

4 The domestic sources of foreign policy

Introduction

The adage 'politics stops at the water's edge' captures the tradition of foreign policy being an area where domestic political factionalism is sublimated to the interests of national security. This realist perspective on foreign policy and the communitarian pull of nationalism obscures both the complexity of decision making and the centrality of domestic factors in shaping the aims and outcomes of that process. Time-honoured questions such as who makes foreign policy and in whose interests, highlight the difficulty of ascribing simplistic, realist-tinged interpretations of foreign policy.

The problems inherent in defining what constitutes the 'national interest' inspired closer examination of the sources of foreign policy decision making and the nature of the process itself and extensive investigation of the individual decision maker and the role of bureaucratic influences in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. This work, in turn, raises questions about how those elements outside the formal state structures of foreign policy decision making, but still within the sovereign confines of the state – societal actors, interests and values that reside in the domestic setting – are actually accounted for and integrated into the foreign policy process.

Domestic influences outside the formal state structures – lobbyists, the media, class factors, constitutional restrictions – are clearly significant and in some cases central to the making of state foreign policy.¹ For instance, societal actors, such as interest groups, actively engage the relevant state political actors in order to influence the foreign policy process in line with their concerns. At the same time, the formal and informal rules of political conduct within a given state are critical for shaping the manner in which this influence is exercised and the degree to which it is effective. Also, the overarching societal

structure and its relationship to the state, that is, the role of elites and even class factors, can play a determining part in the orientation, access and particular forms that foreign policy assumes.

Reflecting this complex mosaic, within FPA there are three basic approaches to understanding the impact of domestic factors on state foreign policy. Each is rooted in a different account of state–society relations and, therefore, reflects the assumptions and interests of that particular depiction of those relations. One approach sees the principal source of domestic influence in the actual structural form (i.e. institutions and regimes) of the state. A second approach sees foreign policy making as being driven by the nature of the economic system within states and, concurrently, in the interests of a narrow elite that traditionally has acted in what it perceives to be the national interest. A third approach sees foreign policy as the product of a competitive pluralist environment as expressed by the interplay between interest group politics and state decision makers and structures. In Chapter 4, we focus on the enduring importance of the domestic setting in shaping foreign policy. In particular, we analyse the three accounts referred to above and examine efforts to model foreign policy decision making at the domestic level. Finally, the neglected role of political parties in foreign policy making process is discussed.

The enduring salience of the domestic

An understanding of the relationship between foreign policy, the state and the domestic environment necessarily requires an investigation of the nature of the state and society as a prerequisite to a discussion of how these actors can affect the foreign policy process. Concurrently, there needs to be some recognition that what constitutes the domestic environment and its array of actors and interests, is to a large extent an artifice which can be permeated by 'outside' forces.

While elsewhere in the book we discuss the role of the state – and its notable absence from the FPA literature – it is in scholarly work on the domestic environment that we find a more explicit commitment to established theoretical positions that reflect upon the nature of the state and its relationship to society. What these various approaches in FPA have in common is a belief that foreign policy is something that is produced and legitimized by the state apparatus, even if its sources reside within the domestic sphere. Based on this, domestic actors actively seek to capture the policy debate on foreign policy through a variety of means – from the dispensing of financial largesse to political mobilization strategies – and orient the policy choices made by the state

towards their particular interests. Even those structuralist accounts which resist ascribing any autonomy of the state from societal – and in particular class interests – concede that factionalism within elite groups produces competition over foreign policy. Exactly how this process is said to occur is part of what differentiates the various approaches to the state.

Moreover what we are characterizing as the ‘domestic environment’ is itself an object of contestation. It is arguable that societies, even within recent memory, mirrored the relative isolation which accompanies subjection to the spatial confines of sovereign territorial boundaries to a greater degree than do contemporary societies. There were also temporal barriers between communities, a product of the slow methods of transport and communication over geographic distances throughout most of human history. These circumstances re-enforced the particularist character of different societies giving rise to notions of cultural specificity and associated practices. These beliefs have gained currency with the rising tide of globalization and inform much of the discourse on topics such as state decline, the homogenization of culture and the rise of global civil society (see Chapter 6 on globalization for more detail).²

At the same time, however, the historical record demonstrates that powerful ideas moved frequently in conjunction, for example, with the growing pace of international trade in earlier epochs such as in Europe in the sixteenth century. For instance, the reformist tracts that paved the way to Protestantism enjoyed a surprisingly robust circulation between city states and the patchwork of duchies, principalities and kingdoms that formed Europe’s regional political system at that time. More recently, the phenomenal absorption of cellular phone technology by African societies – the world’s poorest, saddled with abysmal infrastructures and as a result among the most isolated societies in the world – demonstrates that these seemingly adverse conditions need not be an insurmountable barrier. Perhaps it is a failure on our part, giddy from the near instantaneous forms of global communication, to imagine and recognize the possibilities inherent in slower forms of information sharing, and the hunger for knowledge and communication among peoples separated only by geography.

This bundling of domestic and international concerns, captured by the unfortunate term ‘inter-mestic’, tends to make foreign policy issues subject to influence both external and internal to the territorial state to varying degrees. As far back as the 1970s, Peter Gourevitch recognized the possibilities of external influence over the shape and tenor of domestic debates – especially but not exclusively in relation to foreign

policy issues.³ He suggested that Waltz’s ‘second image’, that is, the state level of analysis, is the ‘reverse’ of the conventional depiction in which influence flows only outward, from the domestic setting to the external environment. Mansbach, Ferguson and Lampert use the analogy of a cobweb to describe the international system and to capture the structural implications of this insight, depicting a process of constant interaction between state and non-state actors.⁴ In the face of ideas and pressures from abroad permeating state borders coupled with an ever-expanding web of international norms, rules and regimes designed to regulate state conduct in particular spheres, the capacity of foreign policy decision makers to construct their policy formulations and actions with sole reference to domestic forces, seems ever more remote.

Nevertheless, despite the prevailing rapid circulation of ideas, pressures and material goods characteristic of the contemporary global setting, there are some defining features of the international political system that allow for reference to the enduring saliency and indeed centrality of the domestic environment in the foreign policy process. Fundamental among these is the legal status accorded to the idea of sovereignty, which, of course, gives to the state primacy over a fixed territory and its population. Recognition of the rights of governments within states to exercise this authority even with the emergence of a discourse on the ‘responsibility to protect’, and the inability of societies to have alternative means of expressing their political aspirations other than through sovereignty, is a powerful, defining characteristic of the international system. The fact of citizenship is an acknowledgement of the constraints on individual action. Moreover, the legal structures of states, which provide formal status to corporative entities ranging from businesses to NGOs, define the parameters to their conduct.⁵ The establishment of tax havens in island states, the movement of multi-nationals from one state to another in search of the most beneficial tax and labour conditions, and the utilization of territory to accommodate political refugees are all signs that states and the domestic conditions within them are crucial sites of relatively autonomous political (and economic) activity, which should be considered with the utmost seriousness. This is given concrete expression through everything from corporate taxes, the possibility of lawsuits and the degree of media freedom that is specific to the particular domestic setting of a given state.

Socio-cultural influences – reflected for example by governing practices in different states – introduce local variation into what otherwise might be relative homogeneity within regions.⁶ The adoption of western ideas of sovereignty, for instance, has not been wholesale, but

rather has been a process mediated by local elites and aligned to their needs, established institutions and foundational ideas. This process – which Amitav Acharya characterizes as ‘norm localization’ – gives primacy to domestic actors, institutions and settings in assessing the salience of ‘foreign’ ideas in relation to prevailing local circumstances.⁷ This reassertion of the domestic in the trajectory of the norm cycle is not only a cogent explanation for the partial adaptation or even rejection of externally sourced ideas, for example, in relation to women’s rights by ‘non-western’ societies, but also reminds us that local societal factors exercise a determining influence over ideational matters.⁸

Finally, the indisputable position of the foreign policy decision makers within this complex setting at the centre of a sovereign-based system of authority, derives its substantive legitimacy from the domestic society, which is reified in legal terms by the international system. While these policy decision makers may seek sometimes to boost their standing and prestige by appealing to international actors, ultimately and crucially their authority is dependent upon domestic sources.

