

**Ethiopian Foreign Policy and Diplomacy/CESt 3066**

**Wollo University**

**College of Social Science and Humanities**

**Department of Civics and Ethical Studies**

**Lecture Note on Ethiopian Foreign Policy and Diplomacy (CESt 3066)**



**Prepared by Jemal Seid, (BA in Civics and Ethical Studies, & MA in Foreign  
Policy and Diplomacy)**

**Dessie, Ethiopia**

**2019/2020**

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO FOREIGN POLICY AND DIPLOMACY

### 1.1. Foreign Policy Defined

Foreign policy has been variously defined. G.R. Berridge and Alan James define foreign policy in their book called “Dictionary of Diplomacy” as: 1) “The political and security policies adopted by a state in relation to the outside world”.(2) “All of the policies (including economic policies) adopted by a state in relation to the outside world”. Foreign policy is what one state does to, or with another state or other states – it is an aspect of *state’s external politics*. The central focus of foreign policy analysis is in the intentions, statements, and actions of an *actor* (often but not always a state) – directed toward the external world and the response of other actors to these intentions, statements, and actions.

James Rosenau has called foreign policy a “*bridging discipline*,” one with that must deal with between domestic and foreign issues, or the socio-political and economic *processes unfold at home and that transpire abroad* (1987a 1,3). Government of a state (sovereign independent) has a discrete set of actions/decisions (strategies) in its dealings with other states and non-state entities acting on the international stage. The consideration of foreign policy in international politics is ‘*who acts for whom and with what effect*’.

Foreign policies are the strategies used by governments to guide their actions in the international arena. Foreign policies spell out the objectives state leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situation as well as is the general means by which they intend to pursue those objectives. Day-to-day decisions made by various arms of government are guided by the goal of implementing foreign policies. According to some, the foreign policy of a state is the expression of its national interest *vis-à-vis* other states. Gibson in his book the road to Foreign policy defines it as... “a well rounded comprehensive plan, based on knowledge and experience, for conducting the business of the government with the rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interest of the nation.” Foreign policy is a plan of what you do in your relation with others in the global political system. It is also defined as all facets of interaction that transcends international boundary of a state. It is also defined as the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations. It includes

processes, principles, strategies, methods, means and objectives. It also refers to a set of priorities and plan of action or percepts established by national leaders to serve the guideline for choosing various courses of action (behavior) in specific situation as they strive to achieve their goals. It can further be referred as the process of identifying the elements which a state considers its vital national interest and designing effective strategies to attain and protect them.

The state has traditionally been viewed as the most important and basic unit in international relations. Every state is essential to the others at least in one or, depending on circumstances, in several ways. Therefore, states are necessarily related with each other in one way or another. It takes place with the purpose of achieving the goals of state's national interest. This is formulated in the form of a state's foreign policy. It may be shaped and influenced by different factors depending on time and circumstances. Foreign policy may generally be described as the official policy actions taken by one state towards other states. It involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which guide the actions of a state while negotiating with other state to protector further its national interest. It should, however, be noted that not all international contacts and relations are associated with foreign policy. Only those matters that originate with, or are openly or secretly sponsored by the government of a state may be considered as belonging to its foreign policy. That is, only 'official' or government directed relations between states is included in the concept of foreign policy.

A nation-state perennially faces the question what should the national goals be; we call foreign policy, and it is at once evident that not everything that could conceivably be desired is obtainable. The formulation of a desired foreign policy objective and its proper execution depend to a great extent on the possession of power. And it is a fact that, national power is limited for all states, big as well as small. Consequently the formulation of a realistic foreign policy depends on appraisal of the power reserve and other available resources. The fundamental task of foreign policy is usually defined as a continuous process of assessing of one's own and other nations' capacities and intentions. Formulation of foreign policy should be preceded by a good deal of situational analysis in both internal and external to one's own state. The information gathering and reporting function of diplomacy is of greater importance in providing input to the formulation of foreign policy. This virtually might mean;

1. Determining one's own objectives in the light of one's own and allied power, that is actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives;
2. Evaluating the objectives of unfriendly, neutral, and friendly nations as well as their actual and potential capacity to realize them.

Foreign policy has faces of *politics* and *coherence*: **Politics** – implies that everything that a given actor generates *officially* at the international level is politics. Foreign policy consists of political aspects of state activity that exists as *actions*, *statements*, and *values* intended to shape the external world in the interest of the state concerned. **Coherence** – implies that foreign policy is *conscious intentions and coordination*. That means:

- Foreign policy is understood as a strategy in which *resources*, *time-frame*, and *instruments* are brought together in the pursuit of national goals/national interests/ internationally on the basis of a degree of rationality.
- Foreign policy also coordinates and establishes priorities between the various competing externally projected interests. In short, foreign policy is the *focal political point* of an actor's external relations.

### Foreign Policy Behavior: Patterns and Trends

Foreign policy behavior refers to the *actions* states take towards each other. Nevertheless, patterns of foreign policy behavior can be identified. Arnold Wolfers suggested that all foreign policy behavior ultimately boils down to three possible patterns: (1) self-preservation (maintaining the status quo); (2) self-extension (revising the status quo in one's own favor); (3) self-abnegation (revising the status quo in some else's favor). Seen from these perspectives, the foreign policy patterns of countries such as United States can be categorized as **self-preservation**. On the other hand newly emerging powers such as China, India, Brazil, Germany and others are competing to restructure the international institutions and different regimes so as to create enabling environment to promote their national interest. Such policy trend can be equated with model of **self-extension**. The third model, i.e. **self-abnegation** reflects the foreign policy trends that are being displayed in

Less Developing Countries (LDC). This can be seen in the weak states of the world which fail to defend and promote their national interests in their external relations. Such countries may succumb/submit to such challenges and compromise its long lasting national interest for temporary and immediate benefits.

#### **2.2.4. Foreign Policy Dimensions**

##### **□ Alignment**

One can first speak of alignment tendencies, in particular whether national leaders choose to ally with certain countries or to remain neutral. Yet one can identify the alignment tendencies such as **alliance**, **neutrality** and **non-alignment**. Alliances are formal agreements to provide mutual military assistance; as such, they carry legal weight and certain benefits as well as risks. Neutrality is a stance of formal nonpartisanship in world affairs. Switzerland is one country that has carried neutrality to an extreme case in refusing membership to United Nations till 2002. While the term alignment as used above refers to formal agreement on alliances or neutrality, it can also describe the general affective orientation of a country. Nonalignment has been the foreign policy pattern of most developing state during cold war. Most developing countries had a movement-Non Alignment Movement (NAM) in which they called for a new foreign policy path/choice/ to be followed disregarding the both the West and East bloc politics and alliances. Although that was practically impossible, NAM had noble agenda that called for the South-south cooperation.

##### **□ Scope**

A second foreign policy dimension is the scope of a country's activities and interests. Here, one can identify at least three patterns of foreign policy behaviors. Some actors act in **Global** terms, others as **Regional** terms, and those that follow policy of **Isolationism**. Major Powers, such as U.S.A, in international relations

have historically been those that have defined their interest in global terms. China is the best candidate to assume global responsibility and leadership. Most countries, such as South Africa, India, in the world are essentially regional actors, interacting primarily with neighboring states in the same geographical area. Some moments in history, such as key weakness or geographic remoteness, may cause the scope of a country's foreign policy to become so narrow that isolationism results. This was the case with Burma in 1960 and 70s. Few countries have ever been totally cut off from the outside world, and in an age of interdependence, isolationism becomes an increasingly less viable/less effective foreign policy orientation. Some of the known global actors such as United States of America, China, and the ex-USSR all have passed through period of relative isolationism and of mainly regional interests, finally branching out in to global concerns.

