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Abstract

Over the past decades, there has been a dramatic change in world’s politics since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the bipolar system of government. The Post- Cold War era marked the beginning of a peaceful world order "the New World Order", a world visioned by the United State of America being the sole superpower with the hope for a better world order led by democracy, diplomacy and peace. However, events of the Post- Cold War era such as the American involvement in 1991 Gulf War, both the Somalia Civil War (1991) and Libyan civil war (2011), the Iraqi war (2003) and the most significant event in history; the 2001 September 11 terrorist attack on the United States soil has seen a return to a realist thinking and an acceptance that war and not peace is the lasting feature of international relations.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the United States foreign policy of the “New World Order” in the Post- Cold War era, how this policy has progressed and whether or not this policy has been acted upon since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the bipolar system of international relations. This is a qualitative case study of the United States and its policy whereby two political theories, "The Democratic Theory" and "The Realism Theory" was used in order to acquire an insight of the United State's policy of the new world order. The democratic peace theory explains the thoughts of the United State’s intended aim of the “New World Order” policy, which is to spread democracy and promote peace to non-democratic counties in order to decrease the occurrence of wars around the world. However, the realism theory reveals a more realistic nature of states, which is to pursue their own national interest.
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1. Introduction

This chapter gives an introduction and background to the research topic, the general problem discussion as well as the research question to the study. More so, the aim of the research paper and limitations encountered in the course of this study are presented.

1.1. Background

The world was considered more stable prior to 1989 as a result of the bipolar system that existed during the Cold War between the two superpowers, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the United States of America (USA). Both superpowers were terrified of directly fighting each other because they feared that (the war) referred to as a “hot war” might result to nuclear weapons (weapons of mass destruction) destroying both nations and possibly the entire world, thus the term “Cold War” was born. Instead of fighting each other directly, the United States of America and the Soviet Union resorted to fighting each other indirectly with the help of allies and proxy wars. While there were fears of World War III among many nations, the war itself never resulted into a “hot war” due to Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) agreement between the two nations. The two political “demigods” were at each other’s throats as there was propaganda everywhere. These countries were reluctant to come to terms and talk at a round table, owing to the fact that the two countries had different political and economic ideologies. The Soviet Union was under a communist government and supported communism while the United States supported a capitalist system of government/leadership (Nye, 1992 pp.150).

Change however, came in late 1980s when President Ronald Reagan was elected as president of the United States of America. On June 12th, 1987 president Reagan made a speech towards Mikhail Gorbachev (former president of USSR) challenging him by stating “Tear down this wall” which is also known as the Berlin Wall Speech. President Gorbachev was willing to forge ahead and put the past behind, in an attempt to end the Cold War and unite the two nations. The fall of the Berlin Wall on 9th November 1989 brought about new hopes, and this led to the convening of Malta Summit in 2nd and 3rd December 1989. In the summit, Gorbachev assured the newly elected President of the United States, president W. Bush, that he would never start a
hot war against the USA, marking the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union (Nye, pp. 155). According to President Mikhail Gorbachev (1985-1991), “The Berlin Wall was a mark of contradictions in the world, and it became a mark of radical changes in the world which touched the majority of humankind, ... But the way towards abolishing it was long and painful” (Architect of peace).

As the Cold War ended and the Post-Cold War emerged, there was hope for a better world order led by democracy, diplomacy and peace. Strangely, many realist thinkers have instead regarded the Post Cold War as a time of instabilities full of different conflicts (specially in the Middle East) as the stable bipolar system no longer existed. On September 11, 1990, George H. Bush stated, “Out of these troubled times, our objective- a new world order-can emerge. Today, that new world is struggling to be born, a world quite different from the one we have known”. There was a need for a strong leader in the international relations; therefore, U.S. emerged as the new, strong and sole superpower. Its economy, military and political ability were so powerful that it could not be compared to any other nation at that time. Thus, U.S. started influencing other countries’ economy and politics with a unipolar system of international relation. America was the only nation that could decide how to streamline power in the world, henceforth: growing stronger and powerful (Nye, 1992 pp. 162). Although the United State’s aim of the “New World Order” policy in the Post-Cold War era was to spread democracy, it however has been conflicted with the dilemma of securing its own national interests while also trying to pursue its goals of creating a more peaceful world. This great predicament of securing its own national interests (such as different oil reserves and open market trade) may have drifted the United State’s focus away from the intended “New World Order” Policy.

1.2. Problem discussion
The United States, being the sole superpower in the Post-Cold War era has sought to endorse and impose a policy called the “New World Order” with the aim of achieving a peaceful and harmonized world. Yet, the recent rise of international terrorism (the global war on terror that was highlighted by the 9/11 event) and other conflicts around the world (such as the ongoing
conflicts in Iraq and Somalia) have seen the policy subjected to discussion once again. The United States and its missions (particularly in Africa and the Middle East) as well as attempts to enforce what has been called a one-world government policy has received diverse reviews from nations and critics alike, who in one way or the other have always been skeptical of the idea or policy. Many argue that the United States has both been influential and rather successful in promoting its policy of the new world order through democracy and multilateralism, mainly in African countries such as Libya and Somalia, leading to the term “a Unipolar” of relation that was not seen before the end of the Cold War. It has also been argued that most of its influence on the international foreign policy originates from the fact that the U.S has been since the end of the Cold War, the most powerful nation, politically, economically and military wise. However, with power comes great responsibilities therefore, U.S. has struggled with the predicament of being a unipolar power in the Post-Cold War era with the mission of promoting freedom and democracy while also battling to secure its national interests. Therefore, it has been argued whether or not the United State’s original policy of the new world order has been acted upon.

