

The Study of Foreign Policy in International Relations

Bojang AS*

Student, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey

*Corresponding author: Bojang AS, Student, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey, Tel: +905061792543; E-mail: asbojang1@gmail.com

Received date: March 06, 2018; Accepted date: Oct 08, 2018; Published date: Oct 18, 2018

Copyright: © 2018 Bojang AS. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Foreign Policy decision-making is agreed to be one of the greatest instrument at a state's disposal to pursue its national interests. It is considered as a full political activity of states. A good Foreign Policy would obviously lead a state in fulfilling its national interests and acquiring rightful place among comity of nations. As such the study of Foreign Policy forms an important part of International Studies. However, the first problem that one faces in the study of Foreign Policy is the problem of definition or clear meaning of the term. When used, it is either out of context or entails a different meaning. As such, it becomes a "neglected concept" as most people dealing with the subject have felt confident that they knew what foreign policy was. This neglect has been one of the most serious obstacles to providing more adequate and comprehensive explanations of Foreign Policy. This article, seeks to provide a comprehensive meaning about the concept of Foreign Policy, and also look into some of the things that determines the foreign policy decision-making of a country. This work, will give many students, researchers and policy makers a good idea of what foreign policy entails and how such policy decisions are being made.

Keywords: Foreign policy; Decision-making; State; Interest; Determinants; Internal; External

What is Foreign Policy?

After the treaty of Westphalia and the end of the First and Second World War, the international system has witnessed an increasing growth in the development of nation states. The end product of this development is thus, the creation of an interaction between these nation states. In addition, the establishment of United Nations and the process of decolonization that has liberated many states into sovereign entities have further provided the impetus to interrelationships among states. Such has resulted into the formation of 'foreign policies'. With the aim of determining and identifying the decisions, strategies, and ends of interaction of a state with another [1]. Furthermore, the modern world of "globalization"; the "widening, deepening and speeding up of global interconnectedness" ¹has increased this interrelationships or interactions among states. Hence, there is unanimity among scholars on the necessity of a "foreign policy" for each state, since no state will like to function in complete isolation. This made scholars like Feliks Gross, to say that even a decision to have no relations with a particular state is also a foreign policy². A state without a foreign policy, has been compared to a ship in the deep sea without any knowledge of directions³. Thus, foreign policy leads a state in fulfilling its national interests and acquiring rightful place among comity of nations.

Like small states studies, the first problem that one faces in the study of foreign policy, is the problem of definition or clear meaning of the term [2]. When used, it is either out of context or entails a different

meaning. Such has led to scholars like Charles Hermann, to call foreign policy a "neglected concept"⁴. Adding that "this neglect has been one of the most serious obstacles to providing more adequate and comprehensive explanations of foreign policy." He believed that part of the reasons for this neglect is that "most people dealing with the subject have felt confident that they knew what foreign policy was."

The term foreign policy has been defined in various ways by scholars; however, they are certain that it is concerned with behaviour of a state towards other states. Hermann for instance, defined foreign policy as "the discrete purposeful action that results from the political level decision of an individual or group of individuals [3]. It is the observable artifact of a political level decision. It is not the decision, but a product of the decision." By this, it can be seen that Hermann defines foreign policy as the behaviour of states.

George Modelski, defines it as "the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment. Foreign policy must throw light on the ways states attempt to change, and succeed in changing the behaviour of other states." Modelski, noted only those aspects of policy that aim at the change in the existing behaviour of states, as the primary objectives of foreign policy. However, foreign policy is not only to change, but also continuation of the behaviour at different times [4]. It is concern both with the change and the status quo as far as they serve the national interest⁵. For example, Gambia's decision to cut diplomatic ties with Taiwan (a country it maintained ties with for almost two decades) in 2013, was a change in the foreign policy of the Gambia. In addition, no reasons were given for the decision, nor further details provided in the official

¹ Held D, McGrew A, Goldblatt D, Perraton J (1999) Global Transformations, Politics, Economics and Culture. Cambridge: Polity Press.

² Gross F (1945) Foreign Policy Analysis, New York, philosophical library.

³ Foreign policy and diplomacy with special reference to India.

⁴ Laura N (2008) The New Foreign Policy: Power Seeking in a Globalized Era. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

⁵ Mahendra K (1967) Theoretical Aspects of International Politics. Shiva Lal Agarwala.

press release other than stating that it was in the “national interests” of the Gambia. In the same vein, Gambia’s decision to resume diplomatic relations with China, is a shift in her foreign policy towards a continuation of relationship with an old ally⁶.

According to Joseph Frankel, “foreign policy consists of decisions and actions, which involves to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others”⁷. By this, foreign policy involves set of actions that are made within state’s borders, intended towards forces existing outside the country’s borders [5-7]. It comprises the formulation and implementation of a set of ideas that govern the behaviour of states while interacting with other states to defend and enhance their national interests.

In the words of Padelford and Lincoln, “A State’s Foreign Policy is totality of its dealings with the external environment. Foreign Policy is the overall result of the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into specific courses of action in order to achieve its objectives and preserve its interests”⁸. Two functions of foreign policy can be extracted from Padelford and Lincoln’s definition; first, foreign policy is to attain its conceived goals and second, to pressurize its national interests.

