

Tiedekunta-Fakultet-Faculty Faculty of Social Sciences		Laitos-Institution-Department Department of Political Science	
Tekijä-Författare-Author Bieber, Tiina			
Työn nimi-Arbetets titel-Title Unilateralism and Multilateralism in U.S. Foreign Policy with Regard to NATO Between 1993 and 2004			
Oppiaine-Läroämne-Subject International Politics			
Työn laji-Arbetets art-Level Master's thesis		Aika-Datum-Month and year 2006-03-06	Sivumäärä-Sidantal-Number of pages 106
<p>Tiivistelmä-Referat-Abstract</p> <p>The topic of this Master's thesis is "Unilateralism and Multilateralism in U.S. Foreign Policy with Regard to NATO Between 1993 and 2004." The purpose of the study is to find out how and why has U.S. foreign policy oscillated between unilateralism and multilateralism with regard to NATO.</p> <p>The theoretical framework of the thesis is built around neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism. These two theories, however, are not used to explain U.S. foreign policy. Instead they are used as worldviews according to which the Clinton and Bush administrations practice foreign policy with regard to NATO. In practice these two worldviews result in unilateral and multilateral strategies. Unilateralism is coupled with neorealism and multilateralism with neoliberal institutionalism to form two models.</p> <p>The realist-unilateral model is centered on military power and capabilities. States behave rationally according to their national interests and seek relative gains. Thus, cooperation is not a viable course of action. The liberal-multilateral model, on the other hand, uses Robert Keohane's concept of "complex interdependence" to explain relations among states. The core elements of this notion are: 1. multiple channels connect societies, 2. absence of hierarchy among issues (thus the boundary between domestic and foreign becomes blurred) and 3. military power is not used against other governments to resolve issues. Moreover, this model is organized around international organizations that are used to further foreign policy objectives. According to both models, the U.S. is perceived as a leader or a hegemon in the world.</p> <p>The hypothesis presented at the beginning of the thesis is that Clinton is more multilateral than Bush in his foreign policy with regard to NATO. The unilateral and multilateral strategies of Presidents Clinton and Bush are tested through three indicators: U.S. foreign affairs (Function 150) and military budgets, Clinton and Bush's national security strategies and finally military operations. The hypothesis is verified, for Clinton practices a more multilateral foreign policy than Bush. However, the differences between Clinton and Bush tend to be overemphasized. Both presidents have used unilateral and multilateral strategies to different degrees. The departure from either the neoliberal-multilateral or neorealist-unilateral model can partly be explained in terms of domestic power politics and the strategic situation of the U.S. Therefore, a worldview alone does not suffice to explain multilateral or unilateral strategies. It has to be coupled with other explanations.</p> <p>The primary sources of the study are Clinton and Bush's national security strategy document and budget data between 1993 and 2004. Congressional web pages, presidents' speeches and NATO's documents have also served as important sources for the study. The theoretical framework builds on Kenneth Waltz's, Robert Keohane's and G. John Ikenberry's research.</p>			
<p>Avainsanat-Nyckelord-Keywords</p> <p>foreign policy-United State NATO unilateralism multilateralism Bill Clinton George B. Bush</p>			
Säilytyspaikka-Förvaringsställe-Where deposited			
Muita tietoja-Övriga uppgifter-Additional information			