

Monograph  
No-107

## Foreign Policy Analysis and Decision Making Issues

**S.S.Patagundi**



**Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research  
(CMDR)**

Yalakkishettar Colony, Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, Lakamanahalli  
Dharwad – 580004, Karnataka, India.  
[www.cmdr.ac.in](http://www.cmdr.ac.in)

January  
2021

# Foreign Policy Analysis and Decision Making Issues

S.S.Patagundi\*

## Abstract:

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) involves the study of foreign policy decision making, domestic and international politics. It also involves understanding of several theoretical perspectives on foreign policy and international relations. Foreign policy analysis provides a framework of theoretical integration based on various theories. The true promise of foreign policy analysis must be theoretical integration: the integration of theoretical insights across several levels to develop a more complete perspective on foreign policy decision making (Velerie M.Hudson and Benjamin S.Day, 2019: 191). Therefore, foreign policy analysis is important in understanding decision making. In this monograph ,an attempt has been made to examine the importance of theoretical integration in foreign policy analysis focusing on the decision making issues.

Keywords: Analysis, theory, foreign policy analysis, structure, actor and world order

## Introduction

Theory provides an analytical framework for understanding the reality of an event or issue. The primary objective of acquiring theoretical knowledge is to understand the problems of society and address them. Therefore, societies strive to ensure a better understanding of the problems confronting the people. According to David Edwards, improving our understanding of international politics will depend basically on two intellectual operations: analysis and theory building. Analysis consists of essentially of decomposing or breaking down into its parts the subject matter we wish to understand (David V. Edwards, 1969:35). The analysis involves dividing the subject of international politics and politics of foreign policy into the components parts or issues or variables according to the objectives of the study and understanding their interrelationship. The complexity of analysis and theory tends to have a number of debates based on various perspectives. Such debates contribute to a meaningful understanding and explanation of foreign policy. Foreign policy is an almost perfect subject

---

\* ICSSR Senior Fellow, Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research, Dharwad-580004 and can be reached at Patagundi53@gmail.com

for examining in detail the fundamental debates within the social sciences, most significantly, the debate on the relative importance of structures and agency, and the debate on whether we should seek to explain or to understand foreign policy behaviour (Steve Smith et al., 2008:3).

Theory consists of abstract, simplified, and general propositions that answer “why” and “how” questions such as “why do wars begin?” or “how do collective identity shape our behaviour?” (Richard W. Mansbach and Kristen L. Rafferty 2008:14). The lack of theory in foreign policy research cannot be readily justified or explained (James N. Rosenau 1971:105). A theory is not merely an attempt at asking questions, it is also an effort to answer (Stanley Hoffmann, 1964:29). Theory involves asking pertinent questions and answering by organising and interpreting data ultimately aiming at understating reality of the phenomenon. J David Singer defines the theory of international relations as a body of internally consistent empirical generalizations of descriptive, predictive, and explanatory power ([www.politicalsciencereview.com](http://www.politicalsciencereview.com)>theoriesandapproachesofinternational). In the words of Christopher Hill, foreign policy is the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations (Christopher Hill, 2003:3). Foreign policy is the total of decisions made on behalf of a given political unit (usually a state) entailing the implementation of goals with direct reference to its external environment (Steve Smith and others, 2008:392). The definitions of IR theory and foreign policy indicate that theory is a generalisation based on logic for explaining the phenomenon.

Conducting a country’s external relations with other countries is significantly influenced by the actors and institutions of domestic politics as well as the international system. According to Peter Gourevitch, there are no good theories of domestic politics for explaining the conduct of foreign relations of a country with other countries. Some IR theories implicitly or explicitly deal with formulating foreign policy. Kenneth Waltz (1959) was among the first to introduce a scheme into international relations focusing on theories of war, not a foreign policy per se, he made the distinction between individual, national and international explanations of state behaviour (International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume 3, and 2008:170). There have been intellectual discussions on the difference between theories of IR and theories of foreign policy. Perhaps it is difficult to unmistakably differentiate between theories of IR and foreign policy since the subject matter of IR and foreign policy is common and it is not possible to separate them by demarking their scope of jurisdiction. Because of this, there is no contradiction between theories of foreign policy and international relations. One of the most obvious differences between foreign policy studies and studies of the international

system is that the former concentrate on individual state's behaviour and the variables that explain the critical actions of each actor whereas, the latter focuses on actors from the perspective of the system as a whole (Raymond F. Hopkins and Richard W.Mansbach,1973:20). It explains the commonality between the subject matter of IR and foreign policy. The Walker School's attempt to bridge IR and FPA through behavioural IR is deserving of special mention for its theoretical ambition (Valerie M.Hudson and Benjamin. S. Day 2019:212). This invokes linkages between foreign policy and international relations. Therefore, analysis and theory building in international politics including foreign policy is significant in understanding any phenomena and creating knowledge for dealing with problems of international society and politics in general. FPA has constantly engaged with the broader debates in the discipline of IR from challenges to realism's key concepts, to introducing IR to new literature, to employing a new type of methodology that of a middle-range theory (Chris Alden and Amnon Aran 2017:15).