1.3. Research questions
The Post- Cold War has highlighted the United States willingness to promote and enforce the New World Order as the driving force of its foreign policy, which is to spread democracies and protect already existing ones. Thus,

- How has the U.S. foreign policy of the New World Order been acted upon in the Post-Cold War era?

1.4. Aim of study
The aim of this bachelor thesis is to primarily analyze the United State’s policy of the so-called “New World Order” and how it has progressed since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the bipolar system of the international relations. This research is to uncover whether or not the United State’s intended goals of the “New World Order” have been acted upon. This study is not to however research what exactly the new world order stands for, but rather to show how the Unites States has acted upon this policy and how it also has affected its own national strategy. I
will however, give a description of the “New world Order theory” as the term was first visioned by President H.W. Bush, in the beginning of the Post- Cold War. I will analyze United States foreign policy of the “New World Order” from two political theories perspectives (i.e. Democratic Peace theory and Realism) other focus will be on a few historical events that have occurred while U.S is pursuing this policy of the “New World Order”, events that have played major roles in the United States policy influence on other national foreign policies with its unipolar leadership, events such as the Gulf War, the Libyan War and many other interventions.

1.5. Limitations
Some restriction that could influence the outcome of this study is highlighted for the readers. A research of this nature can have a lot of problem in term of validity and reliability of data from secondary sources, since there are several materials from different authors that can be biased because different authors are influenced politically and culturally. In addition, the limited time frame (which in my opinion is the main constraint) as the research could have been broader and more comprehensive. Thus, my analysis is centered on the United States foreign policies after 1989.
2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework provides an in-depth understanding of the study in order to help guide the research paper. The two political theories that would be examined in this paper are (i.e. Democratic Peace Theory and Realism) which both present different thoughts regarding the United State’s policy of the new world order. The democracy Peace theory presents the thoughts of the United State’s original intended aim of the policy, which was to spread democracy all over the world in order to reduce the occurrence of wars. Realism presents a more realistic nature of states, which is often consumed with egotistic interests due to their anarchy nature within the international relations.

2.1. Democratic Peace Theory

The democratic peace theory is a widely accepted theory within the international relations studies and policy makers. This theory has had a major influence on the U.S. foreign policy decisions regarding the spread of peace and democracy in order to make the world a better place; therefore, it is appropriate to explain, as this was the intended meaning of the “New World Order” policy. The fundamental idea of the democratic peace theory is that democracies will not go to war with other democracies. This idea has been based upon representative liberal governments trying to diminish the occurrence of war. Over centuries many philosophers such as Immanuel Kant as early as 1795 (Perpetual Peace) have proposed the idea that a world of democratic countries are less warlike (Lyon, 2007). According to Kant’s paradigm,” a function of the form of government of the two potential parties to a conflict, the logical implication is that liberal republicanism must be diffused and made universal in order to achieve perpetual peace among states. Until states share a common liberal perspective, war will be necessary to prevent autocratic and despotic governments from oppressing their own people and from threatening the freedom of citizens in the liberal states themselves”. Therefore, the requirement for achieving perpetual peace is with the presence of a republican constitution, according to Kant (Pugh, 2005).
According to a research by Tomz & Weeks (2013) one of the reasons for this is because most citizens are more reluctant to go to war with other democratic states. In their research they examined this in regards to three mediations. The first mediation is threat perception and it explains how democracies are generally considered to be less of a threat to citizens in other democratic states than any other types of state systems. The second investigation is how much a war would cost and the likelihood of success. Thus, it was concluded that, while this did not have a major effect on public opinion, it was perceived as harder to reach success in a war with other democracies (Tomz & Weeks, 2013, 34). The third calculation was morality and how it is perceived morally questionable to attack a state that reflects the free will of its citizens; therefore an attack would then “count as an illegitimate assault on the freedom and self-determination of individuals“ (Tomz & Weeks, 2013, 8). These three assessment affects public opinion which in return affects the decision of leaders to go to war because leaders in democracies are representatives of voters wishes and if voters are reluctant to engage in a war against other democracies then leaders have to respect those wishes. All four presidential administrations have embraced this foreign policy objective of building a peaceful world, particularly President George W. Bush who stated that, “And the reason why I´m so strong on democracy is democracies don´t go to war with each other. And the reason why is the people of most societies don´t like war, and they understand what war means…I´ve got great faith in democracies to promote peace. And that´s why I´m such a strong believer that the way forward in the Middle East, the broader Middle East, is to promote democracy” (George W. Bush, 2004).

Additionally, President Clinton stated at the State of the Union Address, 1994 that, “Ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advancement of democracy elsewhere. Democracies do not attack each other” (Lyon, 2007). This theory has had a major influence on American foreign policy makers as well as leaders in a way that the spreading of democracy is seen as a security measure. However, the theory has had problems in terms of applying their rules of peaceful resolutions in the international relations as the majority of wars that are battled by democracies have been for different reasons other than for promoting democracy or self-defense. There have also been concerns in terms of how one
can define the words democracy, war etc. As there have been both advantages and disadvantages with the Democratic Peace theory, the goal of spreading democracy in order to create peace and decrease the occurrence of wars is still the main aim of the U.S. policy of the new world order (Pugh, 2005).

2.2. Realism Theory

Realism, according to Ray and Kaarbo (2008) is a “theoretical perspective for understanding international relations that emphasizes states as the important actors in global politics, the anarchical nature of the international system, and the pursuit of power to secure states’ interest”. It is based on the sovereignty of a state, indicating the independent political community with a juridical power over its territory. Realism has its base in the belief of a sovereign state rather international society. The state responsibility is to mainly protect and support the interest if its citizen. States of international community are considered as landmass, which is propelled, solitary by the interest of their own survival without consideration of ethical or lawful responsibilities to other states (Pålsson & Jonsson, 2010).

