

Chapter 1 : The Magazine " Foreign Policy

Foreign policy decision making is an outcome of how individuals with power perceive and analyse events. Political leaders are not beyond the reach of the human traits of assumptions, subjectivity, prejudices and biases.

Each nation has the right and power to secure the goals of her national interest in international relations. It is her supreme duty to satisfy the needs of her people. Each nation wants to be self-reliant in all areas of activity. However, in reality no nation can achieve cent per cent self-reliance and self-sufficiency. These are ideals towards which a nation can try to move. A situational change in West Asia or South-East Asia or Africa necessitates a change or modification of the foreign policies of many nations. Each nation establishes diplomatic, economic, trade, educational, cultural and political relations with other nations. For giving meaning and direction to her relations with other nations, each nation formulates and adopts a Foreign Policy. It is through its foreign policy that it tries to secure the goals of national interest in international relations. The behaviour of each nation in international environment is always conditioned by its foreign policy. What is Foreign Policy? Foreign Policy can be defined as a set of principles, decisions and means, adopted and followed by a nation for securing her goals of national interest in international relations. Foreign Policy defines the goals of national interest and then tries to secure these through the exercise of national power.

Definitions of Foreign Policy: A set of principles, policies and decisions adopted and followed by the nation in international relations. Objectives, goals or aims of national interest which are to be secured. Means to be used for achieving the goals of national interest. Broad policy principles and decisions for conducting international relations. Assessment of the gains and failures of the nation in respect of its goals of national interest. Policies, decisions and action-programmes for maintaining continuity or change or both in international relations. In simple words, it can be observed that Foreign Policy is a set of principles and decisions, a plan of action and a thought out course of action adopted and used by a nation for conducting relations with other nations and all international actors with a view to secure the preferred and defined goals of her national interest.

Elements of Foreign Policy: The foreign policy of a nation is formulated and implemented by its policy makers. In doing so they take into account the national interest of the nation, the internal and external environment, the national values, the foreign policy goals and decisions of other nations and the nature of international power structure.

Size of State Territory: The size of a state is an important factor of its Foreign Policy. Size influences the psychological and operational environment within which the foreign policy-makers and public respond. It includes, as Rosenau says, both human and non-human resources. Nations with large human and non-human resources always try to be big powers and they have better chances of becoming big powers in international relations. Foreign Policy of a big sized state is bound to be different from the foreign policy of a small-sized state. Public and foreign policy-makers of big sized states are definitely governed by their desire to be big powers in the World. Size has been a factor in the foreign policies of the U. Large sized states, with few exceptions, always formulate and use an active Foreign Policy and through it these play an active role in international relations. However, size alone is not an independent determinant of foreign policy. Resources and capabilities of the state are not always dependent upon size. The countries of the Middle East, even with small sizes but with the largest quantity of oil resources, have been playing quite an active role in international relations. Japan is relatively a small sized state and yet its role in international relations has been active and influential. Israel, despite being a small sized state has been influencing the course of politics among nations. Before , Britain, with a small size, could play the role of a world power. Large size poses the problem of defence, security and maintenance of communications. In the absence of natural boundaries, the large size of a nation very often creates the problem of relations with neighbouring states. Despite being the large sized states, Australian and Canadian foreign policies have not been very active. Russia is a large sized state but its role in contemporary international relations continues to be weak. Geography of a state is relatively the most permanent and stable factor of its foreign Policy. The topography of land, its fertility, climate and location are the major geographic factors which influence the Foreign Policy of a nation. These factors determine both the needs as well as the capability to fulfill the needs of the people of a nation. Suitable geographical factors can

help and encourage the nation to adopt and pursue higher goals. The role played by English Channel in the development of Britain as a major naval power and consequently as an imperial power is well known. Indian Foreign Policy now definitely bears the influence of the geographical location of India as the largest littoral state of the Indian Ocean. The relatively unhelpful geographical conditions of Canada have been a factor in the determination of its Foreign Policy. The territorial expanse makes it difficult for other nations to think of securing an outright military victory over Russia. The location of Pakistan too has influenced its relations with India, China and the Central Asian republics. The geographical distance from Pakistan has been a factor in the foreign policy of Bangladesh. The natural resources and the food production capacity of a nation is directly linked with its geography. These factors are also important factors in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. Adequate existence of vital natural resources—minerals, food and energy resources—have been helping factors of the US and Russian foreign policies. Consumer goods shortage have been hitting hard the foreign policy and relations of Russia. Large quantities of oil have made it possible for the West Asian and Gulf nations to adopt oil diplomacy as a means of their foreign policies. Geography, as such is an important and permanent factor of foreign policy, yet it is not a deterministic factor. The revolutionary developments in communications and modern warfare, and the ability of nations to overcome geographical hindrances have tended to reduce the importance of geography.

Level and Nature of Economic Development: One of the main reasons why the US Foreign Policy has been very often successful in securing its national objectives, particularly in relation to the poor and economically lowly placed states of the world is the high degree of its economic development. The developed countries of our times are highly industrialized and economically developed states. These can use foreign aid as a tool for securing their foreign policy goals. The global perspectives and policies of the two super-powers were again governed by their vast economic and industrial resources and their needs for foreign markets and trade. In fact, all economically and industrially developed nations Group of seven plus one, countries in particular are now playing a more a vigorous role in international relations than the lowly developed and developing countries. The strong commitment of the foreign policies of the lowly developed and developing countries to the cause of a New International Economic Order is again a proof of the role of economic factors of international relations. The level of economic development also determines the scope of relations that a nation wishes to establish with other nations. The Foreign Policy of Japan in the contemporary times is directly and fundamentally related to its economic development. The military preparedness and military capability of a nation is again directly related to the factor of economic development and industrialization. Only industrially and economically developed nations can hope to become major and stable military powers. Economic power constitutes a fundamental dimension of national power in contemporary times and at present; it can be used more effectively for securing foreign policy goals. The US economic power has been a major instrument of its foreign policy. Economic weakness of Russia has forced it to change its policy towards the U. Thus, the level and nature of economic development, industrialization and modernization are important factors of foreign policy.