The domestic structures approach: constitutional structures and political regimes

For many FPA scholars, the most significant source of foreign policy is the domestic structure of the nature of the state political institutions, the features of society and the institutional arrangements linking state and society and channelling societal demands into the political system. Katzenstein, Krasner, Risse-Kappen and others provide detailed descriptions of the relative strengths and weakness governing relations between differing state structures and society.⁹

According to Risse-Kappen, for instance, the importance of the state structure resides in the fact that it is the crucial site of foreign policy decision making and, mediated through constitutional arrangements, is the area where state and society ‘negotiate’ the country’s international relations.¹⁰ Here, within the particular constitutional framework of the state, domestic institutions and interest groups operate, devising coalition-building strategies that ultimately demonstrate the effectiveness of domestic influences over foreign policy. The rules of political participation influence formal politics and the conduct of political parties in relation to international issues. Traditionally, the executive has the authority to formulate and implement foreign policy, endowed by the constitution or convention; the legislature and other institutions have limited powers of judicial review and budgetary control.

The number of points of access between societal groups and decision makers determines the degree to which there is public input to state foreign policy. For example, France has very few access points to the executive and is ‘state-dominated’ because the public plays only a limited role in foreign policy making; in the US there are multiple access points to the executive, foreign policy is ‘society-dominated’ and the public has many opportunities to influence it.¹¹

Another aspect of the domestic structure that influences foreign policy is the political regime type. Authoritarian regimes with no electoral mandate from their populations and historically have used foreign issues to distract from domestic difficulties. George Kennan’s ‘X telegram’ and subsequent articulation of America’s ‘containment policy’ towards the Soviet Union was predicated on just such an analysis of the roots of Soviet foreign policy.¹² From this perspective, democratic (or ‘pluralist’) regimes tend to pursue fewer foreign policy ‘adventures’ that are out of step with the interests of their society. However, research shows that lack of access to information and other bureaucratic obstacles constructed by authoritarian states may also exist in democratic states and restrict public involvement in foreign policy decision making.¹³ The differences between these two types of regimes in this respect are sometimes small.

In the context of regime-oriented considerations of the domestic origins of foreign policy there is the ‘democratic peace debate’, which derives from Kant’s ‘perpetual peace’ theory and his model of an international order which only ‘republican’ states are allowed to join. Michael Doyle replacing the term ‘republican’ with ‘liberal’, points to statistical analyses that support the fact that stable constitutional liberal democracies do not engage in wars with one another.¹⁴ His rationale is, first, that a ‘cultural-normative’ interpretation suggests that stable democracies resolve conflict through negotiation and bargaining and, therefore, favour these same approaches in foreign policy, especially towards other democratic regimes. However, in the context of non-democratic regimes, democratic leaders cast off their inhibitions in relation to conflict. Concurrently, a ‘structural-institutional’ interpretation suggests that democratic regimes are founded on a system of checks and balances that effectively slow decision making while emphasizing the public agreement with foreign policy decisions in relation to the declaration of war, all of which serves as an internal deterrent to promulgating war between democracies. Although the empirical basis for democratic peace theory is open to contestation on several grounds, there is general acceptance that the data broadly supports this proposition.¹⁵

The notion of 'middle powers' introduces another variant into the relationship between political regime and foreign policy behaviour. Cooper, Higgot and Nossal propose that ideational and material attributes combine to contribute to a self-conscious assertion of national role – echoing some of the work on role theory – that produces distinctive foreign policy conduct in high-income but 'middle ranked states such as Canada and Australia'.¹⁶ Middle power foreign policies are usually multilateralist, bridge-building and concerned with the promotion of norms. Some scholars include developing countries, such as Malaysia and South Africa, in the group of middle power states.¹⁷ This approach to identifying middle powers is rooted in the prevailing power hierarchies of states (and avoids trying to develop objective material indicators for their rankings), and relies on domestic perceptions of capacity in relation both to other states and to the particular sector (such as trade) or foreign policy issue under consideration.

Scholarship on political regimes within different geographic regions has moved away from analyses of the impact of regimes on foreign policy, to emphasize the regional systemic patterns and local particulars of history and society in shaping foreign policy conduct. For instance, Africanists studying foreign policy who seek to integrate their work into the established typologies of African political regimes, for example, neo-patrimonial to settler oligarchies believe that these have exercised a determining influence over the structures of foreign policy decision making and implementation.¹⁸ In studies of the foreign policy of Middle Eastern states the predominance of authoritarian states backed by security services has been noted.¹⁹ In Southeast Asia, the convergence of elite interests and cultural specificities has produced a regional foreign policy style which some academics and practitioners characterize as the 'ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations) way'.²⁰

In some ways, this trend echoes earlier thinking in FPA related to the diagnosis of 'nation-type' and national attribute theory as a means of developing a comprehensive predictive analysis of foreign policy behaviour.²¹ However, unlike the comparative FPA project, there as yet is no renewal of the effort to systematize these particularist features into a rigorously drawn and universal rationalist framework (much less one that seeks to codify the variables as in the comparative FPA project).²² Stephen Krasner, while critical of what he characterizes as structural approaches to the analysis of state foreign policies, proposes an approach that takes the historical evolution of the state as a starting point for understanding foreign policy conduct.²³ Work on regions, such as Buzan and Weaver's regional security complexes, seems to be anticipating a return to the systematic consideration of foreign policy

conduct through its emphasis on the specificities of local factors as a way of interpreting regional state behaviour. Laura Neack's attempt to link state type to foreign policy conduct, which includes a focus on the category of 'middle powers', is an example of such an approach.²⁴

The 'structuralist' approach: economic systems and social class

Among structuralist writings in the Marxist tradition, we can find the roots of foreign policy and, more particularly, the motivation for exploitative policies, such as imperialism and colonialism, in the nature of the capitalist economic system. According to Karl Marx, although the state may be nothing more than a committee representing bourgeois interests, it performs a critical function in ordering the interests of capital in relation to labour and markets.²⁵ This instrumentalist view denies the existence of state autonomy in real terms, but suggests that state legitimacy is dependent on the population having a perception of its autonomy.²⁶ The literature is dominated by debates on the relative autonomy of the state from the elites, but those scholars in this tradition agree that a narrow social class uses its control over the economy to ensure that foreign policy conforms to its interests.

For structuralists, the crucial divisions between the hierarchy of the states fitted within the international political economy are the most important guide to foreign policy conduct. A centre-periphery relationship, based upon the economic exploitation of non- and semi-industrialized states of the 'Third World' (or the south), produces a foreign policy oriented towards maintaining this relationship between the industrialized core and the countries of the periphery. Bruce Moon examines how the 'peripheral state' is driven by the need for domestic legitimacy – bolstered by international recognition – alongside the pursuit of economic or developmental aims.²⁷ Capturing the state is crucial for domestic actors to enhance their accumulation of resources. Robert Cox and Hein Marais, among others, suggest that in the developing countries there is a transnational capitalist class, which shares the norms and values of the leading capitalist countries, fostered by leading international institutions such as the World Bank.²⁸ These local elites actively subvert local considerations in favour of their capitalist interests and, in so doing, perpetuate the exploitative relations of economic dominance. This explains the foreign policy orientation towards western interests, in matters such as trade liberalization, by otherwise impoverished states, whose domestic industries and agricultural sector suffer from open market access.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