In realist circle, rules are broken regularly, whereby agreements are only long lasting if they benefit the contracting parties. The fact and matter is that, diplomacy is given little significance on the list of national policy goals when other issue arises. This describes the commonness of “double standard” in international diplomacy whereby political leaders pretend to protect human rights and promote democracy while simultaneously allowing these principles to be undermined in the process of pursuing other goals. According to realists, the only certainty in the world is power, and therefore a powerful state with a strong military will constantly be able to outdo a weaker state. This claim of power was not only evident in the Iraq war 2003 but also in the conflicts in Afghanistan where US emerged as the superpower, whose claim was to stop terrorism and promote democracy but according to realists, USA always has a hidden agenda behind every action (Dunne & Hanson, 2008). Realists base their belief on states sovereignty rather than on international relations solidarity due to its anarchical nature. This being the pursuit of power to secure their own states interests, which therefore means that they cannot be trusted. Thukydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes are realists who supported the concept of realism,
emphasizing the importance of sovereign states with leaders solely responsible for their states and citizens (Gustavsson & Tallberg, 2009). American foreign policy has also resulted in more scholars embracing the approach of Classical realist such as Morgenthau and Kennan who earlier warned of the threatening danger when states neglect their core national interest. United States as a superpower with involving or uncontrollable global effects has overseen the transformation of world politics, democratization of pre-existing and newly established states. However, the one thing that remains unchanged is the practice of political realism in the hands of world superpowers. Thus, until states national interest is supreme, democracy is irrelevant, and therefore, political realism will continue to be the leading theory in explaining the international relations. National interest will not be compromised, despite enhanced cooperation among states. Realists such as Nicolo Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes point to human nature as a basic cause of war conflicts. They both recognized the nature of human beings, which is solely driven by self-interests and bound to satisfy their desires. As Machiavelli stated, in politics “it must need be taken for granted that all men are wicked and that they will always give vent to the malignity that is in their minds when opportunity offers” (Donnelly J. 2000).
3. Methodology and Materials

This chapter aim to primarily explain in perspective the kind of approach that I have employed in writing this paper, its weakness and strength; and why such method is appropriate for this study. It also gives a better understanding of the research method, which is the basis of this paper, United States and its foreign policy. Furthermore, a short discussion on the material used, validity and reliability of this study are presented.

3.1. Research method

When conduction a study of this nature, the methodology approach of data collection must be considered. Thus, a qualitative research method will be used in this paper, which would be carried out from a secondary source or material written by other authors. Generally, a qualitative research method is referred to as the method that utilizes open-end interview to investigate and understand individuals (or events) opinion, feelings and attitude. It is used to collect data that are not numerical which can be expressed in words or action in order to attain its aim and objective. For example, interview, observation, documentation, archival records etc. When planning or implementing a study, the first step is employing the data collection method that is essential due to the difficulties that associated with data analysis (wrongly collected data) often faced by researchers (Wolcott, 1990; Yin, 2002).

Case study

In the course of writing this paper, I will utilize the case study method because this study will be dealing on one part, a descriptive approach and the other, an exploratory approach. The descriptive part of this research will deal with the study object (i.e. United States of America and its foreign policy). The exploratory part will explore how the United States has acted and performed after 1989. According to George & Bennett (2005) a case study is a well-defined aspect of a historical event other than the entire event, which a researcher intends to analyze. Hence, in this case, I will place my focus on the aspect of the events, based on the analysis and will be done according to the data available to me. Case study method has been used in many research areas, such as in political sciences, psychology, sociology etc. This is because it tends to
contribute to researchers knowledge of social political phenomena, depending on the focus area. This method is a preferred strategy and tend to answer the question of "How" and "Why", and "case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful life cycle or international relations and the maturation of industries" (Yin, 2003: 1).

3.2. Data Collection

In this research paper however, I will utilize the secondary source of data. I am applying this method because it erases difficulties (if not impossible) of personally going on a field research and also saves time with regards to the stipulated time for this study. Although there can be weakness in utilizing secondary materials, I intend to however place more focus on data from a reliable and dependable sources.

According to Ghauri & Gronhaug (2005) primary and secondary data are the two major sources of data. The former includes observation, surveys (questionnaire) and interview. While the later are data that has previously been collected by others for different purpose not specifically relating to a particular study. An example includes books, journal articles, online data source (webpage) catalogue etc.

Pre-understanding

My pre-understanding, with regards to this research paper is based on knowledge gained through my studies in political science at Linnaeus University, Växjö/ Kalmar and Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario. One indispensable prerequisite is for an individual/ researcher to understand what he/she is studying because it gives direction to the research. Hence, reality is not only comprehend by ones five senses, but interpreted with the help of earlier knowledge gained. I believe therefore that knowledge and pre-understanding cannot be overemphasized. Thus referring to Nyström (2001), that pre-understanding affects how a researcher gathers data/information, analyze it, as well as drawing conclusions.
3.3. Scientific Credibility

Validity and reliability among others is the commonly used test in establishing the quality of a case study research as suggested by Yin (2003).

Validity - The validity of this paper was ensured through careful analysis of the study area, which was done according to the analytical framework. I have also considered the case study approach, in order for me to make generalization that can be transferred to similar studies. Thus, conforming to Yin (2003) perspective that validity is used to measure the degree to which a study result can be generalization, and the extent a variable can accurately enumerate the intended measurement of the theoretical concept. Therefore my conclusion will be based on the result of the data collected from secondary sources.