□ **Mode of Operation/ “Modus Opernadi”**

Some countries (most developing countries) often rely on **multilateral** institutions like the UN through diplomatic forums to enhance collective barraging power. Some rely one on **unilateral** means to solve the problems by themselves. Germany, (though it is an economic power), is known to be multi-lateralist in its external relation. Most of Scandinavian countries fall under this category. Whereas countries may opt to rely on unilateral means of settling different issues with other countries that have strong economic and military muscles they would prefer this approach to settle problems. They play the carrot and stick diplomacy to affect the outcomes of events. Two tactics (promise and reward) represent the carrot approach. Threats and punishment (military strikes, sanctions, embargo, etc) represent the stick approach.

**Classification of Foreign Policy**

As a discipline / study, it has the following area classifications as:

**Country-studies:** there are students of foreign policy who develop their expertise on the foreign policy of an individual state; e. g. foreign policy of Japan, foreign policy of Russia, the UK, the USA etc. Particularly, foreign policies of permanent members of the UN Security Council are studied individually.

**Area studies:** where foreign policies of states are dealt with in groups, as with in comparative study manner: *African foreign policies, the foreign policies of Middle Eastern states, European foreign policy* (regional integration/EU Common foreign policy, (but the current tendency is to re-nationalize foreign policy), *the foreign policies of new/weak states*.

The two broader classifications of types of foreign policy named as policy of **status quo** and policy of **revisionism**. The later tries to maintain the already existing trends to keep up one's own advantage while the earlier aspires to redefine the existing situation to achieve new ends from the system. Moreover the unit is also dedicated to discuss some of the major instruments of foreign policy and how each is employed to get foreign policy achieved. Constant modifications or alteration to changing circumstances without affecting the basic substances of own foreign policy may be an important measure that foreign policymakers should work about. No static foreign policy is actually desirable since it should cope-up with the changing situations without compromising the core values of a state's national interest.

**The policy of the status quo:** This policy, whether followed by a large or small state, seeks to maintain a stabilized set of international relationship that includes the relatively advantageous situation the state now enjoys. When a state that follows this policy is faced with conflict, it tries to avoid the aggravation of the conflict. It works for the resolution of the dispute at low level of tension.

**The policy of revisionism:** This policy is strategically offensive. A state that follows this kind of policy will not seek or agree to a stabilization of international relationship until it achieves what it seeks. Such a state will not only accept conflict, but also actively seeks it as long as it offers a hope for the attainment of an objective.

## 1.2. Approaches of Foreign Policy

### A. The Ideological approach/Outside-in Approach

Two approaches to foreign policy have viewed with one another in Western thought at least since the days of the French Revolution. The ideological views policies of states vis-à-vis the rest of the world as merely expressions of prevailing political, social, and religious *beliefs*. In this approach, foreign policies are classified as democratic or totalitarian, libertarian or socialist, and peace loving or aggressive. This dominant approach views foreign relations primarily in *psychological* terms; it looks to the motives or ideologies of leaders or governments as the essential, if not the sole, determinant of policy. It maintains that a democratic regime pursues one type of foreign policy, an autocratic government another, a communist government a third and a democratic-socialist administration still another. Its *simplistic* approach makes it widely acceptable and easily understood. Foreign policy is considered a function of a political system in action or of the preferences or convictions of political leaders who carry out its programs.

### **B. The Analytical approach/Inside-Out Approach**

Its renaissance is partly an outcome of the apparent shortcomings of the psychological or ideological approach, especially in accounting for present-day international developments. That approach has been shaken and discredited by inner contradictions, and it has faltered and failed in describing the continuities of objective and purpose in the policies of states. Regardless of the party in power or the leaders and their private or public philosophers, British, American, French, Russian etc. foreign policies display unities that transcend individual beliefs or ideologies. The means, methods, or techniques may have changed, but the interests and objectives have been relatively constant. As per the analytical approach foreign policy is analytical. At the heart of this view point is the proposition that policy rests on multiple determinants, including the state's historic tradition, geographical location, national interest, and purposes and security needs. To understand foreign policy, the observer must take into account and analyze a host of factors.

Therefore, in a period of a little more than two decades there has been a reaction against the ideological approach to the study of international relations. It should perhaps have been obvious that a conception in which foreign policy is nothing more than a by-product of domestic politics could hardly do justice to the elements of continuity in national policy. At some point, it became necessary to recognize that objective requirements of the national interest place certain irremovable limits upon any statesman seeking to formulate foreign policy. Regardless of the intentions, social philosophy, or religious outlook of individuals, there are broad strategic



interests intimately bound up with a nation's geographic position and international role that must be safeguarded if its independence is to be preserved.

However intangible, the “national mind,” which interprets the national interest, is itself a factor in the *permanence* of foreign policy. Out of the interplay of a durable international position with permanent traditions and institutions, the larger nation states have fashioned foreign policies to be consistently maintained over long periods, even in the face of drastic changes on the domestic political scene. According to this second approach, foreign policy demands, of policy makers, choices and discriminations of a basic order. Not only are the interests of a nation *permanent* in character, but they range themselves in a *hierarchy* of greater and lesser interests. Certain interests must be defended at all costs; others should be safeguarded under particular circumstances; and certain others, although desirable, can almost never be defended. It is the task of foreign policy, in the first instance, to determine its own hierarchy of interests and next, to examine the scale of interests revealed in the principles or practice of other nations foreign policies. The interests of states, and their power to pursue their claims, are of course immutable for any given historical period only in the sense that they set broad limits within which choices in foreign policy are made. They set the framework within which the domestic political contest over external policies must be waged.

### 1.3. Theorizing Foreign Policy

#### A. Liberalism/Political Idealism

Liberalism or political idealism – *legalistic-moralistic* approach to international politics, gives more value to *international regimes*: international law and international organizations as a mechanism of *collective security*. Diplomacy is a means of *negotiation, dialogue and discussion* for peaceful resolution of international disputes.

An objective comes into existence when particular types of national interests, become sufficiently compelling for a state to seek. Thus, both interests and objectives constitute the subject matter of foreign policy. Broadly speaking, the *objectives of foreign policy* are basically founded on the approaches – *Idealist or Realist* – which paved the way for deciding the national interests – long term with peaceful-coexistence and short-term with aggressiveness and hostility respectively. Based on these two yardsticks, we can explain some of the major objectives of

foreign policy. The idealists have forwarded some of the principles to be considered while framing the foreign policies.

- Moral nations should try to follow moral principles of “*peaceful-coexistence and cooperation*” rather than “*hegemony*” in their international behaviour and must adopt policies of non-partisanship. By adopting such a principle while framing foreign policy, the evil influence of power politics may be progressively minimized.
- Efforts should be made by the international community *that totalitarian forces of any kind must cease to exist*. But in this regard, it is very much difficult to define and judge the characteristics of totalitarianism – especially international totalitarian vs. national totalitarian and the use of violent means which are antithetical to idealism.
- All the nation-states should come together in their foreign relations to form an International Organization based on *equal participation and power distribution*. This may be attained if the present structure of the United Nations is democratized. But at the same time, there are other forces like Supranational or Regional Powers competing with International Organization under globalization – European Union (EU), African Union (AU), South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) etc.
- Thus, the ultimate objective of idealism is tied up with the ideal of *World Federalism* which will take place first under the process of Regionalization (some of the major actors of this process are mentioned above) that will work as *support for convergent trend of globalization*. So, according to the visualization of idealists for the futuristic world, though there are internal conflicts and tensions but most of the states at regional level are binding themselves with each other under single currency, removal of trade barriers, boundaries and other differences with an example of EU.

