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**Introduction**

More often than not, the US has always been busy with developing world affairs. The Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State are seen on the move and overseeing global developments. It seems that Washington holds acting as a world cop dear to its heart. The US is always reassuring its friends and allies. The US does not take into account the consequences when it makes up its mind to help its allies, no matter where they are located. Sadly, the allies and friends of the US do not help the US whenever it is in need. This paper intends to highlight the fact that the US goes to unprecedented miles in assuring its friends and allies. Moreover, this paper will recommend ways for the US that will place its citizens at the helm of the priority list.

**Discussion**

When Russia annexed Crimea, European friends and allies of the US raised a hue and cry against the Russian aggression. American jumped in to placate the issue by reassuring its allies in Europe (Von Hlatky, 2013). The US administration argued that the US is contemplating concreted steps that would reassure its NATO allies. So much so, the US sent its aircraft and fighter jets in areas bordering Russian to reassure its NATO partners. This goes to show that the utmost priority of Washington seems to keep reassuring its friends and allies. Moreover, the then Vice President of the US, Joe Biden, set out on visits of Baltic nations to deliver the message of reassurance from Washington. The US delicately tried to offer reassurance to its allies in Europe without irritating Russia (Von Hlatky, 2013). The US taking into account the Russian factor goes to show that it wanted to reassure its allies without creating any more pressure for them. Furthermore, China stretching its muscles in Asia forced the allies of the US to demand actions that would reassure them. The US administration sent numerous representatives to visit multiple states with the only message that the US will always have their back, no matter what. There have been numerous instances when the visits of the US presidents to Asian states were labeled as reassuring tours for allies in leading newspapers (Von Hlatky, 2013).

Certainly, conventional wisdom is central to American foreign policy. However, the US thinks that they should always give and reassure its friends and allies. This US policy of supporting certain countries by going miles have Americans think they would not only have to die for certain countries but also demonstrate this willingness at all times (Lindley-French, 2006). Moreover, it seems that the US official and administration does not sleep peacefully until or unless certain countries are provided reassurance. Certainly, this policy of the US is strange.

The US must remind itself that the topmost priority of the US should be safeguarding American interests and its people. The certain countries that always seek support from the US in difficult situations must be given a message that the US is not a charity created with the aim to grant protection to some countries, defend the allies, protect the borders of rich states, and maintain the world order (Lindley-French, 2006). The countries that always seek protection and support from the US must be sent a message that the US military is not an institution that is going to highlight the flagrant violations for human rights across the world and play its role in promoting democracy. The central idea of the US foreign policy should be to always promote the interests of American citizens, no matter what. The US government shall represent those who fund and support it, the American citizens (Lindley-French, 2006).

Sadly, whenever the US was in need, the countries that tout themselves to be allies and friends failed in reciprocating the US actions. For instance, the countries that were helped by the US by going miles contributed to the Iraq and Afghan wars by sending small troop contingents (Von Hlatky, 2013). This action came only after the US equipped and funded these countries, another instance that shows that the US support some countries way more than others (Von Hlatky, 2013).

Undoubtedly, there are numerous repercussions of this US action. For instance, the countries that the US supports are both populous and prosperous. The unnecessary US supports prevents these countries from defending themselves. For instance, the collective GDP of Europe is eight times the GDP of Russia. Still, the European states call for the US to support them when in need. A question arises here that why the European countries don’t deploy their forces in Eastern Europe if Russia poses a threat to the security of Europe (Brands & Feaver, 2017). Moreover, Japan, the third-largest economy in the world, wants US support when it comes to asserting influence over contested islands. Furthermore, South Korea, despite having a GDP 40 times greater than the GDP of North Korea, seeks US support to maintain order in the Korean peninsula (Brands & Feaver, 2017).

**Conclusion**

Certainly, the US, being the superpower, should do all it can to maintain the peace and world order. However, there are numerous ways in which this can be carried out. For instance, the US actions must imply that the intentions of the US are not to wage war of conquest against any nation, capture resources of smaller nations for profit, toppling repressive regimes around the world, or forcing different societies to realign their culture, economy, politics, and social preferences with that of the US. Instead of supporting countries by going miles, Washington must ensure that it remains dedicated to ensuring common liberty and prosperity to maintain the international order.
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