Reliability - Reliability has been a focus, thus; I have maintained reliability throughout this study, from data collection to data analysis. This relates to the stability of the measure based on the perception of Ghauri & Gronhaug (2005). The objective is to ensure that same result is obtained when a different researcher employ the same procedure in a case study (Yin, 2003).

3.4. Discussion on material

In the process of writing this paper, several informational materials from already published literature, from different authors will be used, which was obtained through Linnaeus University and Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario, library database (where access was gained during my time as an exchange student at the university). Internet articles and journals from the search engine were also utilized as well as the material from different press release and foreign affairs websites of the United States department.

Sources evaluation

Dealing with primary source of information such as books and articles from various authors (with different views) can be very demanding. Therefore I will try to be unbiased, while carefully evaluating these sources to ensure that validity and reliability of the collected data because it is very important when using these sources as basis of information. More also, the
contemporary world has become a global village, thus, information can be posted by almost everyone.

Secondary and content analysis
I will adopt the secondary analysis approach in this study because the data used was from existing materials and studies earlier carried out by other researchers. Secondary analysis is generally referred to as studies taken from historical data materials that has been written and analyzed by other researchers or which previously existed and serve as a source or basis for a new research.

3.5. Summary of the Methodologies
The figure below shows an overview of the methodologies choices that has been used in the process of writing this thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research strategy</th>
<th>Qualitative, Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Secondary data, Pre-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Credibility</td>
<td>Validity and Reliability, Secondary and content analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1. Summary of the methodologies used.
4. The New World Order (NWO)

This chapter presents a brief background of United States foreign policy and its intended vision and mission of the New World Order (NWO) after the Cold War.

4.1. The New World Order (NWO): America's Vision

The collapse of communist Soviet Union in 1989 along with the bipolar system (due to the capitalist United States defeat) marked the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the Post-Cold War; therefore, the “New World Order” emerged according to President George H.W. Bush. This new world order emerged with principles of democracy and with both mutual cooperation and responsibilities. President Bush was the first to define the vision of the “New World Order” to the congress on September 11, 1990. He presented his vision of the new world order as an era “freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice and more secure in the quest for peace, an era in which in the nations of the world can prosper and live in harmony” (Bush, 1990: pp.91). He also stated in another speech that the world needed “serious international cooperative efforts to make headway on threats to the environment, on terrorism, on managing the debt burden, on fighting the scourge of international drug trafficking and on refugees and peacekeeping around the world” (Sewell, 1991: pp.35).

President Bush’s vision of the new world order not only provided the basis of its national strategy but it also guided the United States foreign policy all through the decades of the Post-Cold War. United States has had several interests with this policy, however, the major national interests it had were access to oils and other natural resources, open markets for trade and to promote basic human rights and democratic principles. It was clear what the president had in visioned, a stable and democratic world attained with the help of multilateralism, such as the United Nation (UN), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank through coalitions of alliances. Joseph Nye Jr (1992) concluded in his article “Soft power”, “The United States will have to combine both traditional power and liberal institutional approaches if it is to pursue effectively its national interest. We want to promote liberal democracy and human rights where we can do so without causing chaos. The reason is obvious: liberal democratic...
governments are less likely to threaten us over time. We will need to maintain our alliances and a balance of power in the short run, while simultaneously working to promote democratic values, human rights and institutions for the long run“ (Nye, 1992: pp. 96). After the end of the Cold War several National Security Strategies emphasized on the fact that, it was in United States national interest to spread freedom and democracy to make the world a more secure place (NSS, 1991, pp. 7; NSS, 1994, I; NSS, 2002, II;). “If we do not follow the dictates of our inner moral compass and stand up for human life, this lawlessness will threaten the peace and democracy of the emerging new world order we now see, this long dreamed-of vision we’ve all worked toward for so long” (President, Bush, January 1991).
5. Analytical framework

This chapter’s aim is to look at the analytical framework of this research paper; it takes a look on different missions and interventions carried out by the United States of America. This chapter will help to give a broader understanding of the study: United States of America and its foreign policy.

5.1. The Gulf War

In 1990, the first test of the American military strength and multilateralism was the Gulf War. This one-year war significantly revealed the true nature of the United States. It started on August 2nd, 1990 and ended on February 28th, 1991. Long before the American intervened, there had been an ongoing war between Iraq and Kuwait. The president of Iraq, Saddam Hussein had threatened that Kuwait was part of Iraq territory, a view that was not supported by other countries. The Americans ordered that the Iraqi should totally pull out from Kuwait, fearing that Iraqi domination over Kuwait would for long influence many issues in the Middle East, such as hindering the U.S. access to the oil reserves that were large in the Persian Gulf. This played a prominent motive for the intervention. In trying to achieve their goals, U.S. used both diplomatic and economic means in trying to push Iraqi out of Kuwait. Iraq was willing to negotiate but their demands were deemed unreasonable since they included a removal of all outside forces from the region and also a withdrawal of Israel from Palestinian territories and Syria from Lebanon (Royce, 1991). U.S. refused this pre-negotiation deal and thereby used a military intervention to achieve their objectives of removing Iraq from Kuwait. The UN, who responded with Resolution 660, to remove Iraq from Kuwait therefore, sanctioned this intervention. During the period of the Gulf War, U.S. managed to convince 34 other nations allies to the UN to wage a war against Iraq. This was the first step that the Americans took to help bring order in the Middle East. The United States referred to this war as “Operation Iraqi Freedom” (Baudrillard, 1995: pp. 78).