### **Levels of Analysis**

An important dimension of the FPA is, its commitment to provide multi explanations by committing to an analysis of all variables (if necessary) at all levels of analysis, from the most micro to the most macro, from individual to state to international system, so long as demonstrated to have influenced policymakers (Sharifulla Dorani 2019:81). According to Valerie Hudson, FPA has since the 1950s sought answers to inter-state relations by looking at three levels involved in foreign policy: individual (psychological/sociological studies), groups (group-based analyses) and the states themselves(comparative foreign policy) (Steve Smith et al.,2008:6). Explanatory variables from all level of analysis, from the micro to the macro, are of interest to the analyst to the extent that they affect the decision-making process (Valerie M. Hudson 2005:2). One of the major problems in foreign policy analysis is whether to focus on only one level or multi-levels of analysis for explaining the foreign policy position. The three levels of analysis are interrelated. Therefore, focusing on a specific level of analysis segregate from other levels may not be able to make the study complete and it may not be of much meaning for foreign policy decision making. An integrated three-level analysis makes the understanding of a phenomenon realistic and therefore useful for analysing foreign policy decision making better. From this viewpoint, multi-level analysis plays a vital role in understanding the diverse and multifaceted problems of politics of foreign policy. This involves the importance of issues of micro and macro-level politics of foreign policy. Rosenau argues that multiple levels of analysis, ranging from the most micro to the most macro, should ideally

be integrated into the service of middle-range theory building (Valerie M. Hudson in Steve Smith et al., 2008:15). However, we find that the systemic level produces a more comprehensive and total picture of international relations than does the national or sub systemic level (J. David Singer, 1961:89).

### **Foreign Policy Analysis**

Historically, the study of foreign policy was a part of diplomatic history. The goal of Foreign policy analysis was to understand the determinants of foreign policy behaviour in a more theoretically oriented and empirically rigorous manner (International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume 3, and 2008:169). The dominant tendency within political science from the late 1940s to the early 1970s, behavioralism represented an effort to make the study of politics more scientific by focusing on the observable behaviour of individuals and groups, predominantly through quantitative survey research (Dictionary of the Social Sciences edited by Craig Calhoun, 2002:38). Further, though the behaviourism emerged in political science in the 1930s, the debate on traditional approach versus scientific or behavioural approach to the study of international relations became more rigorous in the 1960s following the publication of an article by Hedley Bull on International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach in the Journal of World Politics, April 1966. The goal of foreign policy analysis in the 1960s was to study the determinants of foreign policy behaviour in a more theoretically oriented and empirically rigorous manner (International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 2nd Edition Volume 3, and 2008:169). The Scientific or behavioural approach believes that objectivity is imperative to the study of international relations. In the late seventies and eighties, two new schools of thoughts namely global dependency and interdependency emerged within the post behavioural approach questioning traditionalists as well as behaviourists of international relations ([www.politicalsciencereview.com>theoriesandapproachesofinternational...](http://www.politicalsciencereview.com/theoriesandapproachesofinternational...)). The tendency of the importance of non-state actors in the politics of foreign policy began to grow in a globalised world particularly in the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and in the initial period of the 21st century.

Foreign Policy Analysis as a subfield of international relations emerged in the 1950s. In brief, Foreign Policy Analysis is the study of the conduct and practice of relations between different actors, primarily states, in the international system (Chris Alden and Admnon Aran 2017:3). Foreign policy analysis theory is rich, detailed, multilevel, multidisciplinary, and centred on foreign policy decision making as it is performed by policymakers (Valerie

M.Hudson and Benjamin S. Day, 2019:191). So FPA integrates multilevel foreign policy studies based on various theoretical perspectives and provides an analytical framework. FPA research in terms of literature has been considerably growing. The true promise of FPA must be theoretical integration: the integration of theoretical insight across these several levels to develop a more complete perspective on foreign policy decision making (Valerie M.Hudson and Benjamin S. Day, 2019:191). These involve several theoretical perspectives of FPA for explaining the behaviour of individual and groups of countries in the context of decision making. IR theories focus mostly on the country as the level of analysis to explain foreign policy or foreign policy behaviour, FPA focuses on the study of dealing with human decision-makers, 'acting singly or within groups' as well as those factors that influence the policymakers when making foreign policy (Shariullah Dorani 2019:70).

For purposes of foreign policy analysis George Modelski defines power as the community's present means to obtain the future desirable behaviour of other states (George Modelski 1962:21). In this respect, George Modelski's definition of power is based on Hobbes's definition of power. "Hobbes defined "the power of a man" as "his present means to obtain some future apparent good" (George Modelski 1962:21). In this context using power for changing the behaviour of other countries also involves the role and influence of groups of countries and global actors. Here, international institutions namely the UN and the WTO can be regarded as global actors representing the collective interest of international society. The relevance of foreign policy is growing in terms of its innovative contribution to how we understand the behaviour of international actors (Steve Smith et al., 2008:3). Hence, understanding global actors are important in explaining the foreign policy.

World politics and foreign policy are continuously changing in the light of fluctuating international situation. Foreign policy is concerned with understanding implications of bilateral and multilateral agreements, international organisations or institutions (intergovernmental organisations or global actors) such as the UN and WTO, actors of states and non-state actors like MNCs, international NGOs etc. It is also significant to explain the foreign policy based on situational issues of domestic politics as a part of decision making. Foreign policy analysis is a study of the management of external relations and activities of nation-states, as distinguished from their domestic policies (Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen, 2008:245).