Cultural and Historical Factors: The cultural heritage and the history of a nation are again important and valuable factors of its Foreign Policy. The norms and traditions that characterize the life of the people of a state are highly influential factors of its foreign policy. During the process of interpreting and formulating the objectives of national interest, the decision makers are always governed by their cultural links, historical traditions and experiences. Strong cultural unity of the people is always a source of strength for them. It materially influences their ability to secure the objectives of national interest during the course of international bargaining. Historical experiences and cultural links further help them to analyze and assess the nature and scope of relations with other nations. Indeed, the weakness of the foreign policies of most of the Asian and African states has been largely due to the presence of internal dissensions and conflicts among their peoples. Bitter experiences with the policies of imperialism and colonialism have been a determining factor of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial contents of the foreign policies of most of the new sovereign states. History is an important factor in determining the relations among the neighbouring nations. Foreign policy interactions between India and Pakistan are mostly the legacies of past history. The shadow of the history of still influences the course of Sino- Indian relations. However, cultural values and links are always subject to

perpetual changes and adjustments. Historical experiences too are forgotten in the face of national interest. The existence of conflict among the European nations, despite their cultural links and the development, and continuance of strong US-Japanese friendship and relations bear ample proof that cultural and historical factors have to have combination with other factors before influencing the course of Foreign Policy. The structure and nature of the society for which the foreign policy operates is also an important element. The nature of social groups and the degree of conflict and harmony that characterize their mutual relations are determined by the social structure. A society characterised by strong internal conflict and strife acts as a source of weakness for the foreign policy. A society of united, enlightened and disciplined people with a high degree of group harmony is always a source of strength. The democratization of the process of policy-making in recent times has increased the importance of social structure as an element of foreign policy. The linkages between the domestic and international environments have tended to strengthen the role of this element. The organisation and structure of government i. The shape of the foreign policy is also determined by the fact as to whether the government agencies handling it are democratically constituted or not.

Chapter 2 : Making Foreign Policy

Making Foreign Policy Each has been given specific powers and has assumed additional authority either through precedent or by relying on other constitutional responsibilities. Since the Vietnam War, Congress has tried to exert more influence and control over foreign policy.

The Institutions of Foreign Policy The Policymaking Process Public policy refers to the actions taken by government " its decisions that are intended to solve problems and improve the quality of life for its citizens. At the federal level, public policies are enacted to regulate industry and business, to protect citizens at home and abroad, to aid state and city governments and people such as the poor through funding programs, and to encourage social goals. A policy established and carried out by the government goes through several stages from inception to conclusion. These are agenda building, formulation, adoption, implementation, evaluation, and termination. Agenda building Before a policy can be created, a problem must exist that is called to the attention of the government. Illegal immigration, for example, has been going on for many years, but it was not until the s that enough people considered it such a serious problem that it required increased government action. Another example is crime. American society tolerates a certain level of crime; however, when crime rises dramatically or is perceived to be rising dramatically, it becomes an issue for policymakers to address. Specific events can place a problem on the agenda. The flooding of a town near a river raises the question of whether homes should be allowed to be built in a floodplain. New legislation on combating terrorism the USA Patriot Act, for example was a response to the attacks of September 11, Formulation and adoption Policy formulation means coming up with an approach to solving a problem. Congress, the executive branch, the courts, and interest groups may be involved. Contradictory proposals are often made. The president may have one approach to immigration reform, and the opposition-party members of Congress may have another. Policy formulation has a tangible outcome: A bill goes before Congress or a regulatory agency drafts proposed rules. The process continues with adoption. A policy is adopted when Congress passes legislation, the regulations become final, or the Supreme Court renders a decision in a case. Implementation The implementation or carrying out of policy is most often accomplished by institutions other than those that formulated and adopted it. A statute usually provides just a broad outline of a policy. For example, Congress may mandate improved water quality standards, but the Environmental Protection Agency EPA provides the details on those standards and the procedures for measuring compliance through regulations. As noted earlier, the Supreme Court has no mechanism to enforce its decisions; other branches of government must implement its determinations. Successful implementation depends on the complexity of the policy, coordination between those putting the policy into effect, and compliance. Board of Education is a good example. The justices realized that desegregation was a complex issue; however, they did not provide any guidance on how to implement it "with all deliberate speed. Evaluation and termination Evaluation means determining how well a policy is working, and it is not an easy task. People inside and outside of government typically use cost-benefit analysis to try to find the answer. In other words, if the government is spending x billions of dollars on this policy, are the benefits derived from it worth the expenditure? Cost-benefit analysis is based on hard-to-come-by data that are subject to different, and sometimes contradictory, interpretations. History has shown that once implemented, policies are difficult to terminate. When they are terminated, it is usually because the policy became obsolete, clearly did not work, or lost its support among the interest groups and elected officials that placed it on the agenda in the first place. In , for example, Congress enacted a national speed limit of 55 miles per hour. It was effective in reducing highway fatalities and gasoline consumption. On the other hand, the law increased costs for the trucking industry and was widely viewed as an unwarranted federal intrusion into an area that belonged to the states to regulate. The law was repealed in

Chapter 3 : Foreign Policy: 16 Elements of Foreign Policy

In making the decision to choose a policy designed to placate such diverse political camps, not only is an incumbent likely to fail politically, he will be undertaking a policy, which almost certainly will fail operationally.

