama-led Democrats team can be called the "New Democrats" or the "Neoconservative Democrats." Because their ideas are exactly the same with the Republican Party neoconservatives. Democrats and conservatives in the Democrats' Center also assert that they are now in favor of a "prospective strategy for the destruction of jihad and the protection of freedom".

Questions about Obama's neoconservatives began to rise, especially after Vice President Joe Biden, who advocates dividing Iraq, called himself a Jew. In addition, it was stated that Jones, the National Security Advisor, the Governor of Arizona, J. Napolitano, was appointed Minister of Homeland Security, and that the Republican Conservative, R. Gates, was named minister of defense, and would promote neoconservative strategies. When it comes to members of the new government, it is also important to acknowledge the involvement of Israeli proponents in the White House by R. Emanuel, D.Akelrod as the leading adviser, and the special envoy of the Middle East, conservative Jew D. Kurtzer. While President Obama has condemned the Iraq war, he has not dismissed the use of "force" as necessary. In particular, he argues that resisting the Iraq war does not mean hesitating to use force for the sake of American interests. And his call for "funding and expanding US forces to remain the most powerful armed force on earth" is crucial to further implementation of neoconservative ideas.

Although President Obama is expected to follow the traditional foreign policy position of the Democratic Party, experts have used the neoconservative advice effectively for foreign policy decisions in the Middle East. Therefore, the content and direction of its current foreign policy has been somewhat unclear. Surprisingly, it supports the separatist groups in Syria (as it did in Libya) and is watching the region break up into smaller pieces [22].
4. Conclusion

In general, US neoconservatives have consistently criticized government activities throughout the Obama administration. They strongly opposed any talks with Iran over its nuclear program. The government's policy on Israel has been criticized and urged not to reduce military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan.

One of the most important changes in Obama's foreign policy was the increased focus on the Asia-Pacific region. Because of the US attempt to maintain global leadership, Washington realized that its main rival was not Europe, and that the problems in the Middle East would not be resolved in the short term, and that hegemonic claims would not be a direct threat.

The influence of neoconservatives on political decision-making was considerably lower during this period, but it was not completely abandoned. Streamers fought for and supported Mitt Romney in the 2012 election. And in the 2016 election, they ran against D. Trump. Defeat in the elections, despite the criticisms of the Iraq war, did not change their foreign policy. They have become supporters of the "peace through force" and the neo-Reaganism concept put forward in the 1990s. Of course, they have had problems revising their views due to changes in world politics. However, the conceptual framework could not be said to change. With the rise of other forces on the world arena more clearly, they gradually shifted their ideas to the "liberal world order" approach. Of course, this approach would not be an alternative to the US concept of global hegemony, but it would reflect a lot of US interests.

From 2009 to 2016, the activities of neoconservatives are characterized by the fact that they are more socialist and active in the media. Since 2009, the Foreign Policy Initiative has been established as their main mental center. PNAC has been active in publishing analytical articles, letters to the government and the president, based on the principles of its activities. It should be noted, however, that it did not have a strong impact. He continued his career until 2017. Nevertheless, it has received constant support from major powers. In particular, Paul Singer, the owner of the Elliott Management Corporation investment fund, is the main sponsor. In addition, the PNAC sponsors, The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation and DonorsTrust, also supported them.

In spite of election defeats and criticism, they still retained their seats in the Republican Party. In 2009-2016, the following questions were answered: first, to clarify the possibility of changing neoconservative ideology under the influence of external factors, and secondly to clarify the possibility of further development of neoconservative influence on US foreign policy.

In summary, the reasons for the combination of US policy and neoconservative views under the Obama administration are:
First, an overly “militaristic” approach to the implementation of neoconservative ideas has led to a worsening reaction to the international community. As a result, there was a need to withdraw from the “unipolarist” strategy;

Secondly, the ideas put forward by neoconservatives have been adequately implemented. So the task now is not to complicate the situation, but to lose the results. These results have been important for both Republicans and Democrats. Especially after the “Arab Spring”;

Third, the limitations of both economic and political implications suggest that there are still insufficient mechanisms for the implementation of failed strategies;

Fourth, there is a tendency to execute future neoconservative strategies and to create a favorable environment for strengthening the dominance of ideas. It is well known that even during the Clinton administration, neoconservatives were exposed to foreign policy decisions. However, the lack of favorable conditions and the prevalence of neo-conservative ideas have not yet been proven sufficiently to ensure their implementation;

Fifth, the internal destabilization of neoconservative ideas has led to the need for a new robust neoconservative community.
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