Any effort to observe the relationship between causes and effects can be regarded as a scientific way of understanding of the matter but it is the most complex in foreign policy. Foreign policy analysis examines the causes and effects of changes in elements of foreign policy (George Modelski 1962:102). Domestic politics plays an important role in such changes in elements of foreign policy. There are no good theories to handle what happens when both are in play when each influences the other when the domestic politics of one country interacts with the domestic politics of another country, an interaction which itself helps define a system that reverberates back on the parts (Peter Gourevitch in Walter Carlsnaes et al., 2007:321). So the external behaviour of countries is significantly influenced by domestic politics and such issues are related to foreign policy decision making.

The following three paradigmatic works arguably built the foundation of foreign policy analysis:

- Pre-theories and Theories of Foreign Policy” by James N. Rosenau (1966).
- *Decision Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics* (1954), a monograph by Richard C. Snyder, H.W. Bruck, and Burton Sapin whose ideas were revised and expanded in their 1963 book (Richard C. Snyder, H.W. Bruck, and Burton Sapin, 1963).
- *Man-milieu Relationship Hypotheses in the Context of International Politics* by Harold and Margaret Sprout (1956), which was expanded and revised first in article form (Sprout and Sprout, 1957) and then in their 1965 book, *The Ecological Perspective on Human Affairs with Special Reference to International politics* (Valerie M. Hudson 2005: 5-6).

Foreign policy decision of a nation-state is a response to the domestic and international political situation. Influences of decision-making variables cannot be the same in different situations and consequently, the response of a nation-state cannot be the same for different internal and external situations. In James N. Rosenau’s view, FPA should not simply identify independent variables that influence foreign policy decisions. It should identify contextual variables, which determine the relative pertinence of one independent variable compared to another (Jean Frederic Morin and Jonathan Paquin 2018:343). Here, the argument is for the consideration of applicable or pertinent variables in order to understand reality.

James N. Rosenau believes that foreign policy analysis lacks comprehensive systems of testable generalisations that treat societies as actors subject to stimuli which produce responses (James N. Rosenau 1971:99). Further, he argues that foreign policy analysis is devoid of general

theory. It is equally commonplace to assume that one's responsibilities as a researcher are to articulate the premise that external behaviour of a country results from a combination of many factors, both external and internal, without indicating how the various factors combine under different circumstances (James N. Rosenau 1971:107). This implies that the influence of internal and external factors is according to a specific situation. Nevertheless, factors influential in the context of an international situation may not be influential in the context of another situation. James N. Rosenau's pre-theory of foreign policy does not believe in adopting only one set of variables. Pre-theory of foreign policy outlines integrating the main ingredients of any pre-theory of foreign policy and indicates how the researcher integrated ingredients in his pre-theory (James N. Rosenau 1971:108). According to James N. Rosenau, the behaviour of level that of national societies is shaped by individual, role, governmental, societal and systemic factors (James N. Rosenau 1971:109). Inter-linkages among these five factors are significant in explaining the foreign policy. On the whole, decision-making processes affect the external behaviour of nation-states. Foreign policy is shaped by internal as well as external factors and it is not to comprehend how the two intermix or to indicate the conditions under which one dominates over the other (James N. Rosenau, 1971:98). Christopher Hill's fundamental assumptions of FPA are that it generates middle-range theories, actors and structures engage in a continual process of mutual interaction, and deals with how the foreign policy-making process affects the outcome (Christopher Hill, 2011:918-919).

Scholarly attention to foreign policy decision making generally dates back to the 1954 publication of *Decision Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics* by Richard C. Snyder, Henry W. Bruck and Burton Sapin- the first systematic work look at the determinants of government foreign policy decision making (Alex Mintz and Karl De Rouen Jr. 2010:5). This work focuses on how decision-makers perceive international and domestic systems. Richard Snyder, Henry W. Bruck and Burton Sapin believe that those who study international politics are mainly concerned with the actions, reactions and interactions among the political entities called nation-states (Richard Snyder et al., 1962:199). In this regard, the nation-state is regarded as a principal actor of foreign policy decision making which is significantly influential in international politics. However, the nation-state is subjected to various constraints in a globalised world. There are more constraints because there were an increasing number of restrictions on the freedom of the state to act as it might wish; globalisation created a web of interdependence which undermines the nation state's ability to control its fate (Steve Smith et al., 2007:2-3). Harold and Margaret Sprout made a significant

contribution to the study of international relations from the ecological perspective. To explain undertakings, one needs to look at Sprout and Sprout termed “psycho-milieu” of individuals and groups making the foreign policy decision (Valerie M.Hudson 2005:6).

Actors and institutions are of paramount significance in foreign policy decision making. According to Walter Carlsnaes, there are two perspectives on understanding actors and structures namely approaches based on a structural perspective, consisting of realism, neoliberal institutionalism, organisational behavioural approaches and social constructivism; approaches from an actor-based perspective consisting of cognitive and psychological approaches, bureaucratic politics approach, liberal societal actor approach and interpretive actor perspective (Walter Carlsnaes in Steve Smith et al. (Ed.),2008:90-95). Such actors and structural approaches constitute a part of Foreign Policy Analysis.

Based on IR theories and specific theories from the sub-discipline of FPA, the following theoretical toolbox can be used to:

- Explain what states want in foreign policy.
- Understand how states take decisions in foreign policy issues and how the process itself matters.
- Analyse what states do in different areas of foreign policy (security, diplomacy, economic).
- Assess whether we are currently witnessing a transformation in the very nature of foreign policy” (Derek Beach, 2012:1).