Foreign policymakers follow the same five steps with which public policy gets made: A problem or issue rises to prominence on the agenda. Possible policies are created and debated. The government adopts one policy. The appropriate government agency enacts the policy. Officials and agencies judge whether the policy has been successful. Unlike domestic policy, however, foreign policymaking usually involves fewer people and less publicity. In the United States, the president serves as the chief diplomat and is charged with running American foreign policy. The president employs three tools to conduct foreign policy: Diplomacy Military force Diplomacy Diplomacy is the act of dealing with other nations, usually through negotiation and discussion. Diplomacy involves meetings between political leaders, sending diplomatic messages, and making public statements about the relationship between countries. The American president, for example, often hosts leaders and chief diplomats of other nations at the White House in order to discuss a variety of issues. Most diplomacy occurs behind the scenes as officials hold secret negotiations or meet privately to discuss key issues. Approaches to Diplomacy States generally pursue diplomacy in one of three ways: The states acts alone, without the assistance or consent of any other state. The state works in conjunction with another state. The state works in conjunction with several other states. There are pros and cons to each of these three approaches. Acting unilaterally, for example, allows a state to do what it wants without compromise, but it must also bear all the costs itself. Acting with allies, on the other hand, allows a state to maintain good relations and to share the diplomatic burden, but this often requires compromise. American Isolationist Versus Internationalist Attitudes Americans have always debated what role the United States should play on the global stage. Those people who advocate a strategy of largely ignoring the rest of the world are called isolationists. In contrast, those people who advocate taking an active role in world affairs are called internationalists.

Foreign policy analysis (FPA) is a branch of political science dealing with theory development and empirical study regarding the processes and outcomes of foreign policy. Foreign policy analysis is the study of the management of external relations and activities of state.

Each has been given specific powers and has assumed additional authority either through precedent or by relying on other constitutional responsibilities. Since the Vietnam War, Congress has tried to exert more influence and control over foreign policy. The president and foreign policy The president negotiates treaties, appoints ambassadors to represent the United States overseas, and is commander in chief of the armed forces. Even though they are effective only during the term of the president who made them, executive agreements negotiated with another head of state do not require Senate approval. Presidents also have access to discretionary funds that can be and have been used to finance both military and diplomatic initiatives. Presidents routinely rely on special envoys, who do not require Senate confirmation, to carry out negotiations with other countries. Congress and foreign policy The constitutional function of Congress is essentially to act as a check on presidential power. Congress has additional authority through its appropriation and oversight functions. As must all government programs, the operations of foreign policy must be funded. Congress can cut or increase foreign aid or the budget for a defense project. It can set restrictions on the length of time American troops are deployed during an international crisis by refusing to pay for them beyond a certain date. Congress has used its power to make laws that specifically limit the freedom of action of the president in foreign policy. The Neutrality Acts are an early example. The War Powers Act, which was a direct response to the Vietnam War, requires that Congress be consulted whenever the president is ready to commit American troops. It puts a day limit on their deployment with an additional month for withdrawal without further congressional approval. Still, President George H. Congress also authorized the use of force in Iraq in the fall of The mass media and foreign policy The print and broadcast media play a role in setting the foreign-policy agenda for the country. Coverage of the Vietnam War is credited with bringing about the public-opinion shift in favor of withdrawal. On the other hand, the images of starvation in Somalia and the graphic reports of "ethnic cleansing" during the civil war in Bosnia built support for American intervention in both of those countries.

Chapter 5 : SparkNotes: Foreign Policy: Tools of Foreign Policy

powers in the foreign policy making process, probably most significant being the power of the purse which allows Congress to set conditions as to how money can or cannot be spent, or earmarking it for specific programs or countries.