One cannot fail to realize that at this moment, the USA was trying to correct muddled affairs of other nations. The war led to the aerial bombardment of Iraqi soldiers on January 17th, 1991. Three weeks later, on 24th February of the same year, a ground assault was initiated. Kuwait was
liberated from impunity and the coalition forces then advanced into the Iraqi territory. However, Iraq fought back by launching Scud missiles against its enemies, with Israel and Saudi Arabia being the major target. This led to call for a cease-fire by the United Nations in April 1991. The message was clear, U.S. was not going to sit back and watch other nations suffer at the hands of tyrants like Saddam Hussein (Gaddis, pp. 33). What emerged clearly in this war was U.S. ability to convince other nations to come together with ideas and finance in aiding other nations from war at the brink of invasion by other countries, as well as revealing its military strength. U.S. managed to finally push back Iraq behind its own border and restore Kuwait’s sovereignty and freedom (Lloyd, pp. 55).

5.2. The Global War on Terrorism

One of the unforgettable events of the Post-Cold War era was the September 11, 2001, otherwise known as the “9/11” bombing of United States of America which led to war against global terrorism. The American led war on terrorism campaign started after the September 11th, 2001 terrorists attack on the United State soil. It led to an international military campaign that was targeted at eliminating Al-Qaeda and its network. The conflict brought together both the NATO and non-NATO members like Pakistan, amid views that the terror attacks were an imminent threat to world security. Currently, the term have been changed by President Barrack Obama to “Overseas Contingency Operation”. When the operation was initially being launched, President Bush had a lot in mind, with the priority of defeating terrorists like Osama bin Laden and Zarqawi, and the destruction of terrorist bases, organizations and networks. The operation was also aimed at preventing other nations from sponsoring terrorists among other duties (Schanzer, pp. 79). Over the past several years, this operation has been successful in many countries all over the world as many terrorists are captured or killed; terrorist camps destroyed and groups disengaged however, this operation of global war on terror has also been misused by the United States in order to invade sovereign countries (such as Iraq) claiming that they pose a threat to their national security. According to Taylor & Snow (2006), around 70% of the American people strongly believed that there was a connection between Iraq and the 9/11 attack threat. In addition
to that 48% of the Americans believed that Iraq was connected to Al-Qaeda operatives and contained WMD in Iraq.

The 2003 Iraqi War was said to be a fabricated story by the United States, stating that Iraq was in possession of nuclear weapons that would threaten not only the security of the Middle East region but also the U.S. national security. The UN Security council obligated Iraq to conform to these allegations of being in possession of nuclear weapons but they refused. There was not enough evidence to support the United State’s claims of Iraq being in possession of WMD; however, the international community had a commitment to continually support the UN Security council sanctions and inspections of Iraq. The United States therefore, took it upon itself to invade Iraq in claim to liberate the country from Saddam Hussein and bring order in the Middle East. The fact and matter is that Saddam in 2003 was in control of a country at the centre of the Gulf, a region that contained a quarter of the world oil Production with 60% of the world’s known about reserves. The United States is known as the world’s largest net importer of oil, therefore by invading Iraq, it would take over the Iraqi oil fields. This control over Iraqi oil would in return increase security of supplies to the US (The Guardian). The conflict between the desire of promoting democracy and the reality of national interests is clear that it is the national interests that take precedence over promoting freedom and democracy.

5.3. United States interventions in Africa

One incident in particular highlighted the clash between promoting democracy and securing national interests, this incident is the failed intervention in Somalia. The downfall of the President of Somalia in the beginning of 1991 led to the breaking down of the state that resulted into a civil war between two different clans that were led by both Mohamed Farah Aideed and Ail Mahdi Mohamed. The increased hostilities between clans lead to an increase of UN humanitarian actions in the country, and in January 1992 the UN was involved in the political sphere in order to bring about a cessation of hostilities so that humanitarian aid can reach the civilians caught in the conflict (UN, 2003). The situation in the country worsened and by October the same year, U.S. troops launched an operation to capture General Mohamed
Farah Aideed. Two U.S helicopters were shout down by the Somali rebels, which lead to the death of 18 U.S. soldiers and hundreds of Somali civilians were also killed. This operation was launched, according to Security Council Report, without the knowledge or consent from the UN (Security Council Report, 2013). By March 1994 United States withdrew from the conflict. This intervention was considered a failure because it failed to improve the Country’s situation and as a result, the civil war is still ongoing (Marangio, 2012).

Another African intervention that has been significant in the U.S. foreign policy of the new world order was the Libyan civil war in 2011. Libya had an election that was marred with chaos and civil strife. Colonel Muammar Gadhafi (deceased) was not willing to accept defeat and relinquish power to Lorro Bagbo (winner by election). The UN ordered a resolution that allowed member states to “to take all necessary measures... to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, including Benghazi, while excluding an occupation force” (UN News Centre). The country was established by the Security Council as a “no-fly zone” and banned all flights apart from those for humanitarian purposes. This led a to military operation that took lots of lives, especially civilians and destruction of property. The United States as a superpower became involved in the war and provided help to the Anti-Gadhafi forces, leading to the capture of Bangui and several other towns that Gadhafi forces had earlier occupied. United States was once again able to take advantage of its powerful resources to carry out its military operation that helped in liberating the country to impunity and from downfall and Gadhafi. Gadhafi was killed in a military ambush (Crawford, pp. 29).
6. Findings and analysis

In this chapter, the information from the analytical framework will be analyzed accordingly. This is in view of detailed examination of the study with respect with the research question.