If the Comparative Foreign Policy was not successful, the other two main strands of FPA, the work on psychological process and decision making had built up robust and powerful accounts of foreign policy (Steve Smith et al., 2008:4). FPA has evolved beyond both policy and decision making to include all the domestic sources of foreign policy and to some extent also the foreign sources of domestic policy (Christopher Hill, 2011:917). George Modelski outlines input and output linkages in FPA. Policymakers can be pictured as occupying that crucial point at which inputs are transformed into outputs; it is this key position that accounts for their importance to foreign policy analysis: inputs and outputs can be defined by reference to policymakers (George Modelski, 1962:5).

The diversity of perceptions of policy analysis reflects the different ways in which we think about policy, mobilising multiple and overlapping frameworks of meaning to make sense

of what we see and what we do, so we will need to dig deeper to get a fuller understanding of policy analysis (International Encyclopedia of Political Science, Volume 6, 2011:1893). So, there are divergent approaches or perspectives to the study of foreign policy. Synthetic approach to foreign policy is rich flora indeed, a surfeit of alternative approaches to FPA raises the question whether it is possible to synthesise or integrate at least some of these, or if we are willy-nilly obliged to choose between them (Walter Carlsnaes in Walter Carlsnaes et al., 2007:341-342). In this regard, Walter Carlsnaes makes it clear that “because of this array of contending approaches to the study of the role of actors and structures in FPA, it is generally agreed that there is a strong need at present for scholars to facilitate integrative frameworks of analysis, as well as to break the habit of viewing actors and structures as mutually exclusive rather than constitutive and interactive entities” (Walter Carlsnaes in Steve Smith et al., 2008:99). Foreign policy analysis considers that the study of both actors and structures are equally important. The focus of the study on actors and structures is determined by contextual factors in foreign policy decision making. The knowledge generated by FPA thus far: attempts to assess what may be feasibility expected of foreign policy and what may not (Christopher Hill 2003:24).

Since all foreign policy activities implicitly or explicitly are concerned with policymakers, and since policymakers can be conceived of as standing midway between inputs and outputs, their activities are a natural focus for the analysis of foreign policy (George Modelski, 1962:6). Individual human beings make foreign policy decisions but always within organisational structures, some of which will have formal responsibilities and are accountable to various types of organisations (Christopher Hill, 2011:920). Key policymakers’ have domestic institutional constraints to contribute to the successful functioning of international institutions. Though Woodrow Wilson played a substantially important role in establishing the League of Nations, the US was not able to join it since Senate did not approve it indicating how foreign policymakers are subjected to institutional constraints in taking decisions and implementing them. Most democrats, certainly Roosevelt and Truman, believed that America’s absence from the League of Nations was a major mistake- primitive Republican isolationism -that had led to its failure and outbreak of Second World War (Michael G. Roskin and Nicholas O. Berry, 2002: 302). Consequently, the United Nations came into existence on 24 October 1945 in place of League of Nations.

We focus on three theories: realism, liberalism and constructivism which contribute significantly to the understanding of FPA. Of course, the contribution of these three theories cannot be confined to FPA as they are comprehensive to explain the politics of foreign policy as well as international politics. Realist, liberal and constructivist tenets can all shed equally robust explanations on the external behaviour of sovereign states (Steve Smith et al., 2008:6). In view of this, the central argument of these theories is appraised in brief.

## **Realism**

Realist theory is of paramount significance among the international relations theories for explaining the foreign policy and international politics. Hans J. Morgenthau, the most renowned US realist scholar in the mid-twentieth century, periodically used realist ideas to inform trenchant critiques of his government's foreign policy (William C. Wohlforth in Steve Smith et al., 2008:40). Morgenthau's realist theory was developed as a response to the theory of idealism after the Second World War and these were discussed extensively. Hans J. Morgenthau refers to foreign policy analysis in his realist theory of international politics. Realist theories proceed from realism's three core assumptions of groupism, egoism and power centrism (William C. Wohlforth in Steve Smith et al., 2008:34). Morgenthau considers both domestic and international politics as a struggle for power and it is modified only by the different conditions under which this struggle for power takes place in the domestic as well as in the international sphere. His central argument was that the power struggle is universal in politics. By linking this view of power to the concept of the national interest, Morgenthau believed that he could provide a universal explanation for the behaviour of particular states (Walter Carlsnaes in Walter Carlsnaes et al., 2007:333). The argument of Morgenthau is as follows:

The situation is different when we deal not with social arrangements and institutions created by man, but with those elemental bio-psychological drives by which in turn society is created. Their relative strength is dependent upon social conditions that may favour one drive and tend to repress another, or that may withhold social approval from certain manifestations of these drives while they encourage others. Thus, to take examples only from the sphere of power, most societies condemn the killing as a means of attaining power within society, but all societies

encourage the killing of enemies in that struggle for power which is called war (Hans J.Morgenthau,1985:38-39).

According to Hans J.Morgenthau, statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined as power. Here power implies man's attempt to control the minds and actions of other men. Despite, the apparent overlap between realist theory and the dynamics of foreign policy, realist theories do not necessarily guarantee a clear and accurate analysis of foreign policy (William C.Wohlforth in Steve Smith et al., 2008:42).