In Huges Gibson’s insight, “foreign policy is a well-rounded comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience for conducting the business of government with rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interests of the nations. This calls for a clear understanding of what those interests are and how far we hope to go with the means at our disposal. Anything less than this, falls short of being a foreign policy”⁹. An interesting addition to that of Padelford and Lincoln’s definition in Huges’s insight is that of how far states are willing to go with the means at their disposal to achieve their interests. Such a claim leads us to ask the question; will states be willing to use force when diplomacy fails in achieving their interests? The answer to this is YES. An example of which is the Bush administration’s invasion of Iraq in 2003; where the American government turned to military capabilities at her disposal to achieve their national interest¹⁰.

Finally, in Deborah Gerner’s dictum, foreign policy is “the intentions, statements, and actions of an actor-often, but not always, a state-directed towards the external world and the response of other actors to these intentions, statements and actions.” Laura Neack, has criticized Deborah’s definition being emphasized on states. She argued that other actors such as international cause groups, businesses, religions, and the like-in the international system formulate guidelines and goals that direct their actions towards other international actors. She used a broad definition of foreign policy that involves both statements and behaviours or actions. She asserts that foreign policy, “needs to consider more than what states declare to be their goals and how they attempt to achieve them [8]. The study of foreign policy needs to consider how certain goals arise and why certain behaviours result.”

Thus, in view of such a variety of definitions as to what is meant by ‘foreign policy’, I will conclude by defining a foreign policy as consisting of three parts: the ‘end’, the ‘ways’ and the ‘means’. The end consists a vision of a desired outcome or set of interests in interacting with another state/actor; the ways, consists of the strategies and ideas (e.g. diplomatic tactics, coercion), to pursue these desired interests; and the means, consists of the available resources at a state’s disposal (e.g. economic, military). Thus, a foreign policy is a vision of a desired outcome or set of interests in interacting with another state/actor, the strategies and ideas used in achieving these goals, and the available resources at a state’s disposable, in guiding her interaction with other states.

Determinants of Foreign Policy Decision-Making

In Hill’s insight, “foreign policy is the hinge of domestic and international politics”¹¹. There is also consensus among scholars that foreign policy serves as an intersection point of domestic and international politics. Thus, from here we can say that, the foreign policy of every state is influenced by mainly two determinants; international or external and domestic or internal. These are considered as factors which help in shaping and moulding foreign policy [9-12]. However, the linkage between international and domestic determinants has long been a widely debated topic in the field of international relations and Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) in particular. While others argue that domestic politics and foreign policy are two ‘independent’ arenas of issue, others are of the view that foreign policy and domestic politics are ‘interdependent’ and could spill over into each other.

While both school of scholars made convincing arguments, however, the level of influence between domestic and international determinants of foreign policies varies from state and the political environment in which these states exist. In some cases, international factors play a major role, whereas in other cases, domestic determinants are more important.

External Determinants of Foreign Policy

Undoubtedly, the international environment plays an important role in shaping the foreign policy of every state. Since foreign policy in general is about the interaction of a state with another, this interaction only takes place at the international level and as such, cannot be ignored in analyzing the foreign policy of any state. As scholars in this school acknowledge the importance of both international and domestic factors, however, they argue that international factors play a more important role in determining country’s foreign policy. The main external factors that determine the foreign policy of a state are but not limited to: the international system or power structure, international law, international organizations, alliances, and military strength or arm race. Now we can analyse these factors in details.

⁶ Gambia severs diplomatic ties with Taiwan. (2013).

⁷ Frankel J (1968) *The Making of Foreign Policy*. London Oxford University Press.

⁸ Padelford NJ, Lincoln GA (1977) *The Dynamics of International Politics*. Macmillan Company, New York.

⁹ Gibson H (1944) *The Road to Foreign Policy*, Doubleday, Doran and Company Inc., Garden City.

¹⁰ Bojang MBS (2016) *The Hidden Agenda Behind the Invasion of Iraq: The Unjust War Over Iraq in 2003*. Central European Journal of Politics 2: 1-14.

¹¹ Yitan L (2008) *Domestic vs. international determinants of foreign policy: An empirical investigation of the case of China-Taiwan, 1991-2000*. Prepared for delivery at the 49th ISA convention, San Francisco, CA.

The international system or power structure

The modern state system has been in existence since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. It includes big, middle and small powers. As mentioned above, the interaction between these states takes place at the international level and as such it plays a significant role in shaping and moulding the foreign policies of those interacting states [12]. The establishment of friendly and cooperative relations between states is the aims of a sound foreign policy. Foreign policy is essentially shaped by one's relative power within the international system. The world is continuously changing, new events and personalities create fresh foreign policy problems for all concerned¹². To select events at random, the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the rise of Communist Power in China in 1949, the rise of De Gaulle to power in France and Hitler in Germany, and the emergence of new states in Asia and Africa; brought about significant changes in the power structure and that has impacted the foreign policy of many states.

A prevalent framework of world politics plays decisive role in deciding the foreign policy of a country. As such foreign policies of states thus changes with shifts in the international power structure. In the traditional multi-polar system, it was easier for states to switch sides and gain maximum interests from both sides. Italy has used this strategy skillfully and switched sides during the height of World War I to gain its share in the post war colonial arrangement¹³.

During the 1980s, the international system was characterized with a bi-polar system as witnessed during the Cold War, and now a unipolar with the US as the only hegemonic power. These events have restructured the power system and have a significant effect on the foreign policies of states [12]. During the bipolar world system, it was not easy for states to switch sides easily as the ideological fault lines were clearly marked.