This approach has a branch called the Kantian *theory of democratic peace* for ‘unit-level’/state level explanation of foreign policy behaviour of states is similar to the Kantian *theory of democratic peace*. In view of the theory of democratic peace in relation to foreign policy behaviour, *democracies do not go to war with one another; democracies do not fight other*

*democracies*. This is because, democratic states and their political leaders share *special domestic political culture*; and in democracies, *voters' influence* can deter leaders' aggressive policy behaviour; and offensive military doctrines are *constrained* politically.

### B. Realism

*Realism* – emphasizes the importance of *power* in the anarchical world politics which is dangerous, and unpredictable. The realism theory is a traditional way in the thinking of practitioners of international relations. It became orthodoxy in the IR studies discrediting the *legalistic-moralistic* approach (liberalism) to the field of international relations of the inter-war period. During the *Cold-War period* military force became the main feature of the international system.

The basic concept of differences of idealism and realism is determined in terms of “**long-run policies**” and “**short-run national policies**”. The whole case of idealism is based on the general idea of evolutionary progress in society. It regards the power politics as the passing phase (irrelevant) of history and presents the picture of a future international society based on notion of reformed international system free from power politics, immorality and violence. The impression prevailed of this approach is that foreign policies based on realism are essentially *nationalistic* and hence aiming at the *expansion of national power as an end itself at the cost of other nation-states* which resulted into *anti-peace policies* whereas foreign policies based on idealism are essentially internationalistic and hence promoting the cause of peaceful-coexistence – live and let others to live. So, the basic difference between two approaches is the *relationship between means and ends* – idealism mainly focus on peaceful means whereas realism mainly focuses on hostile means to achieve national power as an immediate ends. So, the central characteristic of idealism is the belief that *what unites human beings is more important than what divides them*.

The realist approach is set of ideas which take into account the implication of security and power factors. The basic assumption underlying the realist approach is rivalry and strife among nations in one form or the other. Therefore, the prime function of foreign policy and diplomacy is *to check the contest for power* and the means to be adopted by other nations after analysing the intelligence (knowledge about other states) and then framing the policies to balance of power. George Kennan and Hans Morgenthau are the leading realists. Both are stressing on the *National*

*Interests* as the prime objective of foreign policy but their views regarding the nature of relationship between the national interest and moral principles differ from each other.

Kennan believes that we can only know and understand our own interests and that “*no people can be the judges of another’s domestic institutions and requirements.*” Therefore, he suggested that we should try to conduct our foreign policy and diplomatic relations in accordance with the requirements of our national interest on the one hand and such moral and ethical principles as are inherent in the spirit of our civilization on the other. Thus, he insists on taking moral consideration while framing the policy. He, however, warns that our moral and ethical principles are valid only for ourselves, not for others, and hence we should not impose them on others as in the words of Robert Good, it is a “*moral relativism*” instead of “*moral absolutism*”. On the other hand, Morgenthau defends the supremacy of national interest much more vigorously and completely ignores the moral aspect. According to him, considerations of national interest must transcend all principles of morality. Thus, it is “*relative realism*” in case of Kennan and “*transcendental realism*” in the case of Morgenthau where only national interest, not moral principles, should guide the foreign policy and diplomacy.

- Keeping the above approaches which are touching *both the extremes* - idealists shouldn’t leave out the *prospective future* only to solve the *bleak present* and *realist* shouldn’t ignore the *immediate needs* for a *rosy future* – there is a middle course/ground adopted by a school of thought called “*Eclecticism*” which is making decisions on the basis of what seems best instead of following some single doctrine or approach. So, it does not regard either the realist approach or the idealist approach as completely satisfactory and takes into consideration the balanced understanding of international relations.

**C. Rational (Public) Choice theory** – grew as reaction to part of a unitary actor model with a given goals, usually maximization of power which is associated with realism. Rational (public) choice grew out of individualist assumptions of economics, and in its stress on power as currency and on the drive towards equilibrium it is closely related to classical-realism. This tends to reduce foreign policy interests (*national interest*) to the interest of self-seeking politicians, decision makers seeking political support, votes, personal interest etc. This theory is thus *unsatisfactory* as an approach to the study of foreign policy.

**D. Systemic IR theory Vs. Domestic Political IR theory** of foreign policy

- ✚ **Systemic IR theory:** as mentioned is about the structure of anarchy in the international system and by which maximization of power is seen as necessary for survival. Systemic IR theory explains similarities in the behaviour of states similarly placed in the condition of anarchy.
- ✚ **Domestic Political IR theory:** is about how domestic politics shapes foreign policy decision-making process. Domestic Political IR theory explains why state 'X' made a certain foreign policy move at a particular time. It is a theory of state choice making. Domestic Political IR theory explains states similarly placed in the condition of anarchy behave in different way. It explains for example,
  - Why in 1991 Saddam Hussein, the late President of Iraq, invaded Kuwait provoking the US-led Desert Storm. The theory shows that states are “*programmed*” to play particular foreign policy role(s); and
  - Why states similarly placed in the system of a condition of anarchy behave in different way. All states highly value survival strategy, but in different ways:
    - a) some exercise successfully *adaptive learning strategies*,
    - b) some a pure *survival-of-the-fittest* type strategy: the policy of power maximization

### 1.4. Objectives of Foreign Policy

The goals and objectives of any state's foreign policy constitute to a large extent the *national interest* as a basis. The objectives of any state's foreign policy include maintaining *territorial integrity*, promoting *economic interest*, providing for *national security*, protecting *national prestige*, developing *national power* of a state and maintaining *world order*. For the sake of convenience, we can however divide foreign policy objectives in to three broad categories on the basis of importance and period of achievability. These are:

#### A. Core/Immediate objectives

These are the objectives to which government commits its very existence and must be arrived at all times. They are related to issues of the lives of the people, political independence and territorial integrity/sovereignty of the nation at large. States are ready to go to war when these objectives are threatened because these are not negotiable or compromising.

These are short-term goals /*high level goals* that a given country ‘values’ as immediate interests or objectives of its foreign policy. Short-term goals are *immediate* interests to one particular state, the traditional notion of *national interest* pursued as major priority. These are *core values*, *immediate concerns (raison d’état)*, needs of the state to which its government are willing and ready to spend resources. These include a state’s: survival of political independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty and economic development and prosperity

### **B. Middle Range Objectives**

These are less important and less immediate relatively compared to core objectives. They are mostly of broad concerns of economic development and social welfare. These include fulfilling material needs, economic needs, prestige of the nation, scientific and technological advancement and so forth. These are goals expected to be fulfilled within the *maximum period* of time. They are *secondary, not immediate* to a particular state. Hence, they are goals governments proclaim at public but do not take quick actions to implement them. One example of such goals is *regional integration and cooperation* for economic and security issue –regional integration scheme.

### **C. Long Range Objectives**

These are the least immediate ones to policy makers. They include future plans, thoughts, and visions concerning the ultimate political and ideological organization of the domestic state system. They are *Universal goals* whose achievement requires *collective responsibility (concern)* far beyond their border. Example of such goals are like *transfer of resources & technology* to the world’s poorest or less developed countries (LDCs), and *global security*, i.e. stabilization of potential flash-points (conflict). For scholars in the *realist school* of thought these are *mere aspiration*, normative and moralistic approach to the study of international politics and, therefore, are not acceptable to them.

Take, for example, the United States’ *Marshall Plan* for Europe in the immediate post-World War II period. For the *idealists (liberal internationalists)* this was unselfish sharing of resources by the U.S. to assist European recovery. For the *realists* on the other hand it was an intelligent device/means of the U.S. for saving Europe for democracy from the *threat of communist* expansion from the Soviet Union. That means, according to the realists, the Marshall Plan was an instrument of U.S. foreign policy of containing communism.