Finally, there is a strand in the literature on class and elite foreign policy theory that describes foreign policy as conducted by and for the elite within society. Skidmore and Hudson characterize this approach as the 'social bloc' model, in which power is concentrated in the hands of a social minority which produces a drive for a more cohesive elite and a relatively stable domestic environment. As a result, political leaders can emerge only through alliance to one of a few dominant social blocs whose well-articulated interests are reflected in the foreign policy implemented.²⁹ The breakdown of this cohesion, for example, in the case of the Philippines under the Marcos regime and Nigeria under General Suni Abacha, can provoke political crisis that can lead to the broadening of political participation in an effort to re-legitimize the political system. Christopher Clapham holds that the overarching imperative of state survival compels African elites to use foreign policy as an instrument to obtain economic resources and political legitimacy from the external environment.³⁰

The relationship between the institutions of foreign policy making and the interests of the dominant economic and social forces in society has been studied in depth. The nineteenth-century English observer, John Bright, noted that the members of the diplomatic corps essentially were drawn from the elite and he suggested that 'foreign policy is a gigantic system of outdoor relief for the aristocracy'.³¹ In the mid-twentieth century, the American political scientist Charles Wright Mills identified a 'power elite', composed of corporate leaders, politicians and military commanders, as the driving force behind foreign (and national) policy.³² The ability of these groups to construe parochial concerns as 'national interest' and, thus, dictate foreign policy, is tied to their capacity to maintain an overarching social cohesion that allows them to continue to mobilize society through ideological and economic appeals.

The pluralist approach: sub-state societal actors and interests

Pluralism is perhaps the most widely acknowledged approach to assessing the role and impact of domestic factors on foreign policy. Pluralism includes the myriad of sub-state and non-state actors within the domestic arena and their efforts to exert influence over state institutions and decision-making processes. In this depiction of the state, its autonomy is assumed (as in the classic Weberian approach), but implies also a more explicitly atomized and competitive depiction of state-society relations. The general preponderance of domestic over international concerns, from this perspective, is a function of the

variety of societal interest groups and the cross-cutting cleavages among them.³³ Because foreign policy issues affect the material interests of different societal groups differently, these groups compete and mobilize for influence over political decision making. The focus in the pluralist approach is primarily on electoral democracies and the role of sub-state and non-state actors, principally interest groups, public opinion and the media, in shaping the foreign policy choices of decision makers.

Interest groups are distinguished by their sources of support and the nature of their interests. They offer either political mobilization for electoral support or financial mobilization for electoral support (or both), to governments and political parties, in exchange for their backing for foreign policy positions. A key variable in this exchange is the degree to which interest groups are able to mobilize and present their positions, at least in ideological terms, as responsive to collective (or national) concerns. The number of techniques used to achieve these aims has grown in line with new telecommunications/communication technologies and the growth of new media. Interest groups can be categorized roughly as lobby groups, single-issue movements, constituency-based groups (e.g. ethnic minority voters) and special interest groups (e.g. representatives of a particular industry).³⁴ Research into interest groups' influence on foreign policy focuses mainly on the economic and political aspects, for example, the impact of particular business lobbies on a state's commercial policies or the role of ethnic lobbies in promoting their respective concerns. Security issues, from this perspective, are a matter of national interest and, therefore, domestic factionalism is set aside. David Skidmore challenges this view, demonstrating that the rise of foreign and security lobbies, ranging from defence industry groups to non-governmental 'peace' organizations, such as the American Friends Committee (Quakers), are a clear indicative that society does hold distinctive and sometimes deeply contradictory views on security matters.³⁵

Public opinion is a broad term that encompasses the mass, attentive public and various interest groups and lobby groups. Public opinion sets the parameters to foreign policy decisions and can be seen as a 'background' restraint on foreign policy making and implementation. The concept of public opinion is problematic since it requires definition of who is the public and involves debate on the methodologies adopted to promote the public's viewpoints. Christopher Hill, in his study of British public opinion on foreign policy, characterizes public opinion as 'the Loch Ness monster', something frequently spoken about, but never seen.³⁶

The classical Almond–Lippman view holds that public opinion should have no role or influence over foreign policy and it is largely indifferent to and ignorant of foreign policy issues. Subscribers to this consensus believe that the public's attitudes are mercurial and inconsistent and therefore a poor – and even dangerous – source of foreign policy making. For these reasons, they argue persuasively for a governing elite to manage foreign policy.³⁷ Shapiro and Page disagree, demonstrating in their study of US foreign policy during the CW, that public opinion was not only consistent – as shown by numerous studies of democracies – but quite 'rational' in its assessment of international events.³⁸ James Rosenau studies public opinion based on a pyramid where the peak is the elite (the government, the legislature and the media); the second level is the attentive public (intellectuals and business); and the third level is the general public (who are indifferent).³⁹ Several scholars suggest that only a section of public opinion, perhaps between 5 and 20 per cent, is interested in and attentive to foreign policy. Public interest seems to depend upon the issue (also known as 'issue saliency'). Routine issues related to diplomacy are not high on the agenda of public concerns, but economic and trade issues and questions related to war and peace arouse the public interest.⁴⁰

It is clear that a discussion of public opinion without a concomitant theory of the media will be incomplete. The *media* play a crucial, if controversial, role in the foreign policy process, in acting as a bridge for the passage of information between the public, the state and the international arena. The media's influence on foreign policy can be considered in our view from three perspectives: agenda setting, information clearing house and government propaganda tool. The media as an agenda setter is exemplified in the role of William Randolph Hearst, an American newspaper mogul, whose bellicose editorials and reportage promoted American military action in the late nineteenth century. A contemporary example is the so-called 'CNN effect', or the degree to which media spotlight on a particular issue forces the state to take action.⁴¹ Research into government responses to portrayals of humanitarian crises indicates that while the media can play an important role in shaping foreign policy at the height of a crisis, its influence wanes as the crisis – or coverage of it – declines.

The media as a 'clearing house' is predicated upon an implicit sense of its institutional neutrality. Editorial policy is not as much a function of ideological perspectives, established interests or personal biases, but rather an ordering of information that conforms to the wants and needs of the citizenry. Market factors and consumer conduct, therefore, are the main drivers of media action and impose a logic on the

particular sector that defies efforts to give it overt direction. The fact that disaster and sex promote sales of newspapers and other media, means that these sorts of stories will be prioritized in order to increase circulation.

The media as a government propaganda tool certainly holds for closed, authoritarian states that seek to manage the flow of information to their citizens in the interests of regime security. The more controversial position is that democratic polities deliberately engage in manipulating the public in order to steer foreign policy in directions that suit elite interests. Noam Chomsky characterizes the process of opinion formation in democracies as 'manufactured consent', in which the state and the media elites shape citizens' outlooks to conform to their particular interests in order to gain support for the pursuit of a specific foreign policy agenda.⁴² Following this insight, several studies suggest that it is only when elite opinion within a state is divided over foreign policy that the media can exert influence over public opinion. For example, the UK media and the public outcry against the Blair government's participation in the last Iraq war reflected divisions within the foreign policy establishment over this policy.

Having an input into the media is a priority for democratic states seeking the approval of the public for a particular course of action. Following the Vietnam War, the US government tried to influence the media, which was seen as being an independent actor capable of undermining the government's foreign policy objectives. The influence exerted included the introduction of new approaches to managing media (daily briefings, controlled leaks, spin and 'embedded journalists'). State-funded media, such as the UK British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), present a somewhat different set of problems for a democratic state since they raise the issue of a balance between independence and control of the media agenda. Another source of information on international affairs is non-state actors whose mandate is to shape public opinion on foreign policy issues. These include 'think tanks', such as the numerous (nearly 300 in 2011) strategic studies centres across the world, philanthropic foundations, such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and semi-state actors such as political party foundations, for example, Germany's Friedrich Ebert Foundation and the US National Endowment for Democracy.⁴³ MNCs use their funding of non-state actors to support perspectives that correspond with their interests. Advocacy groups, such as environmentalists or human rights activists, try to mobilize public support (and in so doing influence government action) through media campaigns designed to raise awareness of their issues and concerns.