In this paper I have tried to highlight the basic features of diplomacy and a short brief on its origin. Diplomacy plays an important role in Foreign policy because through diplomacy the states try to achieve its interest and apply its policies to gain from it and diplomacy also plays a vital role in conflict negotiations. Diplomacy has always been a keyword in International Politics and till date it has been playing a significant role in International Relations. Lastly, I will be providing an overview on Diplomacy problem between India and Pakistan in recent years which will be helpful in projecting the role of diplomacy. Foreign Policy is the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law-making power in a manner desired by the states concerned: Foreign policy of a state is concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states. It refers to the ways in which the central governments of sovereign states relate to each other and to the global system in order to achieve various goals or objectives. It is primarily in proportion to its national power that its persuasive power is effective in this regard. However, even a powerful state cannot afford to enjoy a solo flight in this regard. It has to take into account, not only its own objectives and interests, aspirations and problems, but also those of other states. This process involves intricate processes of diplomacy short of war. It is also based on the observations regarding the traditional behaviour of a given state. Moreover, a state while implementing its foreign policy cannot afford to ignore the rules of International law and canons of international morality. The whole essence of this prelude is that the term foreign policy cannot be studied in isolation from the factors that determine it. Through foreign policy a state seeks to achieve a variety of objectives. The objectives sought to be attained by a state are of different types and categories, yet there are certain objectives which are uniformly pursued by all states i. Political independence and territorial integrity, economic well being and, prestige and status of a nation. They have been classified into short range, middle range and long-range objectives. Diplomacy and Foreign Relations Cultivating and managing a favourable world opinion toward a nation-state is the mandate of diplomacy. By this accord, nation-states partake in the most pluralistic organizing institution in the international system. One state can confidently enter into diplomatic relations with another under a shared understanding. With sovereignty mutually recognized, nation-states can use diplomacy as the means to achieving political ends. Foreign policy is the content of foreign relations, comprising the aspirations and aims a country wants to achieve in its relations with other states and international governmental organizations. A developmental foreign policy is pro-engagement; it is not isolationist. It is fundamentally concerned with addressing domestic, continental, and global disparities and inequalities. Some countries formulate and publish their foreign policy goals. Diplomacy plays an important part in shaping what happens in international relations. Diplomacy is used to manage the goals of foreign policy focusing on communication. Diplomacy attempts to manage the goals of foreign policy mostly by implementing goals but also by preparing foreign policy decisions. Diplomacy is negotiated when the interests of states cannot be fully reconciled, and explicit bargaining is required to reveal the area of agreement. On the other hand, even when the will or opportunity to negotiate is absent, and when it is not explicit, bargaining can converge upon and underscore common interests between states, avoid misunderstandings, highlight the potential for communication between adversaries, and define practical steps to strengthen the harmony of interests. Non-negotiated bargaining is critical for international norms of behaviour. Convergent interests are commonly understood as increasing the potential of interstate cooperation. Convergence is stimulated either by shifts in national interest or by new opportunities to recognize those shifts. The coexistence of separate political units necessitates a certain degree of contact amongst themselves. The Oxford dictionary defines diplomacy as the management of international relations by negotiation. Greece, Byzantium; Renaissance Italy made the most notable contributions to its evolution. Morgenthau referred to diplomacy as the brain of state power. These functions imply that one must: Employ the means suited to the pursuit of these objectives. A diplomat is a person appointed by a state to conduct diplomacy with another

state or international organization. The main functions of diplomats revolve around the representation and protection of the interests and nationals of the sending state, as well as the promotion of information and friendly relations. Diplomats are the oldest form of any of the foreign policy institutions of the state, predating by centuries foreign ministers and ministerial offices. Diplomats in posts collect and report information that could affect national interests, often with advice about how the home country government should respond. Diplomats have the job of conveying, in the most persuasive way possible, the views of the home government to the governments to which they are accredited and, in doing so, to try to convince those governments to act in ways that suit home country interests. In this way, diplomats are part of the beginning and the end of each loop in the continuous process through which foreign policy is made. The diplomat should be an excellent negotiator but, above all, a catalyst for peace and understanding between peoples. This role takes on heightened importance once war breaks out. Negotiation must necessarily continue but within significantly altered contexts. Protection of national interests and nationals abroad 5. Maintenance of international peace and promotion of international cooperation. Patience was a watchword, negotiations and talks would be initiated, broken off, resumed, discontinued temporarily and re-opened again by professionals in whose lexicon there was no substitute for diplomacy. It was Europe-centric. Diplomacy was virtually European Diplomacy. Traditional diplomacy was the monopoly of the aristocratic class and of the professional diplomats who shared a rapport with each other. States still remained the major actors. The only difference was that the stage has to be shared with non-state actors. Alongside bilateral negotiations on a state-to-state basis, groups of states negotiated multilaterally in inter-governmental organisations like the U. When states recognize one another as sovereign states and agree to develop diplomatic relations, they exchange diplomatic agents such as ambassadors to facilitate dialogues and cooperation. Challenges in Diplomacy and Foreign Relations In international relations, diplomacy is inevitably driven by changing events, if not exclusively so. The points of contact between states have increased dramatically. International trade, tourism, migration, development assistance, and cultural exchanges have linked countries together. The communications revolution, the impacts of modern technology, the emergence of new non-government influences business, the professionals, civil society, the new risks environmental dilapidation, resource scarcity, as well as those intractable afflictions poverty magnified by globalization are all set to undermine diplomatic services over the pursuit of relations and issues between countries. Foreign public opinion today is gaining ever more significance in forming an emerging globalized public and influencing international political process and outcome. Issues that used to be considered part of the domestic domain, figure prominently today on the international agenda. Publics, domestic or foreign, do not always have an informed view or coherent opinion on matters related to cross-national and foreign policy issues. Direct and effective linkages between public opinion and policies always do not exist either. However, the role of individuals and their expressed opinions do form a climate of opinion in which decision-makers pursue policies. Therefore, the perceptions and opinions held by foreign publics regarding a given nation are critically important to decisions by nation-state. With the changing global political and economic landscape, the proliferation of media and communication technologies, the emergence of new actors in global affairs, and most of all, the complex confluence of these facets, the credibility and effectiveness of standard communication practices in diplomacy is under challenge. Managing the information flow in such contexts is the realm of diplomacy, particularly in the new world of globalization and communication. Diplomacy today struggles to reflect the diversity and pluralism of the globalized age. It is almost impossible to examine any problem in contemporary international relations effectively without considering the diplomatic challenges which it poses, the innovations in diplomatic practice which it calls forth, and the contribution which diplomacy can make to easing the problem in such a way as to contribute to a more peaceful, just, and orderly world. Since their independence, the two countries have fought three major wars, one undeclared war and have been involved in numerous armed skirmishes and military standoffs. The Kashmir dispute is the main centre-point of all of these conflicts with the exception of the Indo-Pakistan War of 1947, which resulted in the secession of East Pakistan now Bangladesh. A car bomb exploded near the Jammu and Kashmir State Assembly on 1 October, killing 27 people on an attack that was blamed on Kashmiri separatists. It was one of the most prominent attacks against India apart from on the Indian Parliament in