## 1.5. The Concept of National Interest in Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

### 1.5.1. Defining National Interest

- The first way to study national interest is to analyse various states and to ask whether there are any consistent ways that they define what their subjective national interest is. In other words, what is a state's perceived national interest? A state's definition of its national interest is based on its *values* and *perceptions*.

*Values* involve what we define as good or bad, for ourselves and others, and we use values to evaluate past, present, and future events and goals.

*Perceptions* -what a state perceives itself *vis-a-vis* other states determines its foreign policy goals. Individual values and perceptions heavily influence leadership decisions.

- Objectively seen, whatever the system of governance of any state, its interests govern its affairs and interactions on the global stage. All states in the international arena do identify their objective national interests and put priorities on various interests.
- These objective national interests of a state may range from the *political*, *security* (military) or *economic* dimensions to that of cooperation or conflict in relation with other states in a given region, continent or else the international politico – economic arena in particular.

By national interest we mean the sum of the goals and objectives of a state's foreign policy. Even though the national interests of states vary in that detail; core national interests are the same for different countries. The minimum essential components of the national interest of any state are security, national development and world order. All states devise and continuously search for national security, political independence and territorial integrity. Second to security comes the promotion of economic interest, which includes the preservation or acquisition of favorable conditions and terms of trade. Even if security and economic prosperity are core components of the national interest of a country it also include other elements. National interest is a key concept in foreign policy. The making of foreign policy begins by identifying the state's key national interests. Foreign policy cannot be subordinated to any other principle than national interest. The total task of foreign policy is to defend national interests peacefully and rationally. The goals and objectives of any state foreign policy constitute national interest as a basis.

### 1.5.2. Dimensions of National Interest

### A. The Issue/Content Dimension

It focuses on analyzing national interest of a given state through critically categorizing and assessing areas of policy impact. Donald Neuchterlein (1979), for instance, has yielded four basic issue areas of national interest: physical safety, material well – being, political environment, and national cohesion. Or national interests can be classified into political interests, security interests, economic interests, and cultural interests.

### B. The Time Dimension

Based on the time span for attaining an interest, national interests can be divided into constant interests and variable interests. The former are perpetual; the latter can be further divided into long-term, middle-term and short-term interests. Usually, however, short –term interest should be subordinate to long –term interests. And each category in turn is prioritized as primary and secondary interest for each of the short – term and long-term dimensions. Perpetual interests are the most stable. They will not disappear until the nation state itself disappears. If a nation state wants to exist, it cannot give up this kind of interest. Examples include territorial integrity, national independence, state sovereignty and the ability to pursue economic development.

### C. The Importance Dimension

Based on importance, national interests can be divided into *vital interests*, *extremely important interests*, *just important interests* and *less important interests*. Vital interests are related to people's life and security as well as to the long-term stability of a country's political system and economic life, territorial integrity, political independence, economic independence and the continuation of the political system. The difference between extremely important and vital interests is that the former are under less threat than the latter. Extremely important interests include a favorable international strategic balance, the maintenance of national prestige, the ability to choose one's model for development, and the guarantee of important economic interests, etc. Just important interests are interests pursued when there is not an obvious threat, such as expansion of the export market, maintenance of technological superiority, attracting international investment, maintaining international political stability, improving friendly bilateral relations and so on. Less important interests are interests that do not seriously affect national



security or strategic economic interests. Examples would be a company or an individual's security and economic interest overseas.

#### **D. Based on Scope**

Based on the scope of an interest, national interests can be divided into *universal interests*, *partial interests* and *individual national interests*. Universal interests are those interests pursued by every sovereign state, such as state sovereignty, international status, the security of the population and so on. Partial interests are those pursued only by some countries. They would include the international order and leadership position pursued by superpowers; dominating roles in regional affairs and regional cooperation pursued by countries in a defined area, mutual security and alliances pursued by militarily allied countries and so forth. Individual interests include those of a single country that are different from the interests of other countries. For example, after the Cold War, the US wants to maintain American dominance, establishing a new world order under its leadership.

### **1.5.3. Elements of National Interests**

Different authors have broadly classified the national interest into the following categories which are as here under:

#### **A. Primary interests**

These are vital interests of a given state which primarily include core interests like the preservation of physical (territorial) and political identity of a state against external imposition, invasion and/or aggression by another state/s. Hence forth, all states in the international system strive to formulate and execute foreign policies that foster physical safety, national development and the freedom of their people which would in turn assure the security and continuous survival of the states. This type of interest includes the preservation of physical, political, and cultural identity of the state against possible encroachments from outside powers. These interests are referred as core interests of any state which must not be compromised at any costs as it relates with the security of the country.

#### **B. Secondary Interests**

Such interests are vital but *not* as crucial and decisive as primary interests. As the name self explains, secondary interests are usually external to the state in the sense that they include the

protection of a state's citizens abroad (the Diaspora) and ensuring the well – being of its diplomatic mission and the staff in another state/s through connivance with the host state. Under this category, the main interests are the protection of the citizens abroad and ensuring diplomatic immunities for the diplomatic staff.

### **C. Permanent Interests**

Is another category and include a state's long – term and persistent interests which rarely change. They are also related to the vision and the long – sighted, general national objectives of a state. Developing self – reliant national economy and military power are instances of permanent interests of states.

This refers to the relatively constant and long-term interests of the country. The change in the permanent interest is rather slow. We can take an example of India's historical evolutionary foreign policy of *peaceful co-existence* with the long-term objectives to fight and eliminate imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism and tried to forge solidarity with the Afro-Asian countries. It is observed that till now, India is not sided with any country pursuing vicious policies against any other country.

### **D. Variable interests**

These refer to those interests of a state within a certain circumstance or a given condition. They function within specified time and space frameworks, which are consequently influenced by different factors like political institutions, personality, and ideology. Variable interests can possibly change with changes in the existing political parties, leadership qualities and the public opinion of a given state. These interests are those which a nation considers vital for national good in a given set of circumstances. In this sense the variable interests are largely determined by “*the cross currents of personalities, public opinion, sectional interests, partisan politics, and political and moral folkways.*”

### **E. General interests**

Refer to shared interests commonly identified and recognized between and/or among independent states themselves. General interests may include trading and diplomatic relations, commercial linkages as well as the creation of world order. In the case of world order, for example, issue like maintenance of international peace, the promotion of international law or the establishment of international organization is subsumed. These interests refer to those positive conditions which apply to a large number of nations in several specified fields such as security,

trade, diplomatic intercourse etc. For example, interests of the member states of European Union and *their integration* are meant for general interests of all.

### **F. Specific Interests:**

These interests are defined through logical outgrowth of the general interests in terms of time and space. For example, the specific interest in Middle East led the members of NATO to go for collective decision in Iraq, Afghanistan and now in Libya.

### **G. Identical Interests**

This refers to interests which are held in common by a number of states. For example, Countries of Western Europe did not want the expansion of Soviet influence & its ideology in the region. Third world Countries wanted to join the NAM when it was formed.

### **H. Complimentary Interests**

These are not identical interests but form some kind of basis for agreements & compromise. For example, Britain wanted independence of Portugal against Spain for control of Atlantic Ocean and Portugal accepted the hegemony of Britain as a safe means of defense against Spain. USA & Pakistan had a complimentary interest in containing Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

### **I. Conflicting Interests**

These are opposed Interests. These conflicting interests sometimes become complimentary interests or identical interest. For example, Kashmir issue is a conflicting interest between India and Pakistan.

## **1.6. Determinants of Foreign Policy**

### **1.6.1. Domestic/Internal Factors**

Determinants of foreign policy are *factors* that influence foreign policy decision-making process. Determinants of foreign policy are the *nexus (interplay)* between *the domestic* and *the external* politics of a state. They are about *sources* of foreign policy. Sources of foreign policy have individual, national, and international contexts- *levels of analysis*. The individual and the national are domestic contexts (political environment) of foreign policy.