Finally, new media, especially computer-enabled media, have provided non-state actors and individuals with numerous platforms, such as 'blog' sites and social networks, to connect people and provide information. There is a dizzying array of alternative narratives and stories, sometimes available in 'real time', which make it very difficult for governments to keep abreast of events and enables the 'spinning' of public opinion. The extraordinary efforts exerted by authoritarian states to control the Internet (e.g. in Cuba, Iran and China) are testament to the fear that these instruments induce, and the outbreak of revolution in North Africa in 2011 served to confirm this fear. The longer-term implications for governance that accompany the fragmentation of national media into narrower interest-based constituencies that are market or interest driven, and the implications for opinion formation on foreign policy have yet to be thoroughly explored.

Modelling foreign policy decision making in the domestic environment

The inherent complexity involved in interpreting foreign policy formulation and choice has inspired different approaches to modelling this process. These approaches mirror the classic three levels of analysis in FPA focusing on the role of the individual leader, the place of state institutions and the influence of system factors, in their assessment of foreign policy decision making in the domestic environment. Joe Hagan and Julia Kaarbo having written about the competitive role played by political actors within government structures in their efforts to understand the dynamics of foreign policy choice; Robert Putnam, Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye have developed approaches to foreign policy which seek to account for the complexity and interplay between the domestic and external forces.

Hagan revisits the role of leaders in democratic governments as the focal points of foreign policy decision making.⁴⁴ He holds that a leader's primary concern is political survival in office, and that all policy choices ultimately are set against the backdrop of this *sine qua non*. The task of the leader becomes one of creating and maintaining coalitions of support for the respective foreign policy agendas through a central concern over ways of managing opposition to that agenda from within the governing party or from the formal opposition party. Hagan posits that this is achieved through the application of one of three strategies, accommodation, insulation or mobilization. In the case of accommodation, the leader bargains with the opponents to the foreign policy agenda to win support for a compromise foreign policy.

Insulation involves deflecting attention away from the foreign policy issue in question thus freeing the 'political space' for the leader's preferred foreign policy action. A mobilization strategy is pursued to win support for a foreign policy position by persuading opponents of the policy.

Kaarbo delves into the actual governing structures and examines the role of bureaucracies – especially of minority dissenters to the prevailing policy choices – in the foreign policy process. According to Kaarbo, the ability of these bureaucratic minorities to influence foreign policy is based on their familiarity with and consequent facility at manipulating the decision-making procedures and information within governing structures.⁴⁵ Their minority standing, due to the fact that they are directly subordinate within a particular bureaucratic institution (a vertical minority) or because they are part of a weaker bureaucratic institution among more prominent bureaucratic institutions (a horizontal minority), helps to determine the specific strategic approach adopted to promote their position.

Pluralist studies of foreign policy recognize the impact of a diversity of actors, salient international institutions and a changing environment on foreign policy decision making. This growing complexity poses significant challenges to the more conventional explanations of foreign policy conduct in FPA. In attempting to address this, Martin Rochester identifies four problems facing foreign policy makers engaged in classic pursuits of national interest in the context of the pluralist 'cobweb' paradigm: satisfying different interest groups affected unequally by foreign policy; sub-national actors with cross-cutting affiliations and interests; controlling the conduct of MNCs with their own specific interests; and satisfying both the domestic and a foreign constituencies.⁴⁶

In Chapter 2 we discussed how Robert Putnam responded to this last challenge by devising an approach based on the two-level game which reflects the two environments of decision making.⁴⁷ Putnam's approach to modelling foreign policy decision making – which focuses on trade issues, but was seen by FPA scholars as having wider applicability – aims to integrate and understand the different (and sometimes rival) dynamics involved in a given foreign policy choice. According to Putnam, decision makers have to operate within two competing frameworks with different rules and different operational logics – the external environment which is anarchic, and the domestic environment which operates under recognized rules – in order to achieve a 'win-set' (a policy that satisfies all requisite interests). The weighing of options, the classic 'guns versus butter' problem (security versus wealth creation) in the decision on a specific foreign policy

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

matter is made more complex by the different sets of rules governing these two environments. Putnam's influential approach is informed by game theory and captures the dynamic attempts of decision makers to address local constituencies and external forces simultaneously.

Finally, Keohane and Nye proposed a model of foreign policy decision making which echoes the very complexity it seeks to explain. 'Complex inter-dependency' allows the state to retain a measure of agency in assessing and mobilizing state and sub-state actors, NGOs and international institutions for its own ends.⁴⁸ The increasing relevance of international institutions is reflected in the fact that international institutions are seen as the prime arena for action (though implicitly the UN is recognized as an autonomous international actor). Keohane and Nye's portrayal of the foreign policy process as inter-linked through a variety of networks, actors and interests anticipates key features of the globalization literature, although unlike Held and others, they hold fast to neo-realist assumptions about the centrality of the state, the continuing relevance of the domestic environment and its role in defining motivations for action.

Political parties – the neglected element

These approaches to framing and interpreting foreign policy decision making within the domestic context provide some insights into this complex process. At the same time, with the exception of Hagan, they mostly neglect the part played by political parties in this process. In many respects, political parties can be seen as the key site for a number of activities attributed in FPA to domestic sources of foreign policy. These include the simultaneous role of political parties as agenda setters in foreign policy, through ideological discourses reflecting their distinctive political orientation (e.g. rightist or leftist), as agenda followers in foreign policy, and through their position as interest aggregators derived from the support they court from within domestic society.

Closer examination of political parties and foreign policy reveals that many of the determining points in the formulation of ideological orientation and particular policy choices (which sometimes appear directly contradictory to this orientation) of a state's foreign policy are products of the decisions and inputs at the political party level, and not formal government. Moreover, by focusing on political parties and foreign policy it is possible to move away from the normative tendency towards concentrating on democratic forms of governance and imbuing them with special attributes to examining dispassionately how single-party regimes, for example, the Communist Party of China,

operate in ways that mimic these key functions. Political parties utilize their international networks in ways that complement, supplement or even contradict the formal diplomatic bilateral state apparatus. During the CW, for example, the West German political parties and their foundations maintained links that cut across the diplomatic necessity to recognize East Germany.⁴⁹ The international departments of socialist, social democratic, liberal and communist parties all, to varying degrees, exercise a form of 'foreign policy', which is at once deeply ideological, highly political and resoundingly statist in its underlying ambitions. Although a lack of party discipline and the power of lobbies have blunted the power of political parties in the US, it would be a mistake to ignore the important organizing functions they perform within the political system.

Marrying the insights from scholarship on domestic structure to how different political regimes configure political participation is a critical follow-up to the incorporation of political parties into foreign policy decision making. It would provide a richer account of the arena of political action and provide some clarity for our understanding of the dynamics of interest-based politics and their impact on foreign policy choice. The 'shadow politics' of influence peddling, often only dredged up in the wake of political scandal, could give new meaning to our understanding of the competitive world of pluralist politics.

Conclusion

The approaches discussed above – a domestic structures rendering, a classical structuralist account and the pluralist approach – are important elements in the 'conversation' on the significance, role and influence of the domestic environment in foreign policy. We explored the intersection between domestic influences and regional locations. The difficulty inherent in incorporating some of these insights regarding abstract notions, such as public opinion, into a working model of foreign policy decision making, somewhat limit their interpretive value.

However, through Hagan's portrayal of leadership in foreign policy and Putnam's 'two-level game', we can see how decision makers might manage the competing pressures and concerns in developing state foreign policy. We have shown that the domestic environment is a crucial and constraining factor in foreign policy and puts limits on what is possible in national foreign policy. Nonetheless, it is clear that contemporary foreign policy is not focused only on the externalization of domestic politics, but is part of a complex interchange across the domestic-foreign state frontier.