Further, Morgenthau viewed that political power was the psychological relation between those who exercise it and those over whom it is exercised (Hans J.Morgenthau, 1985:32). In the context of all these issues, understanding the thinking of others plays a vital role. He argues that it stands to reason that not all foreign policies have always followed so rational, objective, and unemotional a course (Hans J.Morgenthau, 1985:7). This indicates that Morgenthau implicitly or explicitly considers the perspective of psychology in his theory.

### **Liberalism**

Liberalism contributes to the understanding of foreign policy by highlighting how individuals and the ideas and ideals they espouse (such as human rights, liberty, and democracy), social forces (capitalism, markets), and political institutions (democracy, representation) can have direct results on foreign relations (Michael W. Doyle in Steve Smith et al., 2008:50). Liberals theorists agree with the realists that states exist under anarchy, but they disagree regarding the nature of anarchy. (Michael W. Doyle in Steve Smith et al., 2008:59). Liberals do not agree with the realist notion that war is a natural condition of world politics. Liberals claim that foreign policies conducted between liberal democracies are more peaceful and law-abiding than are foreign policies involving countries which are not liberal democracies (Robert Jackson and Geog Sorensen, 2008:231). Liberal democracies believe in a peaceful settlement of disputes between the countries and most of the disputes are resolved through the international institution like the UN| WTO, norms and values. As a result, peaceful foreign policy behaviour can be manifested.

### **Social Constructivism**

Constructivism was introduced to IR by Nicholas Onuf (1989) who coined the term (Robert Jackson and Geog Sorensen, 2008:168). "Constructivism's core concepts – deliberation, arguing, norms, persuasion, identity, socialisation, arguing—are raised in debates

over globalisation, international human rights, security policy and more”(Jeffery T. Checkel in Steve Smith et al., 2008:72). The central concern of neo-realism is about the distribution of material power and defining balance of power. Based on this, the behaviour of the states is explained. Constructivists reject such a one-sided material focal point and constructivists argue that the most important aspect of IR is social, not material (Robert Jackson and Geog Sorensen, 2008:162). “Both varieties of constructivism give us a new set of lenses for thinking about actors (foreign policy bureaucracy) and dynamics (foreign policy decision making) long central to FPA. Constructivists explore how the interests of foreign policy actors are socially constructed” (Jeffery T. Checkel in Steve Smith et al., 2008:81). Besides, Jeffery Checkel argues that constructivism contributes to the understanding of the social dynamics of FPA. However, “Wendt’s type of constructivism is explicitly not designed for the analysis of foreign policy” (quoted Wendt, 1999:11 in Walter Carlsnaes in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (Eds.), 2007:339). According to the theory of constructivism, actors’ identities and interest play an influential role in foreign policy. The primary concern of constructivism is “ideas are social. Our mental maps are shaped by collectively held ideas such as knowledge, symbols, language and rules. Idealism does not reject material reality but instead observes that the meaning and construction of that material reality is dependent on ideas and interpretation” (Michael Barnett in John Baylis et al. (Eds.) 2008:163). Hence, foreign policy decision-makers’ identities and interests are influential in shaping decisions. Surely the next generation of FPA scholars will not only see constructivism more fully interface with FPA but hopefully, they will be a part of bringing such an interface to pass (Valerie M. Hudson and Benjamin S. Day.2019:224). So Constructivism continues to be relevant to FPA.

### **Foreign Policy Analysis in the Post-Cold War Period**

FPA considers continuously changing world order in explaining the foreign policy because of the context matters in foreign policy decision making. Hence, world order is regarded as one of the determinants of foreign policy decision making and it may be a part of understanding the international system. In view of this, we see FPA as a bridging field linking international theory, comparative politics, and foreign policymaking community (Valerie H. Hudson with Christopher S. Vore, 1995:228). The world order is an important influential variable for understanding and explaining foreign policy decision making. When the bipolar system collapsed with the fall of the Soviet bloc regimes, an important theoretical discovery was made: it is impossible to explain or predict system change based on system-level variables alone (Valerie M. Hudson in Steve Smith et al., 2008:26). The order may denote any regular

or discernible pattern of relationships that are stable over time, or may additionally refer to a condition that allows certain goals to be achieved (John Baylis et al., 2008:585). World order presents two principal aspects; how to reduce the number of wars and armed conflicts; and slumps and other economic turmoil by managing them (Peter Calvocoressi, 2004:150). Order in world politics emerges not from a balance of power but from interactions between many layers of governing arrangements comprising laws, agreed norms, international regimes and institutional rules (Steve Smith et al., in John Baylis et al., (Eds.), and 2008:5). According to Ian Clark, contemporary world order consists of the elements namely the social state system, identity and the nation-state, polarity and collectivisation of security, the organisation of production and exchange, multilateral management and governance, regionalism, the liberal rights order and north-south and two world orders (Ian Clark in John Baylis et al., 2008:564-567). It also indicates the power structure of the international system. The term 'New World Order' denotes the structural changes occur with implications for bilateral and multilateral power relations including the international system with the change in the perception of the nature of conflict, aggression and international peace. As a result of such developments, changes are manifested in equations among the actors and structures. After the Second World War, the international system was attributed to a bipolar world during the cold war period. During this period, the US and the Soviet Union emerged as superpowers and formed two blocs namely democratic or American Block under the leadership of the US and communist or Soviet bloc under the leadership of the Soviet Union. Britain was a dominant power before the Second World War. The dominance of Britain declined during the cold war period. Politics of the superpowers and ideological conflicts-based blocs, arms race and growing strength and role of nonaligned countries significantly influenced world politics during the cold war period. These may be important attributes of world order during the cold war period.