**A. Geopolitics:** – geopolitics is the influence of geographical location of state on its external politics. Geographical location of state is a *constant factor* that shapes its foreign policy behaviour. For example, Ethiopia is situated in the strategic Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian

Ocean areas via which the world's huge maritime trade passes. It is also positioned in the geopolitics of the Nile Valley, where basin countries used to calculate differently their *hydro politics* for the utilization of the waters of the Nile. This shaped and continues shaping the political relations of Ethiopia with the states in the Basin, particularly Egypt and Sudan, the two lower riparian countries. Ethiopia's location in these strategically vital areas therefore is

- 1) The source of its vulnerability to foreign threats, and
- 2) Opportunity for alliance formation.

Thus, Ethiopia's survival in this strategically vital and politically volatile region requires,

a) domestic stability

- i. sustained economic development and its equitable sharing
- ii. social cohesion – self-rule and shared-rule
- iii. political tranquillity/calmness – democracy
- iv. good governance which includes: regime legitimacy (popular support), policy transparency of the regime, accountability of the regime for policy actions and inactions, the rule of law (the supremacy of law)

So, domestic factors such as *location* of the state–(coastal, landlocked, waterlocked); *size*–(large or small territory); *population*–(large or small; literate or illiterate); *natural resources*–(oil, goldmines, iron ore, forests, etc.); *technology*–(developed or under-developed); *will of the people and strong legitimate leadership*; *morale of military* to sacrifice in the name of nation; *degree of popular support* to the ruling political party; *nature of friends and allies* – how much cooperative during the time of crisis; *nature of foes or enemies* – analyzing the extent of direct and indirect harms, the foes or enemies can give.

**B. Type of Government:** Whether country is governed by the *constitutional democracies* like presidential form of government or parliamentary form of government; autocratic or totalitarian government; military dictatorships; political party systems – one, two and multi-party; traditional monarchies as in Saudi Arabia; and modern theocracies as in Iran. All these types of government are important factors that influence the foreign policy of any country while interacting with the international community like superpower, major power, middle power and minor power based on purely mathematical formula.

**C. Individual context**

- The *idiosyncratic/personal* behaviour of policymakers (how policymakers' interests and ideas, beliefs, or belief systems influence policies). This includes cognitive psychology of leaders and personnel in the staff of foreign policy and diplomacy.

**D. Military Capabilities:** Under this category, this is emphasized over the size of military, equipment of military (traditional or modern), training, leadership, and nuclear or non-nuclear capabilities.

### **1.6.2. External (International) context**

- **Alliances:** Alliances concluded by various states also greatly influence the foreign policy. The states or parties to the alliance have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies and refrain from formulating or showing apathy or taking actions which may prove harmful for the members of the alliance. The ongoing war for democracy in Libya is an act of Alliance of NATO's 28 members. Alliance can be *strategic* or *tactical* for reasons.
- **International Law:** International laws and regulations do also affect the substance of a state's foreign policy. These are rules of conduct in the international system that foreign policy decision makers have to reckon accurately with. Interstate regulations cannot be maintained without a certain minimum regulation (conventional, customary, ethical or institutional). These to some extent govern and constrain the behavior of the actors in their intricate relations and limit their degree of freedom. As a result policy outputs needs to meet the demands of international law. A state or some group of states acting a contrary to international law might enter in to difficulty to settle their relations with other states since the law facilitates a common ground for states to interact amongst each. Otherwise the conduct of cross boundary interaction among them would appear inconsistent and somehow difficult to settle. Therefore, states should definitely take the exiting international rules in to account in designing their foreign policy.

It is stated that diplomacy is an instrument of enhancing the national interest. If diplomacy is practiced by every nations of the world in the service of their national interests in an absolute sense, this will bound to create an anarchic situation and will develop a possibility of war like situation, which means the total failure of diplomacy. Therefore, the foreign policy's ability of friendship creation and maintenance establishing strong, but defensive-oriented military posture (necessary for deterrence purposes, and also that can be deployed, when need arises for:the

upkeep of national security, formulating/pursuing a foreign policy dominated by pragmatism (practical and rational foreign policy), and playing pivotal role in promoting regional and continental cause.

- **Globalization:** The existing high level interdependence among nations of the world does also affect the modes and contents of foreign policy followed and adopted. In the existing competitive global system states are trying to get the best for the prosperity of their economy. In this regard currently they are giving due emphasis to economic diplomacy and excreting much of their effort to improve their economic interaction with countries and regions of the world where they believed would promote their economic interest.
- **Policies and actions of others:** Policymaking requires taking sufficient account of what others have done, are doing and are likely to do in response to a particular policy. However, how much account policy makers will take depends upon the relative capabilities (power) of sates. Generally, foreign policy depends on power. Limited power is equivalent to limited foreign policy objectives. Therefore who gets what depends one's ability to influence or persuade the behavior of others. In this regard, how much state's consider the policies and actions of others depends on the extent of power that they wield compared to others.

### 1.7. Foreign Policy Orientations

States may pursue different orientation for their choices may depend on variables like economy, geographic location, military needs and so on. FP orientation refers a course of action or strategy states follow/choose (depending on their position in the international system) to obtain their FP objectives. In other word **FPO** is a general attitudes and commitments towards the external environment based on the examination of global structure of power and influence. Based on this states may adopt a foreign policy of Isolationism, Non-alignment, or neutrality. No country can live in complete isolation in the present day world. As all nations carry on some intercourse with other countries, every nation must have its foreign policy apart from its domestic policy. A country's foreign policy and diplomacy is affected by the changing nature of the global politics. Usually new global phenomena lead to new policy and diplomacy of countries.

#### I. Isolationism

It is the policy of nonparticipation in contentious international matters. It is particularly associated with the United States, which acted on its basis throughout the nineteenth century and for much of the first half of the twentieth. The policy contributed to that state's refusal ever to join the League of Nations, and was only abandoned after the United States was brought into the Second World War by Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor (Hawaii) in December 1941. This is characterized by low degree or no level of involvement in interactions like diplomatic contacts and economic linkages. It may be influenced by the following factors:

- The assumption that state security can be assured by reducing transaction with other State/s.
- The existence of diffused multi-polar system,
- Geographic features particularly distance,
- The level of self-sufficiency,
- The roles of leadership and
- Domestic need to produce what the nation wants.

This foreign policy orientation is primarily characterized by the principle of delinking also called autarky on the basis of which the state follows a close the door policy (which can be partial or complete) with the outside world. Isolationism has economic and political dimensions. **Splendid isolation** is the term often used to describe Britain's pre-twentieth century policy of avoiding alliances in time of peace.

## II. Neutralism

**Neutralism** is a term that was used in the early post-1945 period to describe non-alignment. Neutrality is again a legal status assumed unilaterally by a state during a time of war, indicative of its intention of staying out of the war. The status involves rights and duties on the part of both the neutral state and the belligerents. The neutral must not, by acts of either commission or omission, assist any belligerent, and must allow the belligerents to treat the commerce of its nationals in accordance with the laws of war. For their part the belligerents must not infringe the neutrality of the neutral state, and must allow it to act towards their nationals in accordance with the laws of war. The practice of neutrality has often been far less clear cut than the rules of neutrality would suggest, for political and/or military reasons. Politically, a neutral may wish to display benevolent neutrality towards one side; and the proximity of a powerful belligerent may

also incline a neutral away from a strictly neutral path, so as to stave off the danger of its neutrality being violated. In general, that is perhaps least likely to occur in wars which are limited in both scope and aim. However, the first half of the twentieth century was marked by total war, and in its second half the UN Charter posed a potential question about the relevance of the concept of neutrality – one made pertinent by the Security Council's post-Cold War peace enforcement activity. Accordingly, **neutrality** is now much less heard about than it used to be – although circumstances continue to arise in which states are anxious to keep out of the armed conflicts of others. *Neutrality* is to be distinguished from *neutralism* and *non-alignment*.