Bibliography

- Acharya, Amitav, 'How ideas spread? Whose ideas matter – norm localisation and institutional change in Asian regionalism', *International Organization*, 2004, vol. 58, pp. 239–75.
- Albert, Mathias, "'Globalisation theory" Yesterday's fad or more lively than ever?', *International Political Sociology*, 2007, vol. 2, pp. 165–82.
- Alden, Chris, 'From liberation movement to political party: ANC foreign policy in transition', *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 1993, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 80–95.
- , *Mozambique and the Construction of the New African State*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Alden, Chris and Garth le Pere, *South Africa's Post-Apartheid Foreign Policy – From Reconciliation to Revival?* Adelphi Paper 362, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Allison, Graham T., 'Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis', *American Political Science Review*, 1969, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 689–718.
- , *Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis*, 2nd edn, Boston: Little Brown, 1971.
- , 'The Cuban missile crisis', in Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne (eds) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Allison, Graham T. and Morton H. Halperin, 'Bureaucratic politics: A paradigm and some policy implications', *World Politics*, 1972, vol. 24, pp. 40–79.
- Almond, Gabriel, *The American People and Foreign Policy*, New York: Praeger, 1950.
- Aran, Amnon, *Israel's Foreign Policy towards the PLO: The Impact of Globalization*, Sussex: Sussex Academic Press, 2009.
- Archibald, Kathleen (ed.), *Strategic Interaction and Conflict*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Armstrong, David, *Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International Society*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Art, Robert J., 'Bureaucratic politics and American foreign policy: A critique', *Policy Sciences*, 1973, no. 4, pp. 467–90.
- Axelrod, Robert (ed.), *Structure of Decision: The Cognitive Maps of Political Elites*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Ayubi, Nazih N., *Overstating the Arab State: Politics and Society in the Middle East*, London: I.B. Tauris, 1995.
- Banks, Michael and Martin Shaw (eds), *State and Society in International Relations*, London: Harvester, 1991.
- Barak, Oren and Gabriel Sheffer, 'Israel's security network: An exploration of a new approach', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 2006, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 235–61.
- Barkawi, Tarek, 'Connection and constitution: Locating war and culture in globalization studies', *Globalizations*, 2004, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 155–70.
- , *Globalization and War*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
- Barkawi, Tarek and Mark Laffey, 'The imperial peace: Democracy, force and globalization', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1999, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 403–34.
- Barnett, Michael, 'Culture, strategy and foreign policy change: Israel's road to Oslo', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1999, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 5–36.
- Barnett, Michael and Martha Finnemore, *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*, Syracuse, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Bayart, Jean Francois, 'Africa in the world: A history of extraversion', *African Affairs*, 2000, vol. 99, pp. 217–67.
- Bendor, Jonathan and Thomas H. Hammond, 'Rethinking Allison's models', *American Political Science Review*, 1992, vol. 86, no. 2, pp. 301–22.
- Bernstein, Barton, 'The Cuban missile crisis: Trading the Jupiters in Turkey?' *Political Science Quarterly*, 1980, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 97–125.
- Berridge, Geof W. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2005.
- Blavokos, Sypros and Dimitris Bourantonis, 'Accounting for foreign policy change: The role of policy entrepreneurs', paper presented at the Standing Group on International Relations, Pan-European Conference on IR, September, 2010.
- Bobit, Phillip, *The Shield of Achilles*, New York: Anchor Books, 2003.
- Bobrow, Davis, *Adaptive Politics, Social Learning and Military Institutions*, Springfield, VA: National Technical Information Service, 1970.
- Boulding, Kenneth, *The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society*, Ann Arbor, MI: Arbor Paperbacks, 1956.
- , 'National images and international systems' *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1959, vol. 3, pp. 120–31.
- Brighi, Elisabetta and Christopher Hill, 'Implementation and behaviour', in Steve Smith, Amanda Hatfield and Tim Dunne (eds) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 117–36.
- Brown, Carl L. (ed.), *Diplomacy in the Middle East: The International Relations of Regional and Outside Powers*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.