The demise of the Soviet Union and the advent of the unipolar world (US hegemony) have its own system dynamics, such as Bush's "either with us or against us". This declaration has made many states from the margins of the system to come forward and play effective roles, especially in the so-called Global War on Terror. At this point therefore, every type of power structure at the international level has its own particular dynamics and has an impact on the foreign policies of states.

International law

The international law is generally defined as a set of rules that regulate relations between states. Cali defined it as "a system of rules created deliberately and explicitly by states. Where states have expressly willed to be bound by the rules"¹⁴. The existence of international law and international norms limits the freedom to maneuver of states in the system. It is constituted by interstate agreements and treaties and thus, does not entirely favor every interest a state may have. It limits a state in one way or another [13-15]. That been said, international law regulates the foreign policy of states, and has a binding function in foreign policy as it offers a legal framework through which states should interact. By foreign policy in this sense, is defined as the objectives that guide the activities and relationships of one state in its interaction with other states. It is believed that states

actually obey and comply with international law because it constraints the making and enacting of their foreign policy.

However, there is much debate among International Relations theorists about the consequences of international law. Whether states really comply with or observed international law and norms or not and to what extent they do obey international rules; because it is clear that some international norms are obeyed while others are ignored. One side of the debate, proponents of Realism, argue that international law has little or no independent effect on foreign policy. Henkin, for instance argued that one of the major purposes of foreign ps to "maintain international order so that states can pursue national interests." Thus in a realist view, states have the tendency to give priority to their national interests and then sometimes violate legal norms when fundamental interests are at risk. Leaders are claimed to pursue their national interests (broadly defined to include military security and economic prosperity) without regard for international law. The US invasion of Iraq in 2003, under the Bush administration provides a clear illustration of this [16]¹⁵. Hence from this it is said, the international law lacks force because the legislative, judicial and executive functions are fundamentally decentralized. First, each nation in world affairs is its own lawgiver. Second, a nation is its own judge and can interpret the law to serve its own purposes. Finally, each nation in world affairs is its own sheriff, who must enforce the law for itself or organize a sympathetic posse.

On the other hand, against this skeptical view, liberal institutionalist argues that international law can be profoundly significant. They assert that when states sign a treaty or agreements, it allegedly becomes costlier to take actions the law forbids and less costly to pursue policies the law condones. That is, treaties in the other words "tie the hands of current and future leaders by increasing the cost of renegeing."

According to the Positivist view, international law is a set of rules that regulates and constraints state behaviour. States are constrained to respect international norms if they do not want to face sanctions and avoid 'naming and shaming' by international activists (i.e., human rights activists). The Constructivist approach of international law in foreign policy can illustrate the fact that it regulates and gives a roadmap to state's behaviour, enable them to enter in relationship with each other (thereby limiting their actions); because they are legally bind by customary law and they decide to have legally binding obligations through treaties.

In sum, international law defines the status, the rights, the responsibilities, and obligations of the nations in foreign policy. Thus, it is the responsibility of every state to observe the norms and laws, failure to which there are consequences.

International organizations

Currently, there are over 68,000 International Organizations (both active and inactive) in the world. Many International Organizations (IOs) play an enormous role in the current international system. It is hard to imagine how world affairs would operate without international bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and its affiliates, international financial institutions, such as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). Such organizations are considered as active

¹² Foreign policy and diplomacy with special reference to India.

¹³ Baskin O (2011) Turkish Foreign Policy, 1919-2006: Facts and Analyses with Documents. Utah University press.

¹⁴ Sotong MDL (2013) International Law and Foreign Policy: a mutual influence.

¹⁵ See Iraq War (2003), on footnote of p. 23

actors in the field of International Relations, as they facilitate the interaction between states at the global level. A state's foreign policies is thus, often affected by its membership of international, regional and sub-regional organizations, since they surrender partially their sovereignty to these organizations. As their operations will be guided by the constitution of the organization; the policies of member states will undoubtedly be affected by the nature of the particular institution.

Nevertheless, scholars of international relations still disagree about the role IOs play in the foreign policies of states. The realist approach in the international politics has generally had less confidence in the efficacy of international organizations. They argue, for example that the United Nations and most other international bodies have no way to implement their decisions and that nation states have all the real power in the international system [17-21]. Mearsheimer for instance, argued that international institutions "are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in the world. They are based on the self-interested calculations of the great powers, and they have no independent effect on state behavior." IOs are considered as only a marginal factor in world politics. This is otherwise regarded as the 'bottom-up' perspective; i.e., how the foreign policies of states impact international organizations.

However, the Constructivist and liberal institutionalist account, took a different view; the 'top-down' perspective. How international organizations impact the foreign policies of states. In the constructivist account, international organizations to a larger extent serve as modifiers of state behaviour and as independent actor. They have profound impact on the determination of the foreign policy of the member states.

The realization of mutual independence, has given birth to a large number of international and regional organizations, arrangements, agreements, and trading blocks. The European Union, ASEAN, African Union, OPEC, ECOWAS and several others have been major players in the international system. Hence, it is obvious that the foreign policy of every state is now becoming conscious of these organizations, trading blocks, and economic and trade agreements. Thus, international organization constitute a determinant factor in the foreign policies of states.

Alliances

Alliance formulation is considered to be one of the most curious aspects of international relations. It is regarded as the cornerstone of security policy; however, conventional wisdom holds that its commitment are notoriously unreliable. Alliance formation is considered as a strategy that states use in the formulation and implementation of their foreign policies. Clinton and Palmer, examined the consequences of alliance formation for other foreign policies of a state, including defense spending and the initiation of militarized disputes, using a theory of foreign policy that is based on several assumptions.