**Neutralization** is a formal collective act by which a lesser state gives an undertaking, guaranteed by a group of greater powers, that it will not involve itself in war (except in self-defense) and will take great care not to give political offence in any quarter. In the past neutralization has been used in an attempt to protect small states against powerful neighbors and, more particularly, to maintain the independence of buffer states. During the Cold War Austria (1955) and Laos (1962) were neutralized but, for the reasons given in the entry on buffer states, the device has since the middle of the twentieth century lost most of its relevance.

This implies the lack of commitment by a state to provide its military and diplomatic support for the purpose of another state. States with this foreign policy orientation do not usually form military alliance and do not help states in times of war. They may not also offer their territory for the passage of especially military goods of another state. They may however let the passage of non-military goods for humanitarian purposes. But depending on their will, they can offer their good offices for the mediation and negotiation of other states. In fact, neutralism is a legal status recognized by other states and the international law.

**Permanent neutrality** is the position of those states which not only remain neutral during all wars between third parties but accept no commitments in peacetime (alliances or military base agreements, for example) which might lead them into belligerency in some future contingency. This peacetime aloofness from military commitments might, as in the case of Sweden, be based on a purely unilateral political position which can, as a result, be changed unilaterally. Alternatively, it can derive from an international obligation. The paradigm case of this kind of permanent neutrality, sometimes regarded as the only true version, is Switzerland, at least since



the Congress of Vienna in 1815. Here it was declared that ‘The neutrality and integrity of Switzerland and her independence from any foreign influence are in the interest of European politics as a whole’. Switzerland did not join the UN until September 2002. Austria also, by treaty, became a permanent neutral in 1955, but nonetheless decided to join the UN in the same year. **Perpetual neutrality** is another term for permanent neutrality. By a treaty of 1839, Belgium was declared to be perpetually neutral. For diplomacy, the regulation which it agreed solved at long last the serious problem of precedence; while the restoration of the Swiss Confederation and the guarantee by the Congress of Switzerland’s permanent neutrality fortified a tradition which was subsequently to prove of considerable value to the world diplomatic system.

### III. Non-Alignment

This foreign policy orientation is similar with neutralism in two aspects: First likewise neutral states, states that pursue non-alignment do not commit themselves militarily to support other state/states. In addition, they do not form military alliance with other states. Non-alignment differs from neutralism in two aspects:

- A state with non-alignment policy may give different diplomatic support for blocs/alliances or for states in a fight.
- Moreover, non-alignment is not a legal status. It is simply the wish of that state and therefore it is not recognized by other states and the international law.

For example: the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) is one wonderful example to this. The movement consisting for the most part of Third World states which had as its rationale a determination to resist pressure to abandon their non-aligned stance. Its origins are to be found in a summit meeting held in Bandung in Indonesia in April 1955, though it was not formally launched (in Belgrade, Yugoslavia) until 1961. Pioneer leaders of the non-alignment movement were; Marshal Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India, President Sukarno of Indonesia and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia.

Since the Lusaka summit in 1970, summit meetings of members have been held triennially. Non-alignment is in a sense the policy of refusing to join either of the military alliance systems which were a key feature of the Cold War.

### IV. Alliance (and Counter Alliance) Formation

**Alliance formation** is a treaty entered into by two or more states to engage in cooperative actions in specified circumstances. With the advent of nuclear weapons in the second half of the twentieth century, alliances were increasingly concluded in the hope of deterring the outbreak of war rather than with a ready willingness to fight in one. Accordingly (and also for strategic reasons), these recent alliances have often, from the time of their making, involved detailed contingency planning and complex organizational arrangements.

The hallmark of an **alliance**, compared to an **entente**, is the precision of its commitments. In contrast to an alliance, in entente relationships between states in which military commitments are implicit rather than explicit. These may derive either from a formal agreement for consultation in the event of a crisis, or from some kind of practical military collaboration, for example in arms sales, military assistance agreements, military research and development, maneuvers or arrangements for the use of bases. Ententes, in other words, suggest strongly that the parties are sympathetic to each other to the point that they will *stand shoulder to shoulder* in war but *contain no international legal obligations*. The modern concept derives from the Anglo-French *entente cordiale* of 1904. The relationship between the United States and Israel resembles a classic entente, as does NATO's Partnership for Peace.

Alliance formation can have economic, military and religious dimensions/forms. *Economic alliances* are in principle formed on the basis of states' interest to achieve mutual *economic benefits and gains*. *Military alliances* are purely political motivated by the desire to forge common military defense system through setting up an organization against another counter military bloc. *Religious Alliances* are another form of alliance system through which states with common official state religion organize themselves towards achieving mutual economic, political and socio-cultural/religious cooperation amongst one another. This includes:

- NATO of 1949
- Warsaw Pact of 1955 (e.g. for counter alliance)
- Cartels (like the OPEC),
- Free Trade Area (like the NAFTA),

- Common Market in a form of Economic Community (like the EEC, COMESA and EAC) and at last
- Economic Integration (with common economic policy and monetary system), like the one realized by the EEC-EU organizational framework.

### **1.8. Actors in Foreign Policy Decision Making and Processes**

It is the pattern of cooperation and conflict among the following sub national actors that constitutes the internal foreign policy-making process: political executives, Bureaucracies, legislatures, the people, and varieties of groups. Decision making must be the starting point if we wish to understand the dilemmas of acting in the complex international system. Those who are formally responsible for taking decisions in foreign policy and are carrying it out are politicians of various descriptions. Their precise titles and locations in the political structure will vary a great deal according to the type of state or other international actor they represent. The delineation of the roles of responsible decision makers will involve a discussion of the various institutions which tend to be involved such as; executive councils, inner cabinets and the providers of intelligence.

The nominal chief of foreign policy operation in most states is the foreign ministers. They are still considerably important by virtue of specializing in external policy but they struggle to keep control of their vast portfolio, increasingly invaded by colleagues running other ministries. Moreover they are increasingly influenced by head of governments who decides to take a direct interest in foreign affairs. Heads of governments, whether they intend or not are invariably drawn in to foreign affairs and a large proportion of their time is spent up on it.

The other members of the political foreign policy elite vary more widely from country to country. Where there is some form of cabinet government the foreign minister will have to keep all colleagues on the main lines of policy and get their active support on an issue of high significance. Some of these officials will be continually involved in aspects of external relations by virtue of their responsibilities. Such ministries might include; trade, agriculture, industry, defense and others. In general more and more department ministries are discovering an external dimension to their job, but it would be wrong to suggest that many of them make it their priority

or indeed that they have an international conception of public policy. This still being a matter of great variability, the key colleagues for foreign minister will normally be the ministries of defense, economics and trade. On the other hand, the chair of the parliamentary foreign affairs committee may sometimes be drawn in to top level consultations where the need for wider political consensus is particularly strong.

Regarding foreign policy decision, those who occupy the highest position in a state have the opportunity to dispose of a great deal of influence. Such officials have the state resource at their disposal and foreign policy decision does not require frequent legislation from parliaments or the legislature that gives a fairly unstructured decision environment. As a result this provides a considerable opportunity for the relatively small group of men and women who are the formal political decision makers to exert leadership in foreign policy and personify the state in their actions. How do such higher officials influence foreign policy decisions might depend up on a mix of factors including; the personal and political qualities of the personalities, the nature of the issue being decided and the political structure of the state in question. In most political systems any given area of policy will be conducted at the highest level by a combination of the head of government and the departmental minister, the specialist.