- Brown, Chris, *Sovereignty, Rights and Justice*, Cambridge: Polity, 2002.
- Bull, Hedley, *The Anarchical International Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, London: Macmillan, 1977.
- Buzan, Barry and Richard Little, *International Systems in World History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Buzan, Barry and Ole Weaver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Byman, Daniel and Kenneth M. Pollack, 'Let us now praise great men: Bringing the statesman back in', *International Security*, 2001, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 107–46.
- Caldwell, Dan, 'Bureaucratic foreign policy-making', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1977, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 87–110.
- Campbell, David, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1992.
- Caporaso, James A., 'Across the great divide: Integrating comparative and international politics', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1997, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 563–91.
- Carlsnaes, Walter, *Ideology and Foreign Policy: Problems of Comparative Conceptualization*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- , 'The agency-structure problem in foreign policy analysis', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1992, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 245–70.
- Chabal, Patrick and Jean-Pascal Daloz, *Africa Works: The Political Instrumentality of Disorder*, London: Zed, 1999.
- Chapman, Terrence and Dan Reiter, 'The United Nations Security Council and the rally round the flag effect', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2004, vol. 48, pp. 886–909.
- Checkel, Jeffrey, 'Ideas, institutions and the Gorbachev foreign policy revolution', *World Politics*, 1993, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 271–300.
- Chin, Gregory and Thakur, Ramesh, 'Will China change the rules of global order?' *Washington Quarterly*, 2010, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 119–38.
- Clapham, Christopher, *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- , 'Sovereignty and the third world state', *Political Studies*, 1999, vol. 47, pp. 522–37.
- Clark, Ian, *Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- , *Globalization and International Relations Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Clarke, Michael, 'Politicians and diplomats', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 1978, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 96–8.
- Cohen, Benjamin, 'The political economy of international trade', *International Organization*, 1990, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 261–81.
- Cooper, Andrew, Richard Higgott and Kim Nossal, *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order*, Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 1993.
- Cox, Robert W., *Production, Power and World Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Craig, Gordon A. and Alexander L. George (eds), *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Crozier, Michael, *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Deudney, Daniel and G. John Ikenberry, 'The nature and sources of liberal international order', *Review of International Studies*, 1999, vol. 25, pp. 179–96.
- Downs, George and David Rocke, 'Conflict, agency and gambling for resurrection: The principal-agent problem goes to war', *American Journal of Political Science*, 1994, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 362–80.
- Doyle, Michael, 'Liberalism and world politics', *American Political Science Review*, 1986, vol. 80, pp. 1151–69.
- Drezner, Daniel W., *The Sanctions Paradox: Economic Statecraft and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Dyson, Stephen, 'Personality and foreign policy: Tony Blair's Iraq decision', *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2006, vol. 2, pp. 289–306.
- East, Maurice, 'National attributes and foreign policy', in Maurice East, Stephen Salmore and Charles Hermann (eds) *Why Nations Act: Theoretical Perspectives for Comparative Foreign Policy*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1978.
- East, Maurice and Charles Hermann, 'Do nation-types account for foreign policy behaviour?' in James Rosenau (ed.) *Comparing Foreign Policy: Theories, Findings and Methods*, New York: John Wiley, 1974.
- Elman, Colin, 'Cause, effect, and consistency: A response to Kenneth Waltz', *Security Studies*, 1996, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 58–63.
- , 'Horses for courses: Why not neorealist theories of foreign policy?', *Security Studies*, 1996, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7–53.
- Evans, Peter B., Harold K. Jacobson and Robert D. Putnam (eds), *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Fiske, Susan and Shelley Taylor, *Social Cognition*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Foyle, Douglas, 'Public opinion and foreign policy: Elite beliefs as a mediating variable', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1997, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 141–70.
- Freedman, Lawrence, 'Logic, politics and foreign policy processes: A critique of the bureaucratic politics model', *International Affairs*, 1976, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 434–49.
- Friedman, Thomas L., *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Globalized World in the 21st Century*, London: Allen Lane, 2005.
- Fukuyama, Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man*, London: Penguin, 1993.
- Gaddis, John L., *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Gagnon, Valerie Philip, 'Ethnic nationalism and international conflict: The case of Serbia', *International Security*, 1993/94, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 130–66.
- Gati, Charles, 'What containment meant', *Foreign Policy*, 1972, no. 7, pp. 22–40.
- Gati, Charles and Richard H. Ullman, 'Interview with George F. Kennan', *Foreign Policy*, 1972, no. 7, pp. 5–21.
- George, Alexander, 'The "Operational Code": A neglected approach to the study of political leaders and decision-making', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1969, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 190–222.
- , 'The case for multiple advocacy in making foreign policy', *American Political Science Review*, 1972, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 731–85.
- Gerras, Stephen, 'The army as a learning organization', www.ai.dtic.mil/oai, Army War College, Carlisle, PA.
- Giddens, Anthony, *The Nation-State and Violence*, London: Polity, 1985.
- , *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- , *Runaway World*, London: Profile Books, 1999.
- Goldstein, Judith and Robert Keohane (eds), *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Gorjao, Paulo, 'Regime change and foreign policy: Portugal, Indonesia and the self-determination of East Timor', *Democratization*, 2002, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 142–58.
- Gourevitch, Peter 'The second image reversed: The international sources of domestic politics', *International Organization*, 1978, vol. 32, pp. 881–912.
- Graham, Thomas W., 'The pattern and importance of public knowledge in the nuclear age', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1988, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 319–34.
- Gray, John, *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism*, London: Granta Books, 1998.
- Gross Stein, Janice, 'Foreign policy decision making: Rational, psychological and neurological models', in Steven Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Timothy Dunne (eds) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Haacke, Jurgen and Noel Morada (eds), *Cooperative Security in the Asia-Pacific: The ASEAN Regional Forum*, Oxford: Routledge, 2010.
- Haas, Peter, 'Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination', *International Organization*, 1992, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 1–35.
- Hagan, Joe, *Political Opposition and Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993.
- , 'Domestic political explanations in the analysis of foreign policy', in Laura Neack, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds) *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Halliday, Fred, *The Making of the Second Cold War*, London: Verso, 1986.
- , 'State and society in international relations: A second agenda', *Millennium*, 1987, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 215–30.
- , *Rethinking International Relations*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994.
- , *Revolution and World Politics: The Rise and Fall of the Sixth Great Power*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1999.
- , *The Middle East in International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Halperin, Morton H., 'Why bureaucrats play games?' *Foreign Policy*, 1971, no. 2, pp. 70–90.
- Halperin, Sandra, 'Shadowboxing: Weberian historical sociology vs. state-centric international relations theory', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1998, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 327–39.
- Hanlon, Joe, *Mozambique: Who Calls the Shots?* London: James Currey, 1991.
- Held, David and Anthony McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.
- Held, David and Anthony McGrew (eds), *Globalisation Theory: Approaches and Controversies*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- Held, David, Anthony G. McGrew, David Goldblat and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, Culture*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.
- Hermann, Charles, 'Changing course: When governments choose to redirect foreign policy', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1990, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 3–21.
- , 'Epilogue: Reflections on foreign policy theory building', in Laura Neack, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall 1995.
- Hermann, Charles, Margaret Hermann and Joe Hagan, 'How decision units shape foreign policy behavior', in Charles Hermann, Charles Kegley and James Rosenau (eds), *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.
- Herman, Edward and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York: Pantheon, 1988.
- Hermann, Margaret, 'Indicators of stress in policymakers during foreign policy crises', *Political Psychology*, 1979, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 27–46.
- Higgot, Donna Lee and James Hamill, 'A middle power paradox? South African diplomacy in the post-apartheid era', *International Relations*, 2001, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 33–59.
- Hill, Christopher, 'Public opinion and British foreign policy', *Millennium*, 1981, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 53–62.
- , 'What is left of the domestic?' in Michi Ebata (ed.), *Confronting the Political in International Relations*, London: Macmillan, 2000.
- , *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003.
- Hinnebusch, Raymond and Anoushiravan Ehteshami (eds), *The Foreign Policy of Middle East States*, London: Lynne Rienner, 2002.
- Hirst, Paul and Graham Thompson, *Globalization in Question*, Cambridge: Polity, 2009.

- Hobson, John M., 'Debate: The "second wave" of Weberian historical sociology – The historical sociology of the state and the state of historical sociology in international relations', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1998, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 284–320.
- , 'For a "second wave" of Weberian historical sociology in international relations: A reply to Halperin', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1998, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 354–61.
- , "'Eurocentrism" and neoliberalism in the "Fall of Mann": Will the real Mann please stand up?' *Millennium*, 2005, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 517–27.
- , *The State and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hobson, John M. and Stephen Hobden (eds), *Historical Sociology and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith, 'Roles and reasons in foreign policy decision making', *British Journal of Political Science*, 1986, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 269–86.
- Holsti, K.J., *Why Nations Realign: Foreign Policy Restructuring in a Post-war World*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1982.
- Holsti, Ole, 'The belief system and national images: A case study', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1962, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 244–52.
- , 'The operational code approach to the study of political leaders: John Foster Dulles' philosophical and instrumental beliefs', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1970, pp. 123–57.
- , 'Foreign policy formation viewed cognitively', in Robert Axelrod (ed.), *Structure of Decision: The Cognitive Maps of Political Elites*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- , 'Public opinion and foreign policy', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1992, vol. 36, pp. 439–66.
- Houghton, David Patrick, 'Reinvigorating the study of foreign policy decision making: Toward a constructivist approach', *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2007, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 24–45.
- Hudson, Valerie M. 'Foreign policy analysis: Actor-specific theory and the ground of international relations', *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2005, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–30.
- , *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
- Hughes, B., *The Domestic Context of American Foreign Policy*, San Francisco, CA: W. Freeman, 1978.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Common Defense: Strategic Programs in National Defense*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- , 'Transnational organizations in world politics', *World Politics*, 1973, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 333–68.
- , *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1991.
- Iieda, Keisuke, 'When and how do domestic constraints matter: Two-level games with uncertainty', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1993, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 403–26.
- Jackson, Robert H., *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- , 'Sovereignty in world politics: A glance at the conceptual and historical landscape', *Political Studies*, 1999, vol. 47, pp. 431–56.
- Janis, Irving, *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascos*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.
- Janis, Irving and Leon Mann, *Decision Making*, New York: Free Press, 1977.
- Jarvis, Anthony, 'Societies, states and geopolitics: Challenges from historical sociology', *Review of International Studies*, 1989, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 281–93.
- Jensen, Lloyd, *Explaining Foreign Policy*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1982.
- Jervis, Robert, 'Hypotheses on misperception', *World Politics*, 1968, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 454–79.
- , *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Jisi, Wang, 'China's search for a grand strategy: A rising power finds its way' *Foreign Affairs*, 2011, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 74–7.
- Johnston, Alastair 'Is China a status quo power?' *International Security*, 2003, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 5–56.
- Johnston, Ian 'The role of the UN Secretary General: The power of persuasion based on law', *Global Governance*, 2003, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 441–59.
- Jones, Roy E., *Principles of Foreign Policy – The Civil State in its World Setting*, Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1979.
- Josselin, Daphne and William Wallace (eds), *Non-State Actors in World Politics*, London: Palgrave, 2001.
- Kaarbo, Juliet, 'Power politics in foreign policy: The influence of bureaucratic minorities', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1998, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 67–97.
- Kagan, Robert, *Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, London: Atlantic, 2003.
- Kahler, Miles, 'Conclusion: Liberalization as foreign policy determinant and goal', in Miles Kahler (ed.), *Liberalization and Foreign Policy*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Kaldor, Mary, 'The idea of civil society', *International Affairs*, 2003, vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 583–93.
- Katzenstein, Peter, 'International relations and domestic structures: Foreign economic policies of advanced industrial states', *International Organization*, 1976, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1–45.
- Kegley, Charles, *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy*, New York: St Martin's Press, 1987.
- Keller, Jonathan and Yi Edward Yang, 'Leadership style, decision context and the poliheuristic theory of decision-making: An experimental analysis', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2008, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 687–8.
- Keohane, Robert O., 'International insitutions: two approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1988, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 379–96.