First, states pursue two goods-change and maintenance-through their foreign policy. Second, states select a portfolio of policies designed to produce the most preferred mix of the two goods. Third, all foreign policy behaviour including alliance requires resources. Fourth, states are rational in their allocation of resources [22]. Together this implies that an observe alliance must have been the most efficient mechanism available for acquiring the most desired and achievable foreign policy portfolio and have implications for the observation of foreign policy substitutability.

They added that alliance provide capability on which the state can draw, thereby providing greater opportunity to pursue both maintenance and change. Alliances in their dictum "are the results of agreements that both entail some commitment and allow for increased foreign policy activity." Finally, they see alliances as part of a state's foreign policy portfolio, in which the alliance may constrain the state in some areas while allowing it freedom to act in others.

Alliances like international law do shape the foreign policies of states, because the member parties to the alliances have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies and refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to the alliance partners. Like many scholars in international relations, Dinesh asserted that, alliances serve as instruments of foreign policies. "The extensive and intensive system of alliances that emerged in the post-1945 period had a big impact on the foreign policies of all the nations. During 1945-90, both the United States and USSR, recognized and used alliances as the means for consolidating their respective positions." Again, during the height of the Cold War, neither the members of the 'Warsaw Pact' nor those of 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization' (NATO) could pursue any independent foreign policy [23]. Even now, with the demise of the Warsaw Pact, the US still continues to consider NATO as the mainstay of its foreign policy in Europe.

Military strategy/Arm race

An arm race denotes the quantity or quality of instruments of military and naval power by rival states in peacetime. The first modern arm race took place when France and Russia challenge the naval superiority of Britain in the late 19th century. The buildup of arms, was also a characteristic of the Cold War between the US and USSR. The hostility between the United States and the Soviet Union began near the end of World War I. The profound ideological differences between these two camps were problematic, which eventually had an effect on the international system. The creation of the first atomic bomb in 1945, by the USA had two objectives: a quick end of World War II and possession by US (and not USSR), would allow control of foreign policy in the global stage. However, the discovery and the detonation of an atomic bomb in 1949 by the Soviet Union, ends America's monopoly of atomic weaponry and launches the Cold War [24]. As such in the 1950s, arm race became the focus of the Cold War.

Arm race are a competitive defense spending and military capability building between two states or bloc of states (like the cold war). Examples of such states locked in long-term rivalries with other states include India-Pakistan, China-India, North-South Korea, and Turkey-Greece.

In the pursuit of foreign policy objectives, states adopt different strategies, and military strategy is one of those. Scholars assert that one of the main prerequisite of a credible state actor is to develop the military compatibilities and political will, to back its diplomacy by force when necessary. As the famous saying, 'when negotiations fail, confrontation is inevitable.' Thus, the use of military power is considered as the ultimate tool of international relations following the conception of war as the continuation of politics by other means. However, in either case whether used defensively or offensively, military power lends a measure of international freedom of action to the state involved [25]. Thus, this is affirming the political theory of war which argues that "in a world system of competing states, the basis of diplomacy, and of all contractual obligations beyond the boundaries of the state rest on the capacity to use (diplomacy of) violence, both to protect the state, and to protect one's interest in the face of opposition

from other states." This assertion is in concord with the notion that military strategy occupies a fundamental place in a countries foreign policy.

Sunday Ebaye, argued that a state may pursue its interests by bringing immense resources such as large military forces, allies or embargoes on products crucial to others to the support of the issue it perceived to be at stake. However, "in situations where both states and parties to a conflict have the same preference, the structure of the conflict is then akin to the game theorist's concept of the prisoner's dilemma, where no party to the conflict wants to back down in respect to what it perceived to be the central issue."

In Basse's dictum too, "...whether conceived in terms of it direct or indirect employment, military power has become in the modern era, the legally sanctioned instrument of which states use in their relations with each other..." Coercive diplomacy entails using what Schelling termed the 'diplomacy of violence' to influence the cost-benefit calculations of the adversary; as "it is the threat of damage, or of more damage to come, that can make someone yield or comply."

In view of this, a state possessing sufficient military strength has greater initiative and bargaining power in the international arena. By this, until the nation state system is radically transformed and superseded by a different international order, the military power and the capacity for armed coercion which it sustains, is likely to continue to play a significant role in international politics. The case of Israel and North Korea can be seen as an example. They continue their precarious existence despite the combined opposition of the allied nations; they have power to maintain an assertive foreign policy. The military strength is closely linked to their resourcefulness and the development of their industry.

Domestic Determinants of Foreign Policy

Like the external determinant factors, scholars agree that the internal environment of state also influence the nature and course of its foreign policy. Countries differ in size, socioeconomic development and political regime. They also differ in their political institutionalization and societal structures, military and economic capabilities, and strategic cultures. In the same vein, public opinion, national role conceptions, decision making rules and personality traits of political leaders vary from one state to another [26]. These differences according to Taner, "directly affect both foreign policy making process and foreign policy decisions." By this, the "stuff of foreign policy derives from issues of domestic politics as well as foreign relations." Laura Neack argued. According to Kissinger also, ".....the domestic structure is not irrelevant in any historical period. At a minimum, it determines the amount of social effect which can be devoted to foreign policy."

Therefore, we shall now look into those domestic factors that may shape the foreign policy formulation and implementation of states.