After the end of the cold war in 1991, the international system became a multi-polar world. In the context of the post-cold war period, it is pertinent to look into the changing dimensions of international politics and their implications for FPA. Foreign policy analysis in the post-cold war period retains the following distinctive theoretical commitments that demarcated at its inception:

- a commitment to look below the nation-state level of analysis to actor specific information;
- a commitment to build actor specific theory as the interface between actor general theory and complexity of the real world;

- a commitment to pursue multi-causal explanations spanning multiple level analysis;
- a commitment to utilising theory and findings from across the spectrum of social science;
- a commitment to viewing the process of foreign policy decision making as important as the output thereof (Valerie M. Hudson in Steve Smith et al. (Eds.), 2008:26-27).

If international life has indeed become more colourful in the sense that states are not only relevant actors, then there are a lot of new, exciting and challenging questions waiting for FPA (Rainer Baumann and Frank A. Stengel 2014:513). Issues of the post-cold war are multifaceted. There is no dearth of indicators such as the launching of wars by states and their efforts to negotiate post-war arrangements to highlight the many ways world politics is marked by continuity, it is hardly less difficult to demonstrate that major changes have been at work in the global system, changes of sufficient magnitude to suggest the emergence of new global structures, process and patterns (James N. Rosenau, 1995:193). Such new global structures, process and pattern began to considerably demonstrate in the Gulf War of 1991. Besides, the post-cold war world order marked the emerging forces of integration and disintegration. The USA continues its hegemony in world politics; the European Union and Japan emerged as influential powers in the post-cold war period. These developments are regarded as new dimensions of the post-cold war world order. A significant trend in the direction of post-cold war IR is that it has moved towards surveying the intellectual terrain historically explored by the FPA subfield (Valerie M. Hudson and Benjamin S. Day, 2019:28).

Issues influencing the international system may indicate the elements of world order in the 1990s. Fundamental changes in the international system occurred in the 1990s are as a result of the end of the cold war, the unification of East and West Germany, change in American foreign policy towards South Asia, the trend towards integration of Europe, the collapse of the Soviet Union in December 1991 and the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the growing prominence of economic issues in a globalised world etc. Regarding such global changes, James N. Rosenau viewed that the world is presently experiencing its first period of turbulence since the birth of the state system some 350 years ago (James N. Rosenau, 1995:194). According to James N. Rosenau, students of global politics have not begun to take account of the transformation at work within societies in the 1990s (James N. Rosenau, 1990:17). In this context, the responsive capability of a country determined by internal strength such as political stability, economy, and usage of advanced IT, non-state actors, proper training

of human resources, specifically the development of skills required for various sectors in an interdependent world. Understanding the complex nature of foreign relations from different perspectives is significant in the context of the end of the cold war. In view of such developments, a review of theoretical and methodological perspectives is imperative to address the challenges in the post-cold war period.

The bipolar world was replaced by a multi-polar world basically due to the end of the cold war following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the growing strength of developing countries to a considerable extent and Japan began to emerge as a super economic power etc. India has been in the process of emerging as a superpower based on its credibility in terms of contribution to international peace and security and importance of Indian human resource. India's credibility in the world has significantly gone up further during the period of the Narendra Modi government. As a result of this, India's claim for the permanent membership of the UNSC is substantially justifiable. Such changes in world order have implications for foreign policy decision making. Foreign policy decision-makers' role is to interpret the changed world order in the right perspective for ensuring sound decision to promote the national interest.

The failure to adequately theorise the state and account for the forces of globalisation, foreign policy change has been rather ignored by the classical FPA scholars (Chris Alden and Amnon Aran 2017:13). Globalisation has made international relations crucial to scholars of comparative politics, and issues about the internal workings of countries relevant to IR scholars (Peter Gourevitch in Walter Carlsnaes et al., 2007:313). The globalization of national economies is an important indicator of change in the international system as well as domestic politics. Marshall McLuhan's work (1964) on the Global Village is pertinent to understand its implications on society and politics. According to Marshall McLuhan, the main effects of advances in electronic communications were that time and space have been compressed to such an extent that everything loses traditional identity (Steve Smith et al., in John Baylis et al., (Eds.), 2008:9). The increasing interdependence of nation-states in the post-cold war era is mainly due to advancement in science and technology. As a result of this, technology has fostered the narrowing of social and political space; physical distances have been shortened, social distances have been narrowed, and economic barriers have been circumvented (James N. Rosenau, 1995:197). These would have certain implications for the foreign policy decision making of various countries. This has affected the sovereignty of nation-states to a considerable extent. In light of these developments, foreign policymakers made efforts to reorient the foreign

policy position of their respective countries in the post-cold war period. This task in the post-cold war era became a challenge to the foreign policymakers in both developed and less developed countries because the prevailing turbulence was profoundly non-linear, uneven in its evolution, uneven in its intensity, uneven in its scope and uneven in its direction (James N. Rosenau, 1995:200). “The actor-specific theory produced through foreign policy analysis has enormous theoretical, methodological, and policy potential: a potential that is only starting to be recognised as researchers work to develop theories that facilitate our understanding of why certain foreign policy decisions are made, at particular points in time, by individual decision-makers and collectivities of decision-makers” (Valerie H. Hudson, with Christopher S. Vore, 1995:229). According to Jean Frederic Morin and Jonathan Paquin the challenges of FPA are as follows:

1. In the 1970s, FPA researchers abandoned the idea of formulating a general theory that could explain all foreign policies. FPA rather produces middle range theories: they are only valid in clearly defined situations and only partially explain foreign policies. This epistemological humility, typical of FPA, is both strength and a weakness.
2. Adapting FPA beyond the American framework represents a further challenge.
3. FPA should not only widen its geographic scope and take an interest in countries that have been neglected until now, but it should also broaden the focus of its research and consider new categories of actors (Jean Frederic Morin and Jonathan Paquin 2018:342-345)

The COVID-19 pandemic has significant repercussions on the world order. The WHO is an independent international health body and it is one of the specialised agencies of the UN. The UN Security Council is under attack for being slow in dealing with Corona Virus situation that appears, at least on the surface, are graver than any military threat in recent decades, WHO has been tarred with the charge of bias and grossly underestimating the nature of the epidemic (M.K. Narayanan, The Hindu 2020:6). The US announced to halt its funding for WHO in May 2020 and subsequently decided to withdraw from the WHO because of the Mismanagement of the COVID-19 Pandemic problem. In this respect, the US accuses the WHO of being a puppet of China during the Corona Virus Pandemic period. These developments have significant implications for working the global health body of the WHO. The US withdrawal from the WHO is a setback and it weakens the WHO to a considerable extent in dealing with the pandemic. The concern of every member of the UN is how to strengthen the WHO

according to the interest of the international community in the context of the Corona Virus Pandemic problem.

The economic relations of every country with other countries change implicitly or explicitly in the post-COVID-19 world order since every country has been adversely affected by COVID-19 and it is adding a new dimension to the world Order. The COVID-19 lockdown is estimated to cost India \$4.5 billion each day, but that price which has been paid by India has meant that the survival rate in India has been one of the best rights the way across the world (Baroness Patricia 2020:9). For addressing COVID-19 problems and recovery of their economy, cooperation among countries through global multilateral forums is indispensable and growing in different forms. As a result, the importance of multilateralism has been considerably growing. International cooperation plays a vital role in handling the problem of Covid-19. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director-General of the WHO advocates “we cannot defeat COVID-19 with a divided world. Further his observation is that “the politicisation of the pandemic has exacerbated it” (The Hindu, 2020:12). Deterioration of relations between the US and China is manifested in recent times due to the impact of issues of COVID-19. Post Covid-19 world appears that it tends to major changes in the world politics and causes for initiating the process of emergence of new world order. With the global economy in the doldrums, globalisation in an irrecoverable crisis accentuated by COVID-19 outbreak, and the US under an isolationist president taking the most aggressive position towards China since Richard Nixon, Beijing believes the global order is at a breaking point (Stanly Johny 2020:6). Post –COVID -19 situations may tend to redefine foreign relations in the context of emerging world order since equations among the countries will change in the post-COVID-19 world order. FPA considers the implications of all these developments in the understanding of world order.

## **Conclusion**

Rosenau argued that FPA should strive for a greater degree of generalisation by going beyond simple case studies and the descriptive and interpretative approaches traditionally used in diplomatic history (1968)(James N, Rosenau quoted in Jean-Frederic Morin and Jonathan Paquin 2018:9). This brief study reveals that understanding the FPA perspectives in decision making contribute significantly to perceive the reality of the continuously changing world order and domestic politics in different contexts for dealing with problems of foreign policy in a

globalised world. Globalisation is an important force with implications for world politics and foreign policy analysis in the post-cold war period. Role of non-state actors is increasingly becoming more vital in the governance of nation-states as well as global governance. Global citizenship, global polity, global civil society, global justice etc. have their implications for world politics and foreign policy analysis. Assessing small group dynamics is pertinent in analysing the foreign policy decision-making process because political foreign policy elites are few and play a crucial role in parliamentary democracy; they are subjected to influence of institutional and ideological issues or variables. Paying adequate attention to the issues of the global south is necessary so that FPA can become more relevant in a globalised world.

Biographical Note: Dr. S.S.Patagundi is Former Professor of Political Science and Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Karnatak University, Dharwad. His areas of interest are linkages between domestic politics and foreign policy decision making with reference to the role of political parties and elites, political analysis and international relations. He is the author of two books, co-author of two books and co-editor of a book. Prof. Patagundi has published more than 35 articles in reputed journals and edited books. He has guided 12 PhD scholars and 16 M.Phil scholars. He participated in the IPSA World Congress, Montreal, (2014), Madrid (2012), IPSA Research Committee Conference, Oslo, (2008), Fukuoka (2006), and Durban (2003). He served as the Chairman of the Department of Political Science, Karnatak University, Dharwad, Dean Faculty of Social Sciences, KU, Dharwad and Founder Registrar, Rani Channamma University, Belagavi, Karnataka. He is presently ICSSR Senior Fellow, Centre for Multidisciplinary Development Research, Dharwad. He can be reached at [patagundi53@gmail.com](mailto:patagundi53@gmail.com)

### **Acknowledgements**

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the National Seminar on India's Foreign Policy in a Changing World Order held at the Centre for Multidisciplinary Development Research, Dharwad on 4&5 March 2020. The author gratefully acknowledges the authorities

of the ICSSR for awarding the Senior Fellowship. The author would like to thank Prof.V.B. Annigeri, Director, CMDR, Dharwad for his encouragement in writing this paper as a part of my ICSSR Senior Fellowship research project.

