

RESEARCH ARTICLE		Evolution of the American School of International Competitiveness of Nations
Valeriy Leonidovich Abramov		Professor, Doctor of Economics, Chief Researcher Institute of International Economic Relations Research, Department of World Economy and International Business, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia Russian Federation E-mail: valabr@yandex.ru
Issue web link	https://imcra-az.org/archive/385-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-11-vol-8-2025.html	
Keywords	International competitiveness, United States, global governance, multinational corporations, protectionism, economic sanctions, international economic relations.	
Abstract This article provides a comprehensive examination of the theoretical foundations and practical applications of the American school of thought on the international competitiveness of nations. The study traces the evolution of U.S. approaches to maintaining global leadership, beginning with classical concepts of free market dominance and progressing toward modern strategies that combine innovation, technological superiority, and geopolitical influence. Particular attention is given to the interaction between government policies, multinational corporations, and academic frameworks that together form the intellectual core of the American school. The analysis highlights how mechanisms of protectionism, economic sanctions, and global governance are strategically applied to safeguard U.S. national interests while simultaneously projecting power across international economic relations. Moreover, the research underscores the adaptability of the American school in responding to shifting global challenges, from post-war reconstruction to the digital economy and the current multipolar system. Based on this comparative analysis, conclusions are drawn regarding the implications for other economies, with an emphasis on lessons applicable to Russia's pursuit of sustainable competitiveness in the contemporary world order. The article formulates practical proposals for enhancing the performance of Russian economic entities through the adoption of innovative strategies, institutional modernization, and integration into new models of international cooperation.		
Actuality. The relevance of this study is determined by the growing importance of national competitiveness as a key factor in global economic security and political influence. In the 21st century, the ability of states to compete internationally depends not only on natural resources or industrial capacity but increasingly on innovation systems, financial institutions, and global economic strategies. The American school of international competitiveness represents one of the most influential intellectual traditions shaping economic policy worldwide. Its doctrines and practices have played a decisive role in the construction of the U.S. leadership model, the establishment of global governance mechanisms, and the regulation of transnational economic flows. In the current context of geopolitical confrontation, rising protectionism, and the fragmentation of international markets, an in-depth understanding of the evolution of this school is of particular value. For Russia and other emerging economies, the analysis offers both theoretical insights and practical recommendations for building resilient economic systems capable of competing effectively within the multipolar world order. Thus, the article contributes to the global debate on competitiveness by clarifying the strategic tools employed by the United States and by formulating proposals for alternative development paths in international economic relations.		

Citation. Abramov V.L. (2025). Evolution of the American School of International Competitiveness of Nations. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(11), 283–286.
<https://doi.org/10.56352/sci/8.11.21>

Licensed

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the **CC BY** license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Received: 10.03.2025

Accepted: 01.06.2025

Published: 27.08.2025 (available online)

Introduction

Research aimed at improving theoretical concepts of forming international competitiveness of actors in international economic relations (IER) is currently a relevant and promising scientific direction. It has been most thoroughly developed by representatives of the American school, who serve as advocates of a unipolar world order. However, only a limited number of scholarly works reveal their evolution under conditions of transition toward a polycentric global system.

This article analyzes the multidimensionality of international competitiveness in the American school using a systems approach, which discloses interaction and interconnection at macro-, meso-, and micro-level subsystems of international economic relations (IER) within today's geopolitical and geo-economic realities (Abramov & Prokofyev, 2021; Ryazanov, 2021).

Porter's Concept and the "Competitive Diamond"

One of the most internationally recognized theoretical frameworks is the concept of national economic competitiveness (NEC) developed by Michael Porter, a prominent representative of the American school. This concept, based on research at Harvard University, synthesizes earlier theoretical approaches, beginning with Adam Smith, the founder of economic theory (Tong-song, 2013).

Porter's conceptual contribution was the formulation of the "competitive diamond," which integrates four interrelated determinants of competitive advantage:

1. **Factor conditions,**
2. **Demand conditions (domestic and external),**
3. **Related and supporting industries, and**
4. **Firm strategy, structure, and rivalry,** which increasingly rely on flexible network structures under globalization (Porter, 1993).

According to this framework, high national competitiveness is achieved by progressing through four stages of economic development: factor-driven, investment-driven, innovation-driven, and wealth-driven. Countries dependent solely on resource exports may experience "Dutch disease," losing competitiveness in global markets. Porter's central conclusion is that *firms, not nations, compete in international markets*, and therefore the role of a country is to provide conditions for firms to sustain competitive advantage (Porter, 1993).