Culture and history

Culture provides people with ways of thinking, seeing and interpreting the things around them. It shapes our ideas and serves an instrument for us in analyzing everything happening around us. Everything from our racial features, to the food we eat, the way we dress, the language we speak, the music we listen to, and where we live, all form a part of culture.

In Frode Liland's dictum, "the cultural side of foreign policy is a vast and treacherous area." However, a heated debate exists among scholars on whether and how culture impacts and shapes a state's foreign and security policy in particular as well as international relations in general. Nevertheless, many scholars of international relations argued vividly that the way we think (i.e., our culture) has an effect on the policies we make. Vlahos argued that "pattern of thought and behavior are shaped by culture; they are not the product of mere nationalism." Frode again asserted that cultural diplomacy has deep root and can easily be found in the archives of foreign ministers. A nation inherits a style and culture which in turn influence and decide the course of actions, the nation has to follow in relation to other sovereign states.

Again, the external affairs of a state are to a large extent the legacy of its history and cultural heritage. The approach of a nation to the foreign problems is determined by its traditional values and beliefs which have emerged on periods of years. Historical experiences, like culture and traditions of a state, exert influence on its foreign policy. In general, states with unified culture and common history finds it easier to formulate effective and consistent foreign policy. In such a case, overwhelming majority of people, who share similar experiences and common perceptions of historical events, support the state's foreign policy. However, countries with divergent cultures and various historical experiences in its different parts, find it difficult to formulate foreign policy in unison. The relationship between the Gambia and Senegal is a clear testimony of this fact. The two countries virtually share same cultural ties with the exception of official languages. The two sister countries have effective foreign policy due to shared cultural values.

Colonization, is another dimension of the historical experiences that influence the foreign policy of states. The foreign policy of many Asian and African states is shaped by their former colonial masters, notably Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal. This is more illustrated among French Speaking African countries, such as Senegal, Mali, Benin, Togo, Ivory Coast etc. France, obviously becomes their best and strategic ally in world affairs. Same can be said about the former British colonies or members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, like Gambia, Ghana, Cameroon, Cyprus etc.

Geography, size and population

The size of a state's territory, its geography and population greatly influence its foreign policy implementation. It is generally believed that leaders and people of states with small territory and population do not expect their country to carry out heavy weight in international affairs. For example, Gambia, Benin, Brunei, Kyrgyzstan etc. On the other hand, leaders of large countries are ready and willing to assume special and larger responsibilities in global affairs. For instance, United States, Russia and China, are active players in world politics due to their gigantic size.

However, that is not to say that, all small states do not take active roles in international affairs. Some small states which have rich resources in terms of economics and power, are very active and leave a deep impact on world politics. For instance, Israel and North Korea are playing a very active role in international politics. Same is true for that of the oil-rich countries of the Middle East, though small in size are playing a significant role in international politics, especially in international political economy [27]. In the meantime, large countries like Canada, Australia and Brazil have not been playing active and effective foreign policy. Thus, it can be argued that size is not an

absolute factor but rather gets influenced by other factors like resources at a state's disposal.

The geopolitical location of a state is one of the unrefuted factor that determines a country's foreign policy. In Amer Rizwan's dictum, "it matters where on the globe a country is located. It matters whether the country has natural frontiers: that is whether it is protected by oceans, high mountains, or desserts. It matters who one's neighbors are and whether a given country is territorially large, populous, affluent and well-governed."

The location of a state has a significant impact on its foreign policy. Example of such states includes Turkey, Israel, The Gambia, and Libya. Turkey, with its location as a transit point between Europe and Asia, undoubtedly has profound impact on her foreign policy implementation. Same is true for the Gambia, due to its geographical location on the Atlantic Coastline. Moreover, in the 19th century, the United States has adopted isolationist policy mainly on account of its geographical location.

Although the significance of geographical location cannot be overemphasized, its importance has considerably declined due to technological and scientific developments. Nevertheless, geographical location of a country has a deep impact on the determination of its foreign policy. In Dr. Eayers words, "Pacts may be broken, treaties unilaterally denounced, but geography holds its victim fasts."

Economic development and natural resources

The level of economic development of a country also influences the foreign policy of that country. Many advance industrialist countries play dominant role in world politics, and formulate their foreign policies to maintain such superiority in the system. Such countries like United States, Russia, Germany and France have large resources at their disposal to build military capabilities on one hand, and disperse monetary benefits on other states in the form of aids and loan, with the sole aim of 'seeking allies' with these states.

It is in line with this that, the US has been able to pursue vigorous foreign policy and secure its national interest, which can be highly related to its degree of economic and technological development. It has made liberal use of 'foreign aid' as an instrument for the promotion of its foreign policy goals. A clear example of this can be seen in United Nation's condemnation of Donald Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The US ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley said that "... we don't expect those we've helped to target us. ... the US will be taking names." In addition, the president of the United States, Donald Trump threatened to cut off financial aid to countries that vote in favor of a draft UN resolution to reject the US's decision on Jerusalem as Israel's capital. In an interview, he said explicitly "They take hundreds of millions of dollars and even billions of dollars, and then they vote against us. Well, we're watching those votes. Let them vote against us. We'll save a lot. We don't care."

On the other hand, small states like The Gambia pursue a limited and calculated foreign policy due to their insufficient economic power [28]. Therefore, it can be seen that developing and undeveloped countries remain dependent on these advance industrialist countries to a larger extent to get development loans, import of technologies, provision of health care, access to higher education, and even food-grains to meet their needs. Thus, accordingly it has to adjust its foreign policy in these economic terms.