This is particularly the case to foreign policy, where the expectations of head of government involvement from outside and inside are high and where it is difficult for others to develop an equivalent level of expertise. Since by its nature foreign policy combines various strands of external relations, it is conducted by what can be termed as the ‘foreign policy executive’ constituting the head of the government, the foreign minister, the defense, economic and finance ministries. There are also people without particular portfolios, close to the head of government, whose job is to help on matters of high politics that might have influence on foreign policy decisions.

In most cases a foreign policy issue might not appear in a highly structured manner with a reasonably long time period for consideration. Only for those rare issues that call for longer time consideration and can be decided in a reasonably elongated period the foreign policy executive will choose or be forced to allow wider participation from cabinet colleagues or whatever relevant political group could be. This could also work for issues of high priority and sensitivity

where by the proposals for the decisions are scrutinized by cabinet members and monitor its progress on the course of implementation. However, at the end of the day, for better or worse many heads of government end up by having a distinct impact on their country's foreign policy. This is true for both big and small developed and less developed states, which indicates that they have influence over foreign minister portfolios. In this case there are three possible models of relationships between heads of government and foreign ministers each with its strength and weakness depending on how the personalities involved handle the situation and how they interact with events.

### ➤ **Who more commonly makes foreign policy decisions?**

Politicians of various descriptions, whose titles and power positions in the political structure vary, take policy decisions. There are formal actors (executive branch with primary responsibility and legislative branch with secondary responsibility) and informal actors such as government bureaucracies, sub-national governments, NGOs, “think tanks”, the media, public intellectuals, citizens and public discourses/opinions. The political foreign policy elite are small group of persons whose members include:

1. ***The foreign minister*** –nowadays considered to be a nominal chief of foreign policy, because he/she is increasingly invaded by colleagues running other ministries.

- Even yet, the foreign minister has considerable importance by the virtue of specializing foreign policy.
- He/she coordinates others on issues of a country's foreign policy.

2. ***Heads of State and /or Government***–these vary depending on a country's system of government. Presidential system of government (U.S.A., Russia, Kenya, South Africa, for example) the head of State and Government is one person, the president. parliamentary system of government (Ethiopia, Germany, Britain for example) while the head of state is either the nominal president or the queen or the king, the head of the government is the prime minister, the chancellor in the case of Germany. The ultimate decision making power rests with the president in presidential systems, and with the prime minister in parliamentary systems.

3. ***The chief of foreign intelligence*** – agency for intelligence and national security – usually *covert*. The involvement of this agency in the process of foreign policy decision making is absolutely necessary for the upkeep of a country national security.

4. *The chairman of the chief of staff* – the military arm for national security/ defence – *overt*.

5. *The Chair of parliamentary foreign affairs committee* – the need for wider political consensus in foreign policy decision-making process.

- In democracies people (the *sovereign*) are represented by members of the legislature, where the final decisions are reached.
- In the U.S., one of the oldest democracies, formal (constitutional) division of foreign policy-making power is between the *Senate and the White House* (the President).
- ★ In all systems, those who occupy the highest power positions in the State have a great deal of influence on its foreign policy. This is because they are in possession of the necessary resources of power.

**Steps of Foreign Policy Making:** unlike domestic policy, foreign policy making usually involves fewer people and less publicity. Though not exhaustive, policy making across all foreign policies follow the following steps:

- A. Policy Articulation:
- B. Policy Formulation:
- C. Policy Implementation:
- D. Policy Evaluation:

## **1.9. Instruments of foreign policy**

States employ different instruments to achieve their respective foreign policy goals and objectives. The nature and mode of applicability of such instruments may vary according to the necessity and actual possession by states. Nevertheless, the most predominant instruments are:

### **1.9.1. Diplomacy:**

In the definitions, the state is central player to understanding of diplomacy and that diplomacy, largely, concerns the *business of peace*. Diplomacy is *peaceful dialogue and interaction between political units* – the most peaceful communication among int'l actors. It is 'the conduct of relations between sovereign states with standing in world politics by official agents and by peaceful means', (Hedley Bull). G.R. Berridge defines diplomacy in statist terms as, '*the official channels of communication employed by the members of a system of states*'. For him, diplomacy is the *most important institution of society of states*, enabling them to secure

objectives of their foreign policies *without resort to 'force, propaganda, or law'*. Satow understands diplomacy as, 'the application *of intelligence or tact* to the conduct of relations between governments of sovereign states – the conduct of business between states by *peaceful means*. Diplomacy is, Satow adds, a '*persuasive argument*, if applied skillfully and sensitively at the right time, may achieve a better result than persuasion backed by the threat of force.

### 1.9.1.1. Functions of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is carried on by a variety of officials with titles such as President, Prime Minister, Ambassador, or special envoy, with their own respective roles and/or functions. These functions can be:

**Observation and Reporting:** Gathering information and correct data regarding various aspects of other countries is an essential factor for the formulation foreign policy. Gathering of information and its reporting to the home government are, therefore, most important functions of diplomats. As has been said earlier, those who formulate the policy of a nation require precise and objective information regarding other countries. These can be obtained from various sources. Thus, data concerning military potentialities, economic trends and political factors of a foreign state may be supplied by intelligence units abroad. But mere supplying of information is not always enough. The duty of a diplomat is not only to collect information and send them to the home government but he is also expected to 'sell' the foreign policy objectives of his nation to the political leaders and the public of the host country. For the successful performance of this task "the personal appeal of the diplomat and his understanding of the psychology of the foreign people are essential prerequisites. All diplomats in a sense serve as policy makers, as they provide the lion's share of the information upon which policy is based. A principal contribution of the diplomat in the policymaking process comes from his skill of interpretation and judgment about conditions in the country to which he is accredited.

**Negotiation:** with the government of receiving state. Some important factors might determine the success of negotiation that includes; negotiating ability, degree of experience, stamina (determination), honesty, knowledge of the counterparts culture, technical expertise to deal with legal, political and moral aspects of the negotiation and necessary degree of power to decide.

**Representation:** interest representation represents the sending state interests in the receiving state. Formal representation, participation and protocol in the diplomatic circuit of the national capital or international institution continue as important elements in state sovereignty as part of the notion of international society

- **Substantive:** *Undertaking activities necessary for policymaking that include: Information gathering, and Political reporting back home to advice the foreign ministry in making foreign policy; has to be aware that he/she is representative of a country as well as to a country, both of which are sovereign 'equals'*
- **Symbolic:** the ambassador/diplomat represents in the same way a *flag* represents a nation; benefit in this is gaining audience in the receiving State.

**Public Relations:** As the legal and symbolic representative of his country a diplomat is engaged in continuous efforts to create and propagate goodwill in favor of his own state and its policies. This can be done by effective propaganda as well as by maintaining good public relations. Giving and attending parties and dinners, delivering lectures and other speeches, attendance at or participation in dedications of monuments, buildings, foreign assistance projects etc., are the various ways of maintaining public relations. Some scholars question the effectiveness of such public relation activities, because they are unsuitable yardsticks of a diplomat's success. But if a diplomat refrains from participating in these social gatherings it may give cause to unnecessary ill-will; it will at least fail to brighten the image of his country. Therefore, diplomats always endeavor to maintain good public relations by various means.

Modern international relations are also increasing conduct through public diplomacy. It refers to a process of creating an overall international image that enhances a state's ability to achieve diplomatic success. It is part of worldwide transformation in the conduct of international affairs. Instant global communications are breaking down *rigidities* and *isolation*. As a result, these days diplomacy has failed to become the sole preserve of foreign policy decision makers, diplomats and ambassadors.