6.1. United States Emergence and Foreign Missions

When United States took over after the end of the Cold War, its aim was to be the best country on the planet, “United States of the earth” as some would call it. It wanted to dominate and prove its statue as a superpower by developing theories that will lead it to its goal. One of these theories was known as the theory of modernization. “USA emerged from the wars strengthened, and become a world leader….” (Smelser, pp. 269-270). This has been seen in various states all over the world, whereby the American values have been enforced into their cultures using the so-called “Americanized” term. United State’s policy of the new world order has been to promote democracy and peace all over the world but it has not been an easy journey as there have been several difficulties and dilemmas that it has encounter during the post-cold war era. George W. H. Bush was the one president who solidified what the new world order instituted. Bush stated in the State of the Union Address on January 29, 1991, during the engagement in the Gulf war. ”What is at stake is more than one small country; it is a big idea: a new world order, where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind- peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law. Such is a world worthy of our struggle and worthy of our children's future” (Bush, 1991).

The intended vision of the NWO was that nations would work together to promote and spread peace and security through democratization, in other words via multilateralism. However, it is important to point out that three of the presidents, George W. H. Bush, Bill Clinton and Barack Obama, have been in agreement that this goal should be achieved by multilateral means. On the other hand, George W. Bush deviates from this view and wrote that ”While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country”, (NSS, 2002, 6).
In other words, if U.S. do not gain support from the international community, it will not let that be a barrier from acting in what it believe to be its best interest. This is definitely a deviation from the new world order that George W. H. Bush had presented. While the goal of the NWO is still to spread freedom and democracy, George W. H. Bush, Bill Clinton and Barack Obama see multilateralism as a goal itself, while George W. Bush sees it as a means to an end. This difference in worldviews between George W. Bush and the others is noticeable even when examining the military interventions they have all undertaken during their presidency.

6.2. The Gulf War

In 1990, when George W. H. Bush was United States president, the first multilateral military intervention after the end of the Cold War occurred on August 2, 1990. Iraq invaded Kuwait, which is considered to be the most democratic country in the Gulf, without provocation and thus, put the United States interests at risk (Worth 2008). In the National Security Strategy (NSS 1990) Bush wrote that one of U.S. national interests is to promote a stable and secure world, as well as fostering political freedom, human rights and democratic institutions. To achieve this goal they had several strategies, amongst which is to “maintain stable regional military balances to deter those powers that might seek regional dominance“, (NSS, 1990, 2). However, the threat towards U.S. access to the oil reserves in the Persian Gulf was also part of the obvious motives for the intervention. The goal of the intervention was to oust the Iraqi regime from the country and push the Iraqis back behind their own boarders, hence, reinstate the legitimate Kuwait government. These were two of the four principles or goals guiding the United States in its actions according to declassified documents. The other two were to create a commitment to the continuing security and stability of the region, and also to protect the American citizens abroad (Bush, 1990, 2). In this document the need for multinational cooperation, both through UN but also by coalitions with friendly states in the region was stressed. The United States achieved its goals using both diplomatic and economic means in pushing Iraqi out of Kuwait and their sovereignty and freedom was restored. It continued to keep a strong military presence in the country, protecting them from further invasions from its stronger neighbors (globalsecurity.org, 2012).
The goal of the intervention was to regain the freedom of the Kuwait state, which was accomplished but one question remains on everyone’s lips. Why was freedom and democracy not spread and promoted in Iraq? United States did try spread and promote freedom and democracy in Iraq, although not by military means but by economic sanctions instead. President Bush even encouraged the Iraqi people to rebel against Saddam Hussein as a means of stopping the occupancy of Kuwait. Bush said on February 15, 1991 in a speech that “There is another way for the bloodshed to stop, and that is for the Iraqi military and the Iraqi people to take matters into their own hands and force Saddam Hussein, the dictator, to step aside, and then comply with the United Nations’ resolutions and rejoin the family of peace-loving nations” (CNN, 2001). The uprising however resulted in the crushing defeat of the rebels and the death toll was estimated to be around 30,000. United States encouraged the Iraqis to rebel but they did not offer them any support neither economical nor military wise (Embry, 2003). The contradiction between the aspiration of promoting democracy and the reality of national interests by the United States was obvious, thus, according to realists, the national interests and strategy always takes superiority over promoting freedom and democracy due to the anarchy nature of the international states.

6.3. The Global War on Terrorism
Looking at U.S. interventions during George W. Bush presidency, there has been obvious deviation from multilateralism to say the least, though it also sought to promote freedom and peace. This deviation however did not occur until after the September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attack on United States soil. It was after this event that George W. Bush adopted neo-conservatism, which is essentially to promote democracy and freedom by using military force. In 2001 United States started the war against Afghanistan, as a pay back for the 9/11 attacks, perpetrated by al-Qaida operatives in Afghanistan. However, the United States had other motives for the attack, one was to destroy safe haven for terrorists, as one of the plans of action in the strategy for defeating terrorists (Doc. 14, 2001). Nevertheless, one of the unforgettable events of the Post-Cold War period was the (9/11) that led to war against global terrorism. The 9/11 events was a realism theories’ direct prediction in the sense that states should be based on sovereignty. Although the 9/11 attacks shows some clear negation in the realist account, the fact that the
attack was carried out by non-state actor (a global network of Al Qaeda operatives with an unconventional goal of a forceful challenge of the west ideological supremacy, rather than seeking territorial dominance). The United States identified these terrorists of Al Qaeda operatives as global criminal or threat, thus US together with its allies regarded them as enemy of the state (that should be targeted and defected) thus relating the 2003 Iraq war to its global war on terror (Global Research). According to Kenneth Waltz a realist, the Iraq war illustrated the propensity for states with great power to misuse it.