Moreover, in recent years, we have seen that Germany is playing leading role in Europe's politics despite not being permanent member of UNSC, and being a non-nuclear state. It can rightly be argued that Germany's increased leadership is entirely attributed to its economic development. Also, the emergence of China and India on world stage is based on their economic resurgence in recent years. On the contrary, in post-cold war period, Russia's influence decreased to a considerable extent as its economic power has diminished after the disintegration of USSR.

The available natural resources that a state has, influences the foreign policy of those states. These resources include minerals, gas, petroleum or crude oil, and water resources, which are abundant in Africa and Middle East. It can be seen that such countries in these regions are considered small; however with such abundant natural resources at their disposal, despite their size they play a crucial role in international politics. This, according to Rizwan has made Middle East to have leverage in world politics due to oil diplomacy of the region. Due to their oil power, small states in the Middle East such as Qatar, Bahrain and Kuwait, pursue foreign policy more confidently and assertively.

Military capabilities

The military strength of a country, also determines the foreign policy strategy of states. The capability of a state to defend its borders against armed aggression plays a profound role in both internal and external policies that states make. Militarily capable states exercise greater independence from external forces in the formulation of their foreign policy. In the same vein, increase in the military capabilities of a state might result in change in its foreign policy; from peaceful to an aggressive foreign policy. For instance, India has acquired new dimensions after 'nuclearisation', as it attempts to get the status equivalent to the P-5 countries. The same can be said about North Korea, with her possession of new weapons of mass destruction, it is directing her foreign policy towards an aggressive one. This is to say that, states with high military capabilities such as US, China and Russia, tend to be active and vigorous in pursuing their foreign policy objectives in the international system.

On the other hand, states with weak or low military capabilities tend to be more salient in the pursue of their policy goals and most often depend on ally seeking with greater powers and international organizations for their protection [29].

Political system

The political organization and institutions in a country, also greatly influences the foreign policy of that country. Generally, under authoritarian or totalitarian forms of government, easier and faster foreign decisions are possible because the decision-making power rests with an individual assisted by his clique. They are the sole decision makers and as their decisions are made without any constraints or consultations, their foreign policy decisions can be conflictual. It is also observed that decision making under such closed systems have often, if not always, lead to a country's isolation in international politics as happened with the regimes in North Korea and Myanmar.

On the other hand, in a state with democratic system, foreign policy implementation tends to be difficult and slow as compared to that of an authoritarian structure. Citizens in this system can freely express and voice their opinion on the domestic as well as foreign policies of their country, making an impact on the policies their government is

pursuing. Democratic leaders tend to respond to these public demands and formulate a foreign policy within it.

In the same vein, Kitol asserted that the different political structures in a democratic system itself have its impact on foreign policy. For instance, under a parliamentary system of government based on co-operation between the Legislature and the Executive body, the cordial relation between these two wings, have an impact on a country's foreign policy. On the other hand, under presidential system of government based on the principles of separation of powers, the relation between the two wings are non-cordial and likely to be strained, which affect the ambiguity or the continuity of foreign policy [30]. Similarly, different foreign policy is likely to emerge under bi-party and multi-party systems. Under bi-party system the government is likely to have a clear-cut majority and conduct itself in a more decisive manner regarding the conduct of foreign relations. In contrast, under multi-party systems, conflicting views and interests may occur. This may lead either to the avoidance or postponement of the decision.

Personality and character of the leader

Leadership in general, the personality of a leader in particular plays a profound role in foreign policy formulation. The role of personality in foreign policy encompasses cognitive processes, and assumes that decision making is the result of individual 'human agency'; that is, ultimately, it is 'individuals' who make decisions, not 'states'. Thus, personality can be important in adding to our understanding of foreign policy behavior. However, its relevance some scholars argue, is dependent upon the constraints of the international system as well as domestic political structure. Rosenau said, "A leader's belief about the nature of international arena and the goals that ought to be pursued therein, his or her peculiar intellectual strengths and weakness for analyzing information and making decisions, his or her past background and the extent of its relevance to the requirements of the role, his or her emotional needs and most of other personality traits these are but a few of the idiosyncratic factors that can influence the planning and execution of foreign policy." Though, the government structure and societal realities are believed to constrain the character of a leader, during crisis time the leader shows the path to the government and society.

Leaders have been categorized into two: 'hawks'—those who advocate an aggressive foreign policy based on strong military power, and 'doves'—those who are termed as conciliatory and try to resolve international conflicts without the threat of force. According to Hermann, an aggressive leader can be characterized by certain attributes as tendency to manipulate others, high need for power, paranoia, high levels of nationalism, and a vigorous willingness to initiate on behalf of their state. Whereas conciliatory leaders on the other hand, are the opposite of the above. They possess attributes such as a desire for affiliation and friendly relations with other, low level of nationalism, etc. From this, due to their aggressive foreign policy, leaders like Hitler, Mussolini, George W. Bush, Donald Trump, and King Jong-Un of North Korea, can be categorized as 'hawks', while leaders such as Abraham Lincoln, Barack Obama, Sir Dawda Jawara and Emmanuel Macron of France, can be classified as 'doves'.

Again, while Winston Churchill's astute leadership had steered England to victory in the Second World War, the British participation in the 2003 Iraq War, has been characterized as "Tony Blair's War", with many believing that the personality and leadership style of the prime minister played a crucial part in determining British participation in the war.