December The dead bodies of the terrorists and the data recovered from them revealed that Pakistan was solely responsible for the activity. In January , 24 Kashmiri Pandits living in the city Wandhama were killed by nonsense Islamic terrorists. On 13 July , armed men believed to be a part of the Lashkar-e-Toiba threw hand grenades at the Qasim Nagar market in Srinagar and then fired on civilians standing nearby killing twenty-seven and injuring many more. Abdul Ghani Lone, a prominent All Party Hurriyat Conference leader, was assassinated by an unidentified gunmen during a memorial rally in Srinagar. The assassination resulted in wide-scale demonstrations against the Indian occupied-forces for failing to provide enough security cover for Mr. A car bomb exploded near an armoured Indian Army vehicle in the famous Church Lane area in Srinagar killing four Indian Army personnel, one civilian and the suicide bomber. Terrorist group Hizbul Mujahideen, claimed responsibility for the attack. Most of those injured were media journalists. No Terrorist group claimed responsibility for the attack. Insurgent activities elsewhere The attack on the Indian Parliament was by far the most dramatic attack carried out allegedly by Pakistani terrorists. India blamed Pakistan for carrying out the attacks, an allegation which Pakistan strongly denied and one that brought both nations to the brink of a nuclear confrontation in 1999. However, international peace efforts ensured the cooling of tensions between the two nuclear-capable nations. The plane was hijacked on 24 December approximately one hour after take off and was taken to Amritsar airport and then to Lahore in Pakistan. After refueling the plane took off for Dubai and then finally landed in Kandahar, Afghanistan. The decision, however, cost New Delhi dearly. Maulana, who is believed to be hiding in Karachi, later became the leader of Jaish- e-Mohammed, an organisation which has carried out several terrorist acts against Indian security forces in Kashmir. The Fort houses an Indian military unit and a high-security interrogation cell used both by the Central Bureau of Investigation and the Indian Army. The terrorists successfully breached the security cover around the Red Fort and opened fire at the Indian military personnel on duty killing two of them on spot. The attack was significant because it was carried out just two days after the declaration of the cease-fire between India and Pakistan. Only two months later, two Kashmiri terrorists belonging to Jaish-e- Mohammed raided the Swami Narayan temple complex in Ahmadabad, Gujarat killing 30 people, including 18 women and five children. The attack was carried out on 25 September , just few days after state elections were held in Jammu and Kashmir. Two identical letters found on both the terrorists claimed that the attack was done in retaliation for the deaths of thousands of Muslims during the Gujarat riots.

Chapter 6 : Foreign policy of the United States - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Abdulkareem Abdulrazaq Kayode Abstract Decision making in foreign policy analysis tends to explain an aspect in the study of international politics and explains why and how states behave the way they behave in the international arena. However, in the quest for decision making, there are actors involved in which one of the actors is the state bureaucracy. National bureaucracies have been at the heart of foreign policy analysis. Bureaucracies are found in both small and large states whose interest is to defend the national interest. Therefore, this paper seeks to question who are the foreign policy decision makers, what interest do they have? Which foreign policy instrument do they hope to use to achieve their objective? This paper concluded thus, the bureaucracy is an important institution of the state whose functions have been primarily policy execution, however, the influence of bureaucracy had gone beyond the execution of policies alone, and it has permeated through the policy formulation process and the policy itself. Therefore, the role of bureaucracy is far more than just the implementation of foreign policy but rather it remains one of the key actors involved in the making of the policy through dialogue, debate, conflict and compromise. INTRODUCTION Foreign policy is the strategy chosen by the national government of a state to achieve its relations with external entities; this may even include the decision to do nothing within the context of international relations Smith. S et al, States relates with its external environment via code of conducts, these codes can be regarded as the foreign policy of the state. These policies needs to be in place to guide the relationship of a state and its international environment as noted by William Wallace Foreign policy is just like every other state policy directed to solve a specific issue within the state but seeks to address issues outside the boundary of the state but formulated within the state. Bureaucracy is any large-scale organization of appointed officials whose primary function is to implement the policies of the decision makers. It is a rational system or organized structure designed to permit the efficient and effective execution of public policy Tasie, Decision making in foreign policy analysis tends to explain the approach to the study of international politics and explains why and how states behave the way they behave in the international arena. As noted by Smith et al, Therefore, it boils down to the question of who are the foreign policy decision makers, what interest do they have? Also, it seeks to address the process involved by which the participants and organizations struggle to bring about the decision they want. And to identify the sources of bureaucratic power and the resultant effect of their decisions that later emerge. There are several approaches to the understanding of international politics or better say world politics. The bone of idea usually lies within the Realists, Liberalists and the Radicals or the structuralisms. Foreign policy decision making does not refer only to the making of conscious choices, but also to a range of personal, organizational, institutional and environmental factors which also help account for the flow of events Micheal Clarke, Therefore to understand the realm of decision making, we need to critically analyse it from the system approach- having input, output, feedback and the environment. The models of foreign policy making tend to explain how different answers can be offered to a single question. The realist pushed an argument forward claiming that the government of a state is the monolithic actor in realm of foreign policy formation. And sees inter- state struggle for power as the order of the day in the international arena which tagged the international environment as chaotic, hostile and dangerous. There are however, three basic concepts in the realm of traditional foreign policy decision making; decision, decision- maker and the decision- making process. The trend goes thus; foreign policy entails a series of decisions made by a group of people who can be labeled decision makers. It goes further to explain the behavior of an individual or a group of individuals who are saddled with the responsibility of choosing, making and enforcing decisions within a structured environment Synder et. But the question often raised is why does a policy maker tend to pursue a course rather than the other? The foreign policy maker is however seen an actor that considers possible course of actions and evaluates the likely outcomes of each in terms of costs and benefits. In essence, the foreign policy decision