While on the surface, it may seem as though this war was a multilateral decision, a deeper analysis nonetheless gives a different view. On September 20 2001, nine days after the attack on U.S. soil, president George W. Bush said in a joint session of Congress; "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists" (Bush, 2001). By saying this George Bush was essentially saying that if you do not join his cause you are an enemy of U.S., which sounds as if they are really not about multilateral decisions in this regards but would appreciate it. This became further clear in the NSS 2002 report, where it is written that " [...] we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense [...]" (NSS, 2002, 6). Krauthammer (1990/1991) draws a distinct line between real and apparent multilateralism. He wrote, “True multilateralism involves a genuine coalition of coequal partners of comparable strength and stature. What we have today is pseudo-multilateralism: a dominant great power acts essentially alone, but embarrassed at the idea and still worshiping at the shrine of collective security, recruits a ship here, a brigade there, and blessings all around to give its unilateral actions a multilateral sheen“. So multilateralism visible in this example can be referred to as pseudo-multilateralism. Which is not really multilateralism but a screen hiding the unilateral nature of the United States. When U.S. invaded Iraq in 2003, for example, it dropped this screen of multilateralism and acted solely without any support from the international community.

Despite the fact that the U.S. acted unilateral, it however sought to promote freedom and democracy, as this was one of the reasons for the invasion, to say the least. The other is the “Weapon of Mass Destruction” that Iraq supposedly was creating. That accusation turned out to
be wrong as sources claimed that United States knew all along that there were no active Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD) in Iraq, still it was used as an excuse for the invasion, according to reporter Richard Norton-Taylor (2013). If the story of WMD in Iraq was fabricated, why was it used as an excuse for invading Iraq? It could be because; the motive of promoting and spreading freedom and democracy is not a valid motive for invading a sovereign country, if it is of course assume that was the genuine motive. It could also have been as a result of the access to oils, because they wanted to secure their national interests. The real motive is unclear, as Machiavelli stated that men would always give vent to the evil disposition that is in their heart when opportunity presents it. However, the rhetoric surrounding both wars was filled with the message of promoting freedom and democracy.

6.4. United States interventions in Africa

In the 1980s, Somalia received great extents of economic and military aid from the United States due to that Somalia had a strategic importance during the Cold War in upholding open access to the Gulf’s oil fields. After the Cold War and the Gulf War, the U.S. had a direct access to these oil fields through the Gulf Cooperative Council (GCC) nations; thus, Somalia was no longer of importance to the United States. However, in 1991 when a civil war erupted in Somalia among rival clans, the United States was forced to act, as there was an increasing international concern regarding atrocities and starvation of the Somalia citizens (Lofland, pp.54, 2000). The U.S. and other western countries took control over the country claiming to help bring order in Somalia. In 1994, Somalia rose up against the interventions that were carried out by the United States, other western-imperialist states and United Nations forces trying to occupy the nation with the aim of terminating terrorist bases in the country. Many innocent citizens in Somalia and several of the UN troops lost their lives in a shameful defeat that drove these American military occupiers from Somalia. Since that defeat in Somalia, the United States has never stopped controlling that part of Africa. U.S. foreign policy goals in Somalia was said to promote democracy and create peace in the country. Here again we see superpower colonists killing overseas citizens using humanitarian intervention as a disguise in order to gain secure access to natural resources, such as the oils in Somalia and to regain control over the nation.
The current President Barrack Obama has made serious efforts in moving from George W. Bush’s neo-conservatism, back to the world order that was originally stipulated by George W. H. Bush in the early 90s - being the spread and promoting of freedom and democracy through multilateralism. In the beginning of 2011 citizens of Libya, inspired by the revolutions in Egypt and Tunisia, began protest against Colonel Muammar Gaddafi, the then leader of Libya. The protests eventually lead to a civil war break out between Gaddafi and rebel forces. In March 2011 UN Security Council enforced a no-fly zone over Libya as well as tightening sanctions on the Gaddafi regime in order to cease all hostilities in the country (Security Council, 2011). The United States and its allies intervened with military when Gaddafi refused to step down and instead continued the killing of the Libyan people. In the aftermath of the war, President Obama stated that if the U.S. had not intervened when it had to, a massacre would have happen. He quote, “would have driven thousands of additional refugees across Libya’s borders, putting enormous strains on the peaceful – yet fragile – transitions in Egypt and Tunisia. The democratic impulses that are dawning across the region would be eclipsed by the darkest form of dictatorship, as repressive leaders concluded that violence is the best strategy to cling to power” (Obama, 2011). This means that, in order to protect uprising democracies in the region, a military intervention was needed since Colonel Gaddafi actions would result in massive immigration to the neighboring countries that are on the verge of transforming into democracies. The motive for the intervention can therefore be said to protect the seed of democracy in the region that has recently sprung up. Here we can clearly see that the United States had nothing to gain in Libya apart from liberating the country from a dictatorship and therefore, the motive for the intervention was also clear as the country was lead by a dictator. This intervention is therefore classified as a success since the United States managed to remove Gaddafi from power and liberate the country. In this case the military intervention that the United States used was necessary as Gaddafi had refused to step down, thus military force was the only way to resolve this situation.

An interesting distinction between George W. Bush policies and President Obama’s policies is how they have dealt with the unwanted regimes. George Bush tried to force regime change
through military actions, which is evident in the invasion of Iraq. Obama on the other hand, was reluctant to engage in any military actions to topple the Gaddafi regime. He said in an address to the nation, that ” Of course, there is no question that Libya [...] would be better off with Gaddafi out of power. I, along with many other world leaders, have embraced that goal, and will actively pursue it through non-military means. But broadening our military mission to include regime change would be a mistake. If we tried to overthrow Gaddafi by force, our coalition would splinter” (Obama, 2011). President Obama seems to put more value in keeping the coalition between the allies intact, than to forcefully change the regime using military means. This subsequently shows how much Obama value multilateralism when trying to enforce freedom and democracy. The examples of interventions presented in this paper have shown that there is a connection between United States desire to promote freedom and democracy and their national interests.
7. Conclusion and discussion

The concluding chapter, I intend to specifically respond to the research question, which has been the guide in the course of this study. Theoretical contribution from my point of view will also be presented. Lastly, suggestion for future studies/research on this study is discussed to enhance the benefit from the topic of study.