Political parties and interest groups

Political parties are vital to modern political settings. They play an important role in shaping representative democracy in a country. They have a greater say in the foreign policies of their countries and usually voice their interest directly or through interest groups. Under multi-party system and coalition governments, political parties (i.e., the opposition party) always have conflicting views and interests, which may alter the formulation of foreign policy.

Scholars from the neoliberal approach to international politics (e.g. Keohane), accentuate the decisive influence of organized interest groups on foreign policy. In this view, leaders or government officials with foreign policy authority bargain with domestic interest groups that use their member's votes, campaign contributions, labor strikes or other tools to affect the electoral benefits and costs to elected officials of choosing alternative policies. For example, Keohane and Milner, traced targeted government subsidies and trade protections to the influence of well-organized and financed groups; while Snyder attributes defense policy to logrolling coalitions. Organized labor and business corporations possess critical resources for pressuring policy makers. Galenson asserts that, with mission as protecting the jobs and benefits of their members, "Labor leaders have spoken out often on foreign affairs."

Moreover, due to the increase in interconnectedness and the rapid growth of globalization, pressure groups have more interests in the foreign policies of states [31]. They influence these policies when interacting with states at the international and domestic level.

In Robert H. Thrice's insight, "Interest groups can be viewed as auxiliary actors that stand between the government and the mass public, tied to the governments decision-making system by channels of communication." These interest groups have mobilized a diverse area ranging from business, labor, ethnic, health, environmental, human rights, etc. Thus, it becomes impossible for governments to turn a blind eye on their existence.

Press and public opinion

Again, in Thrice's dictum, "the domestic sources of foreign policy are widely recognized and include interest groups, mass public opinion, and the printed and electronic media." Tomz et al, distinguished two pathways through which the public could shape policy outcomes: selection and responsiveness. "First, the public could exert influence by selecting parties or candidates whose foreign policy positions best match their own. Second, after politicians take office, leaders may respond to public opinion out of concern that rebuffing the public could be politically costly." With strong experimental evidence, their study concluded that public opinion affects foreign policy in democracies, both by shaping who is elected and by influencing leaders once they take office. Leaders in countries with advance democracy, consider opinion poll before making any crucial policy decision. The 2003 Iraq war for instance, was initially supported by the American public, which the United States used as an excuse for the invasion despite the international outcry of the unjust nature of the war. The Bush administration had to make a decision by going to war or face the exit door of the white house. At this point, it is worth knowing whether public opinion matter in non-democracies as much as in democracies. The short answer to this according to Neack, is 'Yes'. She argued that leaders of any type of regime need to pay attention to opponents and whatever resources those opponents wield.

The media is agreed by many scholars to play a significant role in influencing the policies and decisions leaders make. There exists a phenomenon called the “CNN effect”, which Joseph Nye explains as:

The free flow of broadcast information in open societies has always had an impact on public opinion and the formation of foreign policy. By focusing on certain conflicts and human right problems, broadcast pressure politicians to respond to some foreign problems and not others. The so-called CNN effect makes it harder to keep some items off the top of the public agenda that might otherwise warrant a lower priority.

In Neack’s insight, those who believe in the reality of the CNN effect, propose that it makes use of public opinion. As the media broadcast images of mass starvation, ethnic conflict, violent human right abuses, and other sort of mass suffering; the images arouse strong emotions in the public. Then in turn the public, aroused by those images of suffering portrayed in the media, will demand from their elected officials to do ‘something’ strong and morally correct response. Obviously, elected officials wanting to stay in the public’s favor for all sorts of reasons, will respond to these demands with some sort of humanitarian or military intervention, or whatever action is necessary in the immediate term.

In addition, Rubenzer, in analyzing the role of ‘social media’ (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube etc.) in foreign policy implementation, argued that the social media as it becomes more accessible, becomes one means by which people, non-state actors and governments can share their foreign policy priorities in an effort to receive feedback, engage in diplomacy, educate people, and attempt to influence foreign policy outcomes. This denotes that the media plays a profound role in setting the public agenda and eventually influencing foreign policy decisions.

Science and technology

Just as media, technology has brought a tremendous amount of change in the areas of foreign policy and diplomacy. Hillary Clinton in her tenure as secretary of state, once said “Just as the internet has changed virtually every aspect of how people worldwide live, learn, consume and communicate, connection technologies are changing the strategic context for diplomacy in the 21st century.”

The recent advances in technology has transcend almost all areas of international affairs and indeed open up vast new areas of communication, cooperation and even conflicts among states in their pursuit of security, development and progress. Science and technology considerations are often central to the interaction of states with other governments. It plays a large role in discussions of such critical topics as nuclear non-proliferation, use of outer space, population growth, adequate and safe food supply, climate change, energy resources, and competitiveness of industrial technologies. In the addressing of these issues, expert science and technology knowledge is significant to the anticipation and resolution of problems and to the achievement of foreign policy goals.

As such, the profound impact of science and technology on human society and national security has made states and foreign policy professionals to use it as a tool in successfully negotiating international affairs. Technology in this sense may be seen as a driver for both power and legitimacy in the areas of foreign affairs and diplomacy. Leaders especially in the advance industrialized countries, use this technology in raising awareness, promoting global culture, and spreading democracy throughout the world.