maker is expected as a rational being to take the right step after weighing the positive and negative consequences the decision might bring. Four basic concepts are quite central to the Rational Actor Model; goals and objectives, alternatives, consequences and choice. Ranks all possible sets of consequences in terms of her or his values and objectives - number of side effects Graham T. It further takes its alternative choice to the output of decision. Thirdly is Consequences which further takes rational actors to consider that to each alternative is attached a set of consequences or outcomes of choice that will ensue if that particular alternative is chosen. And lastly is Choice which is the most difficult of all. The decision maker is at liberty to use any criteria to choose among sets of alternatives. Ideally, the rational actor chooses the options with less negative consequential effect after a careful survey of the costs and benefits. So much we have discussed that decision makers are seen as rational actors and take rational decisions, there is often a case of interest in the field of decision making which are normally sorted out via arguing and bargaining. As argument is seen as a major tool in the process of decision making which more often than not replace bargaining. As decision makers seek to protect their core policies and interests; Smith. Allison in *Essence of Decision* argues that the traditional type of analysis must be supplemented, if not supplanted, by frames of reference that focus on the governmental machine- the organizations and the political actors involved in the policy process Graham T. He pushed two ideas forward about the actors to be involved in the foreign policy making of a state. First is the organizational process model claiming that governmental agencies with semi- autonomous power having a stake or interest in the process of decision making. The other view of Allison sees foreign policy making to be borne out of various bargaining games among the key players within the government. These perspectives are commonly regarded as the bureaucratic politics perspective to the explanation of foreign policy analysis. More on this model would be explained later as it is the crux of this paper. Pluralist maintain that media and publics are independent of political interference and, as such, can and should act as powerful constraints upon governments. The pluralist model placed more emphasis on the role of public opinion and the media in shaping the foreign policy of the state. The liberalist is seen as to be having a stronghold in the explanation of the pluralist model. Example of this model can be derived from the March anti- war protest in the New York, the Washington D. C protest and the Washington D. This shows the level of awareness of the publics through the media to influence the policy of the government. The psychological model assumptions is that there is an influence shaping the rationality of the decision makers. These scenarios give a room for an account to explain the psychological model. Each bureau is saddled with certain roles and responsibilities as individual leaders cannot consider solution to every problem that arises. Therefore there would be need for numerous alternatives that would be considered in the advent of seeking solution to problems or devising policies to promote an agenda. Therefore, as complex issues arises from international politics, state needs to align into bureaucracies meaning that there would be arrangement in ministries, departments and agencies as the case may be. The role of bureaucracy in a state setting cannot be over emphasized as bureaucracy performs a lot of governmental functions and are seen to be influential in decision making and execution. This argument is supported by Tasié G. Their influence makes bureaucrats not just policy executors but policy makers and indirectly the policy itself. They draft memoranda, prepare policy agenda, negotiate funds and technical assistance, work out governmental priorities, etc. When an issue arises, players from different bureaus seek to address the issue base on their organizational interest and perception towards the issue. Each and every unit of the state bureaucracy feels important in decision making because they are safe guarding a particular unit of the state relations. Although it should be noted that decisions arrived at to form the state foreign policy at that time and on that particular issue is a resultant of huge debate, conflict and compromise. Rosati tried to distinguish between the structure and the process of decision making trying to gauge the degree of involvement of the participants involved in foreign policy formulation and what initiate such involvement. It explains that the position of the participants on foreign policy decision making is highly influenced by the position they hold or the organization they represents. Also, Rosati tried to link up the relationship between position and preference. This perspective of foreign policy analysis offers a distinct different explanation as against the traditional rational actor model. Foreign ministries, state departments, external affairs ministry, defense ministry, the finance ministry, economic planning unit, trade and investments etc. Be it large or small, every state has units