The general purpose of this thesis is to analyze the United States of America foreign policies in the Post-Cold War era and therefore, this has been carried out by focusing on secondary data and material in order to obtain specific understanding of the U.S. foreign policy. The study also gave a brief background into the emergence of the New World Order, its intended vision and principle of democracy.

The study shows the U.S. increase in superiority (military, economically and politically) and the global events in the Post Cold War that has threatened the intended purpose of the new world order, for example, the Gulf War, the global war on terrorism, and all other conflicts in Africa and the Middle East. The U.S. foreign policy that saw the emergence of the “New World Order since 1989 has been the focal point of America's political strategy, to spread and promote democracy, freedom, and diplomacy; with the aspiration of achieving a peaceful and harmonized world. The big question however (which is also the research question) is "How has the United States of America foreign policy of the New World Order been acted upon in the Post-Cold War era"?

Most event that has happened since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the bipolar system of international relations has highlighted the superiority of the U.S. and its influence in almost every country in the world with its unipolar leadership, proving beyond any reasonable doubt its capability to promote and enforce its foreign policy. Looking at these Post-Cold War events, I strongly believe that U.S. has on one hand tried to act in accordance to its foreign policy and on the other hand has undermined this policy in awake of its national interests. This is because, realistically, international relations and diplomacy is of little importance when other issues like
national interest and strategy arises, such as in the case of the Gulf War. U.S. invasion on Iraq in 2003 raised a debate regarding the “New World Order” vision as sources claim that the reported weapons of mass destruction was a fabricated story, because the motive of promoting and spreading freedom and democracy was not a legitimate motive to invade a sovereign country. The weapon of mass destruction hoax was therefore, an excuse to invade a sovereign Iraqi state thus, gaining access to Iraqi’s oil reserves and securing U.S. national interest.

In conclusion, one cannot over emphasize U.S. influence on world politics in the Post- Cold War era and its campaign of the new world order, which was to promote democracy and peace all over the world in order to reduce the occurrence of war, however, it has come with a prize. U.S. mission and interventions in the process of spreading democracy, peace and promoting the new world order has been characterized by the pursuit of power to secure its own states interests and the need to protect national interest and strategy, which is solely driven by self-interests and bound to satisfy ones desires.

7.1. Suggestion for future research

The focus of this thesis was on the United States of America after the Cold War and its foreign policy of the New World Order, and how this foreign policy has been acted upon in the Post-Cold War era. It would be interesting to undergo a similar study, but from a different perspective. Thus, the role of U.S. foreign policy on world politics and international relations will be a starting point.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to examine other political theories such as idealism or liberalism with U.S. foreign policy of the new world order to see its role on world politics and international relations since the end of the bipolar system.
8. Summary of the study

This bachelor thesis title "United States after the Cold War: And its Foreign Policy of the New World Order" is about the U.S. foreign policy of the new world order after the Cold War. It begins with the first chapter, "Introduction chapter" which describe the United States of America (USA), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the power struggle that existed between this two countries during the Cold War. It also present the emergence and progress of U.S. after the fall of the Berlin War and the end of the Cold War in 1989, resulting to U.S. being the sole superpower in the Post Cold War era. In order to get a basic understanding of the research, the problem of the study was discussed, which is U.S. foreign policy of the New World Order, its progress and enforcement of the policy on world politics. Thus the research question, "How has the U.S. foreign policy of the New World Order been acted upon in the Post-Cold War era"?

In dealing with the research question, two political theories, the Democratic Peace Theory and Realism theory were introduced. The former presents the thoughts of the United State’s original intended aim of the policy, while the later presents a more realistic nature of states, often consumed with selfish interests due to its anarchy nature. A case study method with the descriptive and exploratory approach was utilized in the research and was conducted through a qualitative research approach, where data and material used was based on secondary source. Validity and reliability are some scientific credibility used to test the quality of the study as well as the collected secondary data.

Furthermore, the emergence of the New World Order and its intended vision, which is not only to provide the basis of its national strategy but also to guide its foreign policy all through the decades of the Post- Cold War as presented by President George H.W. Bush in 1990. The analytical framework came after and describes world events, like the U.S. mission and interventions in the Post Cold War era. For example, the Gulf War, the global war on terrorism and some interventions in Africa. These different interventions have played major roles in how the United States has acted upon its policy of the new world order in the Post-Cold War era.
Both the democratic peace theory and the realism theory were used in the analysis in order to analyze how the United States has acted in the Post-Cold War through the different interventions that were carried by the U.S. together with different organizations, such as, UN, NATO, WHO and many more. The United State’s aspiration to spread democracy in order to reduce the occurrence of wars in the world and to promote the new world order policy has however been challenged by its desire to secure its national interests, which in many cases the desire for its national interests takes superiority over any other missions.

Lastly, from the analysis which is the focus the study, it is evident that the United States has struggled with the challenge of promoting its policy of the new world order in the Post Cold War era, to make the world a better place. This great predicament is caused by its pursuit of power to secure its national interests and strategy while using humanitarian interventions and promotion of a peaceful democratic world as an excuse to acquire its desires.
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