- , 'The globalization of informal violence, theories of world politics, and the liberalism of fear', in Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*, London: Routledge, 2002, pp. 272–84.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Little Brown, 1977.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, New York: Longman, 2001.
- Khadiagala, Gilbert M. and Terrence Lyons (eds), *African Foreign Policies: Power and Process*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001.
- Khong, Yuen Foong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- , 'Neoconservatism and the domestic sources of American foreign policy: The role of ideas in Operation Iraqi Freedom', in Steven Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Timothy Dunne (eds) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.
- Krasner, Stephen, 'Approaches to the state: Alternative conceptions and historical dynamics', *Comparative Politics*, 1984, vol. 16, pp. 223–46.
- , *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Krasner, Stephen D., 'Are bureaucracies important? (or Allison Wonderland)' *Foreign Policy*, 1972, no. 7, pp. 159–79.
- Kuhn, Thomas S., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Lawson, George, 'A conversation with Michael Mann', *Millennium*, 2005, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 477–85.
- Lawson, George, 'The promise of historical sociology in international relations', *International Studies Review*, 2006, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 397–423.
- Lawson, George, John M. Hobson, Linda Weiss, Fred Halliday and Michael Mann, 'The work of Michael Mann', *Millennium*, 2005, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 476–552.
- Leander, Anna, "'Globalisation theory": Feeble ... and hijacked', *International Political Sociology*, 2009, vol. 3, pp. 109–12.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, 'The Cuban missile crisis: Reading the lessons correctly', *Political Studies Quarterly*, vol. 98, no. 3, 1983, pp. 431–58.
- Lee, Donna and James Hamill, 'A middle power paradox? South African diplomacy in the post-apartheid era', *International Relations*, 2001, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 33–59.
- Lehman, Howard P. and Jennifer L. Mckoy, 'The dynamics of the two-level bargaining game: The 1988 Brazilian debt negotiations', *World Politics*, 1992, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 600–44.
- Leifer, Michael, *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Southeast Asia*, Oxford: Routledge, 1995.
- Levy, Gilat and Ronny Razin, 'It takes two: An explanation for the democratic peace', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2004, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–29.
- Levy, Jack, 'Learning and foreign policy: Sweeping a conceptual minefield', *International Organization*, 1994, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 279–312.
- Light, Margot, 'Foreign policy analysis', in A.J.R. Groom and Margot Light (eds), *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*, London: Pinter, 1994, pp. 93–108.
- Lindblom, Charles E., 'The science of muddling through', *Public Administration Review*, 1959, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 79–88.
- Linz, Juan, 'Transitions to democracy' *Washington Quarterly*, 1990, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 133–42.
- Linz, Juan and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Transition and Consolidation*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Lipson, Michael, 'Between Iraq and a hard place: UN arms inspections and the politics of Security Council Resolution 1441', paper presented at Midwest Political Science Association, 20 April, 2006.
- McGrew, Anthony, 'Globalization and Global Politics' in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds) *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Maher, Imelda, Stijn Billiet and Dermot Hodson, 'The principal-agent approach to EU studies: Apply liberally but handle with care', *Comparative European Politics*, 2009, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 409–13.
- Mann, Michael, *The Sources of Social Power: The Rise of Classes and Nation-States, 1760–1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- , 'As the twentieth century ages', *New Left Review*, 1995, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 104–24.
- , 'Has globalization ended the rise and rise of the nation-state?', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1997, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 472–96.
- , 'Globalization and September 11', *New Left Review*, 2001, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 51–72.
- Mansbach, Richard, Yale Ferguson and Donald Lampert, *The Web of World Politics: Nonstate Actors in the Global System*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1976.
- Mansfield, Edward and Jack Snyder, 'Democratisation and war', *Foreign Affairs*, 1995, May/June, pp. 79–97.
- Mansfield, Edward and Jack Snyder, *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go To War*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.
- Marais, Hein, *South Africa: The Limits to Change*, London: Zed, 2001.
- Marx, Karl, *The Communist Manifesto*, London: Penguin, 1967.
- Mehler, Andreas, 'Eternal plight: France in search of a new Africa policy', *Spiegel Online International*, 4 November 2008, www.spiegel.de/international/world/0c1518,546796,00.html, accessed 5 April 2011.
- Mersheimer, John and Walt M. Stephen, *The Israel Lobby*, London: Penguin, 2007.

- Mills, Charles Wright, *The Power Elite*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Milner, Helen, *Interests, Institutions and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Mintz, Alex (ed.), *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy: The Polihuristic Theory of Decision*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Moon, Bruce, 'The state in foreign and domestic policy', in Laura Neack, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995, pp. 192–9.
- Morgenthau, Hans, *Politics Among Nations*, New York: Knopf, 1948.
- Morse, Edward L., 'Modernization and the transformation of foreign policies: Modernization, interdependence and externalization', *World Politics*, 1970, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 371–92.
- Muller, Haral and Thomas Risse-Kappen, 'From the outside in and from the inside out', in David Skidmore and Valerie M. Hudson, *The Limits of State Autonomy*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.
- Neack, Laura, 'Linking state type with foreign policy behaviour' in Laura Neack, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds) *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Neack, Laura, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Neustadt, Richard E., *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership*, New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Ninic, Miroslav, *Democracy and Foreign Policy: The Fallacy of Political Realism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Nye, Joseph S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2006.
- Nye, Joseph S. and Robert O. Keohane (eds), *Transnational Relations and World Politics* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Nye, Joseph S. and Robert O. Keohane, 'Globalization: What's new? What's not? (And so what?)', *Foreign Policy*, 2000, vol. 118, no. 1, pp. 104–20.
- Orbovich, Cynthia and Richard Molnar, 'Modeling foreign policy advisory processes', in Eric Singer and Valerie Hudson (eds) *Political Psychology and Foreign Policy*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992.
- Ougaard, Morten and Richard Higgott, *Towards Global Polity: Future Trends and Prospects*, London: Routledge, 2002.
- Owen, Roger, *State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East*, London: Routledge, 2004.
- Payne, Richard J. and Eddie Ganaway, 'The influence of black Americans on US policy towards Southern Africa', *African Affairs*, 1980, vol. 79, pp. 567–85.
- Peri, Yoram, *Generals in the Cabinet Room: How the Military Shapes Israeli Policy*, Washington, DC: The United States Institute for Peace, 2006.
- Peters, B. Guy, *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The 'New Institutionalism'*, 2nd edn, London: Continuum, 2005.
- Pinto-Duchinsky, Michael, 'Foreign political aid: The German party foundations and their US counterparts', *International Affairs*, 1991, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 33–63.
- Powell, Robert, *Nuclear Deterrence Theory*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Putnam, Robert, 'Diplomacy and domestic politics: The logic of two-level games', *International Organization*, 1988, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 427–60.
- Randolf, Rummel, 'Democracies are less warlike than other regimes', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1995, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 649–64.
- Renshon, Jonathan and Stanley Renshon, 'Theory and practice of foreign policy decision making', *Political Psychology*, 2008, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 509–36.
- Ripley, Brian, 'Cognition, culture and bureaucratic politics' in Laura Neack, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas, 'Public opinion, domestic structure and foreign policy in liberal democracies', *World Politics*, 1991, vol. 43, pp. 491–517.
- (ed.), *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures, and International Institutions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- , 'Democratic peace – warlike democracies? A social constructivist interpretation of the liberal argument', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1995, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 491–517.
- Robertson, Roland, 'Differentiation reductionism and the missing link in Albert's approach to globalisation theory', *International Political Sociology*, 2009, vol. 3, pp. 119–22.
- Robinson, Piers, 'Theorizing the influence of media on world politics', *European Journal of Communication*, 2001, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 523–44.
- Rochester, Martin, 'The paradigm debate in international relations and its implications for foreign policy making: Toward a redefinition of the "national interest"', *Western Political Quarterly*, 1978, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 48–58.
- Rosati, Jerel A., 'Developing a systemic decision-making framework: Bureaucratic politics in perspective', *World Politics*, 1981, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 234–52.
- , 'A cognitive guide to the study of foreign policy', in Laura Neack, Jeanne Hey and Patrick Haney (eds), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Rosati, Jerel A., Joe Hagan and Martin Sampson (eds), *Foreign Policy Restructuring*, Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1994.
- Rosenau, James, *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy*, New York: Random House, 1961.
- , 'Pre-theories and theories and foreign policy', in R.B. Farrell (ed.), *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966.