of bureaucracies carrying out routine functions aiding the movement of the state. Although, names might differ but function could be similar. C and Raymond G. Other agencies also bear responsibility for specialized aspects of U. S foreign relations, such as the Treasury, Commerce and Agriculture departments. This governmental politics is quite prevalent in the United States and other countries where democracy is the order of the day and there is wider participation in the decision making processes. Unlike the less democratic societies such as North Korea where there is high level of dictatorship. Foreign policy of North Korea has always been centered on the Kim Yong II where he reflects in every decision making be it directly from him or a recommendation from the Ministry of foreign Affair. Model I explains governmental action as a result of a monolithic and unified decision of the state as the sole foreign policy decision maker and taker for the state. Model II explains the decision of the state as an organizational output. It explores the nature of organizations based on their Standard Operational Procedures. Policies are characterized neither by a unitary actor nor as an organizational output but rather a result of serious bargaining games among the players in the national government. However, in the course of evaluating the three models to see which suits to explain the model more, it was seen that the three models complement one another. Rather, each individual in this group is, in his or her own right, a player in a central, competitive game. The game is politics: In dissecting the Model III stated above and applying it to the reality of the crisis, the American Blockade of Cuba and the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba summarizes it all. It was a long process of debate and arguments before President Kennedy could push up a decision foreign policy as to how to deal with the missiles planted in Cuba by the Soviet forces which is a danger in view for America. Although, there were sharp differs in given solution to what should be done to the crisis on ground. With the discovery of the problem, President Kennedy informed the inner circle of advisers who met at the Oval Room of the White House from 16th to 19th of October. The Joint Chiefs of staff was so keen to invasion of Cuba and the Soviet forces to eliminate the threat although the new head Max- well Taylor wants a more intelligence report to be gathered before any action would be taken, this could take up to few days. The Secretary of Defense- Mc Namara wants a retaliatory attack and a blockade to avoid future planting of missiles in the American neighborhood to avoid threat to the country. Mc George Bundy who serves as the National Security Adviser was uncharacteristically reticent but two days after he supported the attack against the missiles. On the 19th of October, President Kennedy met the Chiefs of Staff and found that they insist on the attack and Mc Namara on the blockage- negotiation option. The debate now slims down to two sides, air attack and blockade. President Kennedy subscribed to the ideas and suggests that the deal will be taking a- two route agenda. First a blockade with two days ultimatum and if no compliance, an air strike will follow of which the air strike will only be limited to the missile bound areas. Although, there was an amendment to this position by Dillon who suggested a seventy- two hours interval between demand and action Department of Defense,

Chapter 7 : Foreign Policy Association

the foreign policy formulation being implemented by developing countries in Nigeria The study did not evaluate the determinants or identify possible solutions to the formulation process.

Become a Member How U. Compared to every other liberal democracy, the U. Safeguards built into the Constitution prevent tyranny, yet they frequently pit Congress against the executive branch, make it difficult to develop and implement a cohesive foreign policy, create uncertainty as to what that policy is, and give foreign governments and special interests an opportunity to apply pressure at many points, not just one. As a result, the actors of foreign policy in the U. Global interdependence and the breakdown of traditional barriers has increased the complexity of foreign policymaking. The distinction between foreign and domestic issues is no longer pronounced, and as the global financial crisis of proved, local decisions have ripple effects abroad. Understanding how foreign policy is made and conducted in the U. Constitution divides power between the three branches of government: It also gives each branch some check on the other. Foreign policy is thus split amongst different governmental structures. Although the President usually cannot spend money not appropriated by Congress, he has always been granted some latitude in emergencies. The Constitution assigns the Senate a distinctive role in the foreign policy process—to advise the President in negotiating agreements, to consent to them once they have been signed, and to approve presidential appointments, including the Secretary of State, other high officials of the State Department, ambassadors and career foreign service officers. The President Under the Constitution, the President serves as head of state and head of government. As head of state, the President is, in effect, the personification of the U. As head of government, he formulates foreign policy, supervises its implementation and attempts to obtain the resources to support it. He also organizes and directs the departments and agencies that play a part in the foreign policy process. Along with the Vice President, he is the only government official elected nationally. He serves as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; nominates and appoints ambassadors and other public ministers, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate; and makes treaties, by and with the advice of the Senate, provided two thirds of the senators present concur. For example, executive agreements, which have largely replaced the cumbersome process of treaty-making, comprise most of the understandings and commitments between the U. The President is the Commander in Chief, but the power to declare war rests with Congress- though Congress has only exercised the right in response to a presidential request. Yet it is the rise in covert operations deployed by the President, such as the select group of Navy SEALs who assassinated Osama Bin Laden, that evidence a profound change in the type of wars and manner of their deployment. The President also has the power to receive foreign ambassadors and, in effect, to recognize foreign governments. The President has two additional informal but influential powers in foreign affairs. One of these is the ability to determine the national agenda by bringing issues to the forefront of public attention and concern. The Policymaking Machinery Making foreign policy requires the participation of the President, the executive branch, Congress and the public. Conducting foreign policy, on the other hand, is the exclusive prerogative of the President and his subordinates in the executive branch. The distinction is fuzzy but important: Department of State Until World War II, one agency, the Department of State, established in and the highest-ranking Cabinet department, and one individual, the Secretary of State, who is directly responsible to the President, managed foreign affairs. The traditional functions of the State Department and its professional diplomatic corps, the Foreign Service, include: The Pentagon and Security The U. Military power serves as an instrument of diplomacy—as a means of achieving goals defined by civilian officials of the government. The principal military adviser to the President is the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a strategy board consisting of the senior officers of the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. The department, which oversees 22 separate agencies, has become extremely powerful in matters relating to trade, borders, immigration and security. They collect information for example, how many nuclear weapons China possesses , assess its accuracy and reliability, and disseminate the information to decision makers. In addition, the intelligence community, most notably the CIA, undertakes, with the approval of the President, clandestine operations. In , the intelligence

community was expanded to include the new position of Director of National Intelligence, who directs and manages the activities of the individual intelligence agencies and serves as the main adviser to the President on intelligence matters. Since his day, the difficulty of developing a cohesive, relevant and feasible foreign policy has increased enormously. Theoretically, the process of formulation should begin with a clear definition of the national interests, followed by a delineation of the policies that would promote those interests and the course of action by the various departments and agencies that would further those policies, as well as the allocation of the resources needed to carry them out. In practice, no system is likely to produce a cohesive, viable and supportable foreign policy. The national interest is a cluster of particular interests, and the agencies and staffs involved may have very different views as to what it should be. It is clear that foreign policy is not the prerogative of a few members of government; in fact public opinion is key in affecting policy. The same should be true today.