**Information gathering:** gathering of information from the host state, ascertaining and analyzing for policies and policy adjustment and political reporting to the sending state is an important



function of foreign policy. Diplomacy serves the function of acquisition of information and assessment, including acting as listening post or early warning system. Next to substantive representation, an embassy should identify any key issues and domestic and external patterns, together with their implications, in order to advise or warn the sending government. Timely warning of adverse developments is one of the major tasks of an embassy, in cooperation with intelligence services, requiring considerable coordination, expertise, judgment and political courage. At diplomatic level monitoring exists in a number of forms including covert intelligence gathering. However, in terms diplomatic function it is defined as the acquisition of data from public sources in receiving state such as; press, television, radio, journals and other media outlets, about the reporting or presentation of the sending state. The concern is with the image presented of the state and the accuracy of press reports on its policy or actions in the media.

**Interest protection:** it involves protection of the sending state's interest and its nationals (their interests) in the receiving state, within the limits permitted by international law. The duty of protection is a traditional function, which has assumed increased significance in contemporary diplomacy. The growing mobility of citizens, international sport and international conflicts have all added a variety of protection problems with which embassies and consulates now must deal. Dear students, for the purpose of this chapter only a short list of diplomacy definitions and concepts are presented. It will be presented in chapter two later in detail!

### 1.9.2. Trade and Foreign Aid Policies

Trade policies and foreign aid are also known as economic instruments. An economic instrument may be defined as an economic capacity, institution, or technique applied with in foreign policy goals of states towards the favor or disfavor of another state. As the status of a state in international arena is largely determined by its economic status which categorized the nations of the world into *superpowers* (US); *major powers* (EU--Germany, France, United Kingdom; Japan, Russia, China, and India; *middling powers* (Israel, Iran, Pakistan, Poland, Spain, Republic of South Africa, Brazil, Argentina); and *minor or small powers* (Serbia, Denmark, Cuba). There is a power cycling which transfer the superpowers into a major or middling or small one whereas vice-versa is also true. The example is *Japan before tsunami as Major Power* but now it is not possible to say in which category it will fall. In case of vice-versa India can be cited as one of the

best examples to transform from Under-Developed to the Major Power. They are in effect applied by the economically developed states up on weak and poor states of the world. They are classified into two: persuasive economic techniques and coercive economic techniques.

A. **Persuasive economic techniques**: are those methods of offering economic rewards or advantages in turn for a satisfactory modification of another state's behaviors. These instruments in turn include favorable trade policies, foreign aid, and debt relief.

- i. **Favorable Trade Policies**: Provision of free access to their markets, the lifting up of trade barriers, advocacy of imports and technology transfers and subsidies.
- ii. **Foreign Aid**: Also called *Foreign Assistance* (or overseas development assistance), is a policy instrument that is employed by the developed North to help at least in principle, third world states speed up economic development or simply meet basic humanitarian needs. Foreign aid constitutes of different *types* or *forms*. These include:

- **Grants** – are funds given free to a recipient state, usually for some stated purpose/s.
- **Loans** – are funds given to help in economic development, which must be repaid in the future out of the surplus generated by the development process.
- **Loan guarantees**-which are sued only occasionally, are promises by the donor state to back up commercial loans to the recipient state.
- **Technical cooperation** – refers to grants given in the form of expert assistance in some project than just money or goods.
- **Credits** – are grants that can be used to buy certain products from the donor state. For example, the U.S.A regularly gives credits that can be used for purchases of U.S. grain.
- **Military aid** –It refers to both the money and the military armaments that are transferred from the North to the South in a form of aid.

- iii. **Debt Relief**

Whatever the problems and draw backs, poor states are justifiably determined to increase their levels of development. To do this they need massive amounts of capital to supplement their own internal efforts to improve socio-economic conditions. Many things can be accompanied with

domestic resources and drive, but such capital needs require outside resources as well. Loans can be obtained from:

- Governments on a state-to-state level and become bilateral.
- Loans might also be extended by international organizations like the UN or by international financial institutions mainly the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Such forms of loans are called *multilateral* loans.
- Other than government and institutional loans, the private sector is also an important source of income to the LDCs in the form of loans.

### B. Coercive Economic Techniques

Economic embargo refers to limited restrictions of economic relations particularly foreign aid, trade and investment imposed by usually the developed states to impinge up on the poor but disobedient states of the South. But economic sanction refers to an outright interruption or blockage of economic interactions of a state vis – a –vis another state/s.

### 1.9.3. Psychological Technique: Propaganda

Propaganda is information, ideas, or rumors deliberately spread widely to help or harm a person, group, movement, institution, nation, etc. Frankel has clarified this instrument of advancing the national interest as “*propaganda is a systematic attempt to affect the minds, emotions, and actions of given group for a specific public purpose.*” This instrument has been effectively used in this *era of information revolution via different means of communications*. In this situation, the strong propagandas of developed countries are framed in such a manner that *influence the world public opinion* in the like manner as they wished *but* for those countries which do not have effective communication are unable to influence the world public opinion. This may lead to *one sided national interest* that too for the developed countries of the world.

**Propaganda** refers to the organized efforts that regimes of states use to convince their own people internally and/or the people of foreign states to accept policies favorable to them. As an instrument of foreign policy, propaganda is an attempt primarily to influence another state/s through emotional techniques rather than logical discussion or presentation of empirical evidence. It is therefore a process of appealing to emotions rather than minds by creating fear, doubt, sympathy, anger, or a variety of other feelings. There are a Variety of *techniques* for projecting effective propaganda. These are:

- a. **Telling the Truth/ White propaganda**: sometimes the truth can be very damaging to the other side in that it can create public impression that the propagandist state is justifiable than their own state or government.
- b. **Lying/ Black propaganda**: outright lies are not common practices, because they are difficult to support and run the risk of being exposed. Lies which are sometimes called *disinformation* can effectively convince the public in another state and create a distorted image on the targeted state (and its government).
- c. **Half –Truths/ Grey propaganda**: this is a more common technique than lying. It has three approaches.
  - i. First, it involves taking a kernel of truth and projecting it as a general statement.
  - ii. Second, it includes presenting controversial information whose truth or false hood has never been ascertained as a fact.
  - iii. The third approach is deliberate omission of information. In this case, the information presented is true but is incomplete.

#### **1.9.4. Military Techniques**

Military techniques of foreign policy are usually used as an ultimate option immediately after diplomacy (or negotiation) fails. There are the following **four** ways of application of military power:

- Military power as a Diplomatic back drop
- Military power as a threatening force
- Military power through limited demonstration of Violence
- Military power as a Direct Action

There are two ways of measuring the effectiveness of war.

- ✓ The state must apply *cost /benefit analysis*. This includes comparing the outcomes of military action with the actual loss of life, human anguish an economic destruction and act accordingly.
- ✓ The second way is in terms of *goal attainment*. The issue is whether the accumulation and use of military power achieve the desired results or not.

As far as conditions of success are concerned, the following rules are believed to lead to successful use of military force. These are:

- a. Action should be taken in areas where there is a clearly defined probably long-standing and previously demonstrated commitment.
- b. A state's felt and announced Commitment should be strong.
- c. Military force is most successful when used to counter other military force, rather than to try to control political events.
- d. A state ought to early and decisively (with sufficient force) use force than to threaten and then escalate slowly.
- e. Establish clear goals.
- f. Work to secure widespread domestic support of the action and goals.

These correlations between military action, political circumstances, and success *are only preliminary and do not necessarily guarantee success*. Wars are often caused by specific issues and fought with specific goals. Moreover, the choice for war is not irrational in so far as leaders usually calculate, accurately or not, their probability of success. This calculation is called the "expected utility" of war. The validity of this calculation is supported by the fact that military force sometimes works, especially when a major power is the initiator of the war.