## References:

Alex Mintz and Karl De Rouen (2010), *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Baroness Patricia Scotland, Commonwealth Secretary-General Interview, *The Hindu*, 17 May 2020

Chris Alden and Amnon Aran 2017, *Foreign Policy Analysis: New Approaches*, London, Routledge

Christopher Hill (2003), *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Christopher Hill(2011), Foreign Policy Analysis, *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*, Volume 3, Los Angeles, Sage pp.916-928

David V. Edwards, (1969), *International Political Analysis*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp-35-47

Derek Beach (2012), *Analyzing Foreign Policy*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Dictionary of the Social Sciences edited by Craig Calhoun (2002), New York, OUP

George Modelski (1962), *A Theory of Foreign Policy*, London, Pall Mall Press

Hens J.Morgenthau (1985), *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Sixth Edition, New Delhi, Kalyani Publishers (Revised by Kenneth Thompson & First Indian Reprint)

Ian Clark, Globalisation and the Post-Cold War Order in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Eds.) (2008), *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford, OUP pp.562-573 and Definition of Order in Glossary p.585

*International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume 3 2008, New York, GALE CENGAGE Learning pp.169-172

J. David Singer, The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations, *World Politics* XIV October 1961-July 1962, pp. 77-92

James N. Rosenau (1971), *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*, New York, The Free Press & London, Collier- Macmillan Ltd.

James N. Rosenau (1990), *Turbulence in World Politics: Theory of Change and Continuity*, Princeton, Princeton University Press

James N. Rosenau, Security in a Turbulent World, *Current History*, 94 (592), May 1995, p.200

Jean Frederic Morin and Jonathan Paquin (2018), *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Toolbox*, Cham, Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan

Jeffery T. Checkel, Constructivism and Foreign Policy in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.) (2008), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP, pp.71-81

John C. Garnett (1984), *Commonsense and the Theory of International Politics*, London, Macmillan

M.K. Narayanan, The Script of Disruption and New Order, *The Hindu* 28 April 2020

Michael G. Roskin and Nicholas O. Berry (2002), *IR- The New World of International Relations*, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall of India

Michael Barnett, Social Constructivism in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Eds.) (2008), *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press pp.162-171

Michael W. Doyle, Liberalism and Foreign Policy in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.)(2008), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP, pp.49-69

Morton Kaplan, Problems of Theory Building and Theory Confirmation in International Politics, *World Politics*, October 1961-July 1962

Peter Gourevitch, Domestic Politics, in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (Eds.) (2007), *Handbook of International Relations*, Los Angeles, Sage pp.309—328

Rainer Baumann and Frank A. Stengel (2014), Foreign Policy Analysis, Globalisation and Non-state Actors: State Centric After All?, *Journal of International Relations and Development* 17(4) 2014 pp.489-521

Raymond F. Hopkins and Richard W. Mansbach, (1973), *Structure and Process in International Politics*, London, Harper & Row

Reprinted from Richard Snyder, H.W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (Eds.)(1962), *Foreign Policy Decision Making: An Approach to the Study of International Politics*, New York The Free Press from the authors and publishers, Copyright 1962 by the Free Press, A Division of the Macmillan Company

Richard W. Mansbach and Kristen L. Rafferty (2008), *Introduction to Global Politics*, London, Routledge

Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen (2008), *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford, Oxford University Press pp.222-247

Sharifullah Dorani, Foreign Policy Decision Making Approaches and Their Applications, *The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development* 9(2), Summer 2019 pp.69-82

Stanley Hoffmann (Ed.) (1964), *Contemporary Theory in International Relations*, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall of India, pp.1-12

Stanly Johny, Why China is Being Aggressive Along the LAC, *The Hindu*, 26 June 2020

Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.)(2008), *Introduction in Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP

Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne, Introduction, in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.)(2008), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP, pp.1-8

Steve Smith, John Baylis and Patricia Owens, Introduction in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Eds.) (2008), *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford, OUP pp.2-12

Sujatha Singh, India in the Post-Pandemic World, *The Hindu*, 28 April 2020

Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, *The Hindu*, 24 June 2020:12

Valerie M. Hudson, The History and Evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.)(2008), *Introduction in Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP

Valerie M.Hudson with Christopher S.Vore (1995), Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, *International Studies Review*, 39(2)1995, pp.209-238

Valerie M.Hudson (2005), Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations, *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1(1) March 2005 pp.1-30

Valerie M.Hudson and Benjamin S. Day (2019) Third Edition, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield

Walter Carlsnaes, Actors, Structures, and Foreign Policy Analysis in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.)(2008), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP, pp.86-100

Walter Carlsnaes, Foreign Policy in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (Eds.) (2007), *Handbook of International Relations*, Los Angeles, Sage pp.331-344

William C.Wohlforth, Realism and Foreign Policy in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (Eds.) (2008), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford, OUP, pp. 31-48

[www.politicalsciencereview.com>theoriesandapproachesofinternational](http://www.politicalsciencereview.com>theoriesandapproachesofinternational)