Chapter 8 : NATIONAL INTERESTS AND FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION

Making foreign policy requires the participation of the President, the executive branch, Congress and the public. Conducting foreign policy, on the other hand, is the exclusive prerogative of the President and his subordinates in the executive branch.

Search Toggle display of website navigation U. November 1, , 5: But Trump, who fended off investigations and bad publicity for decades as a New York real estate mogul, has a well-honed strategy for shaping the conversation in a way that serves him: Indeed, if you want a good idea of what to expect from Trump after Nov. As he faced negative publicity over the attempted pipe bomb attacks and the deadly shooting at a Pittsburgh synagogue—both crimes allegedly perpetrated by right-wing extremists—he grew only more frenzied in his efforts to change the subject on an almost daily basis. Finally, Trump announced he would single-handedly change the U. Constitution, reinterpreting the 14th Amendment through executive order to prevent some immigrant babies from becoming U. And Trump did change the conversation—so much so that the Washington media could barely keep up, said Gwenda Blair, the author of *The Trumps: Look at him now*. In the aftermath of the midterms, his biographers say, Trump will only make redoubled efforts at dominating the conversation with big new deals. He quickly pulled out, seeking a Trump deal. Even though the TPP will go into force at the end of the year, without the United States, Trump has hinted that he wants to reopen negotiations. In other words, the framework of a previous deal has been layered with a new skin. Trump has indicated that he sees the Iran threat in much the same way. But they wanna make a deal, and at some point we might. Iran wants to make a deal. In late , the U. The rhetoric would likely get more aggressive if Trump faces an oppositional Congress. And they were fined. Michael Hirsh is a senior correspondent at Foreign Policy.

Chapter 9 : Deflecting and Deal-Making: Trump's Plan if Republicans Lose the House – Foreign Pol

Foreign policy experts say that presidents have accumulated power at the expense of Congress in recent years as part of a pattern in which, during times of war or national emergency, the executive.

Study[edit] Foreign policy analysis involves the study of how a state makes foreign policy. As it analyzes the decision making process, FPA involves the study of both international and domestic politics. FPA also draws upon the study of diplomacy , war , intergovernmental organizations , and economic sanctions , each of which are means by which a state may implement foreign policy. In academia, foreign policy analysis is most commonly taught within the discipline of public policy within political science or political studies , and the study of international relations. FPA can also be considered a sub-field of the study of international relations, which aims to understand the processes behind foreign policy decision making. In the simplest terms, it is the study of the process, effects, causes, or outputs of foreign policy decision-making in either a comparative or case-specific manner. The underlying and often implicit argument theorizes that human beings, acting as a group or within a group, compose and cause change in international politics. Stages in decision making[edit] The making of foreign policy involves a number of stages: Assessment of the international and domestic political environment - Foreign policy is made and implemented within an international and domestic political context, which must be understood by a state in order to determine the best foreign policy option. For example, a state may need to respond to an international crisis. Goal setting - A state has multiple foreign policy goals. A state must determine which goal is affected by the international and domestic political environment at any given time. In addition, foreign policy goals may conflict, which will require the state to prioritize. Determination of policy options - A state must then determine what policy options are available to meet the goal or goals set in light of the political environment. Formal decision making action - A formal foreign policy decision will be taken at some level within a government. Foreign policy decisions are usually made by the executive branch of government. Common governmental actors or institutions which make foreign policy decisions include: Implementation of chosen policy option - Once a foreign policy option has been chosen, and a formal decision has been made, then the policy must be implemented. Foreign policy is most commonly implemented by specialist foreign policy arms of the state bureaucracy, such as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or State Department. Other departments may also have a role in implementing foreign policy, such as departments for: Key approaches[edit] as put forward by Graham T. The model adopts the state as the primary unit of analysis, and inter-state relations or international relations as the context for analysis. The state is seen as a monolithic unitary actor, capable of making rational decisions based on preference ranking and value maximization. According to the rational actor model, a rational decision making process is used by a state. Goal setting and ranking. In other words, it provides models for answering the question: In this theory, the underlying assumption is that governments are unified and rational , in this manner, they would seek for carefully planned and well-defined foreign policy goals. In this sense, rational choice model is primarily a realist perspective of foreign policy level of analysis. The model tends to neglect a range of political variables, of which Michael Clarke includes: Governmental Bargaining Model[edit] In this model the state is not seen as a monolithic unitary actor. Instead it is a collection of different bureaucracies vying for increasing their funding and size. Individual decision makers try to bargain and compete for influence with their own particular goal in mind. Here decisions are made by bureaucracies competing against each other and suggesting solutions to problems that would involve using their resources so as to increase their level of importance. Bureaucratic politics model, in keeping with its pluralistic connotation, can also refer to that inner state processes including no institutional actors, who with their informal channels would affect policy results. These procedures are made in order to allow day-to-day operations to be carried out. Often an order or decision will have to work around these standard procedures. It is often exceedingly difficult for a bureaucracy to do something "out of character" or contrary to their standard procedures. Multilevel and Multidimensional approach - In this model, scholars study particular aspects of foreign policy making by using various major theories. Social constructivist approach - In this model, scholars focus on the role of ideas, discourse, and

identity to make foreign policy analysis.