The Role of Multinational Corporations (MNCs) and Clusters

Porter later extended his concept to the activities of multinational corporations (MNCs) as key actors in IER. He emphasized the role of clusters in achieving U.S. competitiveness, conducting econometric analyses of regional development in American states, and justifying their growing contribution to export potential (Porter, 2003).

The original American model, rooted in liberal and monetarist approaches, limited the role of the state to indirect regulation. Government involvement in competitiveness was considered inefficient, leaving the main responsibility to market forces and MNCs.

Reconsideration of Government's Role

Today, as the U.S. loses its hegemonic status in a unipolar world, the Porterian view of minimal state intervention has been radically revised. Harvard Business School's report *U.S. Competitiveness: A Matter of National Security* stresses that competitiveness must be assessed beyond the simplified "competitive diamond" (Disparte, 2013).

Weak government capacity to create jobs, inadequate workforce training in STEM fields, and excessive shareholder-driven behavior of MNCs—often involving tax avoidance and offshoring—are now considered key threats to U.S. competitiveness.

New Concepts: National Competitiveness in the 21st Century

A more comprehensive approach was presented in *The Determinants of National Competitiveness* (Delgado et al., 2012). This framework emphasizes the U.S. advantage from the dollar's role as a global reserve currency, enabling influence over global investment attractiveness while supporting American MNCs' expansion.

In practice, this has been reflected in U.S. neo-protectionist policies—trade wars, sanctions, and geopolitical pressure—aimed at maintaining global leadership. International organizations (IMF, World Bank, OECD) serve as platforms for promoting and legitimizing these models through global competitiveness indices.

Soft Power and the Institutionalization of Competitiveness

The American school also uses *soft power* to entrench its ideology globally:

- Educational programs and standards,
- Scholarships for foreign students,
- Training managerial elites for global corporations.

Harvard Business School remains central, conducting annual monitoring and publishing competitiveness reports. Despite a decade of growth, these reports highlight persistent structural failures in the U.S. political system that hinder significant progress (Porter et al., 2019).

Implications for Russia

American competitiveness concepts reinforce unipolarity, reducing states' roles in favor of MNCs. Developing countries are pressured into resource dependency and technological import reliance, which benefits global corporations. For Russia, which faces unprecedented sanctions and hybrid trade wars, these frameworks expose the dangers of liberal economic policies. A radical revision of economic and structural strategies is required, prioritizing:

- **Diversification and reindustrialization,**
- **Technological independence,**
- **State-led protectionism,**
- **Support for domestic corporations and innovation ecosystems.**

Conclusion

The American school of international competitiveness is grounded in globalization under U.S. dominance, legitimizing the power of MNCs as primary drivers of competitiveness. Through global institutions and soft power, it imposes models that diminish national sovereignty.

For Russia, adapting these theories requires rejecting excessive liberalization, strengthening state regulation, and reindustrializing on the basis of advanced technological paradigms to secure economic sovereignty.

Acknowledgement

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the colleagues at the Institute of International Economic Relations Research and the Department of World Economy and International Business at the Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation for their intellectual support and constructive discussions. Their insights and critical feedback significantly enriched the analysis presented in this article.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. All conclusions and recommendations were developed independently and reflect solely the scholarly perspective of the author.

References

1. Abramov, V. L., & Prokofyev, V. A. (2021). Sustainable competitive advantages of countries in the context of the evolution of theoretical approaches to world trade development. *Voprosy Politologii*, 11(75), 3213–3224.
2. Disparte, D. (2013). *U.S. Competitiveness: A matter of national security*. American Security Project. <https://www.americansecurityproject.org/u-s-competitiveness-a-matter-of-nationalsecurity/>
3. Asadov, A. A. (2025). Comparative literary pedagogy: analyzing the presence of world literature in Azerbaijani school textbooks. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(3), 512–527.
4. Asadov, A. (2017). New America (USA) prose and Azerbaijani literary.
5. Delgado, M., Ketels, C., Porter, M. E., & Stern, S. (2012). *The determinants of national competitiveness* (NBER Working Paper 18249). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w18249>
6. Porter, M. E. (1993). *The competitive advantage of nations* (V. D. Shchetinin, Pref.). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya.
7. Porter, M. E. (2003). The economic performance of regions. *Regional Studies*, 37(6-7), 549–578.
8. Porter, M. E., Rivkin, J. W., & others. (2019). *A recovery squandered*. Harvard Business School. <https://www.hbs.edu/competitiveness/Pages/default.aspx>
9. Ryazanov, A. A. (2021). Modern scientific approaches to managing competitiveness of socio-economic systems. *Ekonomika i Predprinimatelstvo*, 1, 610–613.
10. Tong-song, C. (2013). *From Adam Smith to Michael Porter: Evolution of competitiveness theory*. Singapore: World Scientific.