The advance industrialized countries transfer this technological equipment and the technical know-how, to developing countries. However, in the transfer of this technology, advance industrialized countries exert such leverages or interests to mould their foreign policy. This technological transfer especially in the military sphere has further increased developing world’s dependency on advance countries. Rosenau rightly said, “technological changes can alter military and economic capabilities of a society and thus its status and role in the international system.” Today, it can rightly be argued that U.S.A, Germany, China and Japan are in a position to play crucial roles in international politics due to their technological excellence. Also, the aggressiveness of present day North Korea in global affairs is due to their military capabilities which was enhanced by the advance in technology of the country. The recent conduct of its 6th nuclear test in 3rd September 2017, is a testament of this validity. In sum, the technological advancement of a country, changes her role and status in world politics.

Conclusion

Foreign policy decision-making entails series of processes and involves different actors. It plays an enormous role in the international affairs of a state. Without a properly formulated foreign policy, a state is tended to lose its position and prestige in world affairs and will eventually lead to a decline in achieving its national interest, whereas the opposite is true of countries with well formulated foreign policies. Thus, fully understanding the meaning and concept of the term foreign policy, is quite important for both policy makers, students and researchers.

The foreign policy of every state is influenced by mainly two determinants; ‘international’/external and ‘domestic’/internal. These are considered as factors which help in shaping and moulding foreign policy of a country. However, the linkage between international and domestic determinants has long been a widely debated topic in the field of international relations and Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) in particular. While others argue that domestic politics and foreign policy are two ‘independent’ arenas of issue, others are of the view that foreign policy and domestic politics are ‘interdependent’ and could spill over into each other.

Since foreign policy in general is about the interaction of a state with another, this interaction only takes place at the ‘international’ level and as such, cannot be ignored in analysing the foreign policy of any state. Hence, the international system or power structure, international law, international organizations, alliances, and military strength or arm race, all influence foreign policy implementation.

The internal environment of a state also influences the nature and course of its foreign policy. Countries differ in size, socioeconomic development and political regime. They also differ in their political institutionalization and societal structures, military and economic capabilities, and strategic cultures. In the same vain, public opinion, national role conceptions, decision making rules and personality traits of political leaders vary from one state to another. These differences directly affect both foreign policy making process and foreign policy decisions. By this, it is argued that the stuff of foreign policy derives from issues of domestic politics as well as foreign relations.

While both school of scholars made convincing arguments, however, the level of influence between domestic and international determinants of foreign policies varies from state to state and the political environment in which these states exist. In some cases,

international factors play a major role, whereas in other cases, domestic determinants are more important.

References

1. Ozkececi-Taner B (2017) Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy.
2. Bojang MBS (2017) Domestic Factors Affecting Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process: The Case of The Gambia.
3. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-qdv6h8WKg>
4. Dinesh (2016) Foreign Policy: 16 Elements of Foreign Policy.
5. Dyson SB (2006) Personality and Foreign Policy: Tony Blair's Iraq Decisions. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2: 289-306.
6. Ebaye SEN (2010) Utility of Military Strategy as an Instrument of Foreign Policy. *African Research Review* 4.
7. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-24951115>
8. Feliks G (1994) *Foreign Policy Analysis*. New York, philosophical library.
9. Held D, McGrew AG, Goldblatt D, Perraton J (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press pp:14.
10. Jacobs LR, Page BI (2005) Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy? *American Political Science Review* 99: 107-123.
11. Frankel J (1963) *The Making of Foreign Policy*. Oxford University Press pp: 231.
12. Kissinger HA (1966) Domestic Structure and Foreign Policy. *Daedalus* 95: 503-529.
13. <http://kenngeny.blogspot.com.tr/2012/07/determinants-of-foreign-policy.html>
14. Yitan L (2008) Domestic vs. International determinants of foreign policy: An empirical investigation of the case of China-Taiwan, 1991-2000.
15. Frode L (1993) *Culture and Foreign Policy: An Introduction to Approaches and Theory*.
16. Morgan TC, Palmer G (2013) To Protect and to Serve: Alliances and Foreign Policy Portfolios. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47: 180-203.
17. Laura N (2008) *The New Foreign Policy: Power Seeking in a Globalized Era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
18. Padelford NJ, Lincoln GA (1963) *The Dynamics of International Politics*. Macmillan Company 19: 381-382.
19. Oran B (2011) *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1919-2006: Facts and Analyses with Documents*. Utah University press.
20. Amer R (2009) *An Introduction to Foreign Policy: Definition, Nature & Determinants*.
21. Trevo R (2017) *Social Media and Foreign Policy*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics.
22. Sanford JE (1992) *International Organizations as an Instrument of Foreign Policy*.
23. Caitlin S (2012) *Personality in Foreign Policy Decision-Making*.
24. Sotong M (2013) *International Law and Foreign Policy: a mutual influence*.
25. <http://www.atomcentral.com/the-cold-war.aspx> accessed 27/10/2017
26. *The Yearbook of International Organizations*. Union of International Associations.
27. Thrice RH (1978) Foreign Policy Interest Groups, Mass Public Opinion and the Arab-Israeli Dispute. *Political Research Quarterly* 31: 238-252.
28. Michael T, Weeks J, Yarhi-Milo K (2017) How Does Public Opinion Affect Foreign Policy in Democracies?
29. Michael T, Weeks J, Yarhi-Milo K (2008) Reputation and the Effect of International Law on Preferences and Beliefs.
30. *The Impact of Technology on Foreign Affairs: Five Challenges*. Foreign Policy Association.
31. (1999) *The Pervasive role of Science, Technology and Health in Foreign Policy: Imperatives for the Department of State*. National Academies Press.