- , (ed.), *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*, New York: Free Press, 1967.
- , 'A pre-theory revisited: World politics in an era of cascading interdependence', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1984, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 245–305.
- , *Along the Domestic–Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Rosenberg, Justin, 'Globalisation theory: A post mortem', *International Politics*, 2005, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 2–74.
- Rummel, Randolph, *National Attributes and Behavior*, Beverley Hills, CA: Sage, 1979.
- , 'Democracies are less warlike than other regimes', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1995, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 649–64.
- Russett, Bruce M., *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Salmore, Barbara and Stephen Salmore, 'Political regimes and foreign policy', in Maurice East, Stephen Salmore and Charles Hermann (eds), *Why Nations Act: Theoretical Perspectives for Comparative Foreign Policy*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1978.
- Schelling, Thomas, *The Strategy of Conflict*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Schilling, Roller W., Paul Y. Hammond and Glenn H. Snyder, *Strategy, Politics, and Defense Budgets*, New York: Columbia University, Institute of War and Peace Studies, 1962.
- Scholte, Jan Aart, 'Premature obituaries: A response to Justin Rosenberg', *International Politics*, 2005, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 390–9.
- , *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Scholte, Jan Aart and Ronald Robertson, *Encyclopedia of Globalisation*, New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Scott Thomas, *The Diplomacy of Liberation: The Foreign Relations of the ANC since 1960*, London: Tauris Academic, 1995.
- Shapiro, Robert Y. and Robert I. Page, 'Foreign policy and the rational public', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1988, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 211–47.
- Shaw, Martin, 'The state of globalization: Towards a theory of state transformation' *Review of International Political Economy*, 1997, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 497–513.
- , 'The historical sociology of the future', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1998, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 321–6.
- , *Theory of the Global State: Globalization as an Unfinished Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Shepard, Graham, 'Personality effects on American foreign policy, 1969–84: A second test of interpersonal generalization theory', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1988, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 91–123.
- Shy, John 'The American military experience: History and learning', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 1971, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 205–28.
- Sigal, Leon, 'The rational policy model and the Formosa Straits crisis', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1970, vol. 14, no. 2, 121–56.
- Singer, J. David, 'The level-of-analysis problem in international relations', *World Politics*, 1961, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 77–92.
- Skidmore, David, 'The politics of national security policy: Interest groups, coalitions and the SALT II debate', in David Skidmore and Valerie Hudson (eds), *The Limits of State Autonomy: Society Groups and Foreign Policy Formulation*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1993.
- Skidmore, David and Valerie Hudson (eds), *The Limits of State Autonomy: Society Groups and Foreign Policy Formulation*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1993.
- Skocpol, Theda, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Smith, Karen, *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*, Cambridge: Polity, 2008.
- Smith, Steve, 'Allison and the Cuban missile crisis: A review of the bureaucratic politics model of foreign policy decision-making', *Millennium*, 1980, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 21–40.
- Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne, *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Snyder, Gary and Paul Diesing, *Conflict Among Nations: Bargaining, Decision Making and System Structure in International Crises*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Snyder, Richard, Henry W. Bruck and Burton Sapin, *Foreign Policy Decision-Making: An Approach to the Study of International Politics*, New York: Free Press/Macmillan, 1962.
- Snyder, Richard, Henry W. Bruck and Burton Sapin, 'Decision making as an approach to the study of international politics', in Richard Snyder, Henry W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (eds), *Foreign Policy Decision-Making: An Approach to the Study of International Politics*, New York: Free Press/Macmillan, 1962.
- Sorenson, George, 'Sovereignty: Change and continuity in a fundamental institution', *Political Studies*, 1999, vol. 47, pp. 590–604.
- Sprout, Harold and Margaret Sprout, *Man–Milieu Relationship Hypotheses in the Context of International Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Spruyt, Hendrik, 'Historical sociology and systems theory in international relations', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1998, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 340–53.
- Stanger, Alison, 'Democratization and the international system', in Miles Kahler (ed.), *Liberalization and Foreign Policy*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Stein, Janice S., 'Political learning by doing: Gorbachev as uncommitted thinker and motivated learner', *International Organization*, 1994, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 155–83.
- Steinbruner, John, *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.

- Steiner, Miriam, 'The elusive essence of decision: A critical comparison of Allison's and Snyder's decision-making approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1977, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 389-422.
- Stone, Diane, 'Think tanks – beyond nation states', in Diane Stone and Andrew Denham (eds), *Think Tank Traditions: Policy Research and the Politics of Ideas*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- 't Hart, Paul and Uriel Roenthal, 'Reappraising bureaucratic politics', *Mershon International Studies Review*, 1998, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 236-7.
- 't Hart, Paul, Eric Stern and Bengt Sundelius, *Beyond Groupthink: Political Group Dynamics and Foreign Policy-making*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Tarar, Ahmer, 'International bargaining with two-sided domestic constraints', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2001, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 320-40.
- Tsebelis, George, *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Vertzberger, Yaacov, 'Foreign policy decision-makers as practical intuitive historians: Applied history and its shortcomings', *International Studies Quarterly*, 1986, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 223-47.
- de Waal, Alex, *Famine Crimes: Politics and the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Wallace, William and Daphne Josselin (eds), *Non-State Actors in World Politics*, London: Palgrave, 2002.
- Waltz, Kenneth, 'International politics is not foreign policy', *Security Studies*, 1996, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 54-7.
- Webber, Mark and Michael Smith (eds), *Foreign Policy in a Transformed World*, Harlow: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- Welch, David A., 'The organizational process and bureaucratic politics paradigms: retrospect and prospect', *International Security*, 1992, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 119-146.
- Welch, David, *Painful Choices: A Theory of Foreign Policy Change*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Weldes, Jutta, 'Bureaucratic politics: A critical constructivist assessment', *Mershon International Studies Review*, 1998, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 216-225.
- , *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- White, Brian, 'Analysing foreign policy problems and approaches', in Michael Clarke and Brian White (eds), *Understanding Foreign Policy*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1989.
- Winter, David G., 'Personality and foreign policy: Historical overview of research', in Eric Singer and Valerie Hudson (eds), *Political Psychology and Foreign Policy*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992.
- Wright, Stephen (ed.), *African Foreign Policies*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999.
- Wurfel, David and Bruce Burton (eds), *The Political Economy of Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.

Index

- Abacha, Sani 54
 accommodation leadership strategies 58-9, 97
 Acharya, Amitav 50
 advocacy groups 57
 Africa, political regimes of 52, 54, 68
 African National Congress (ANC) 98, 108
 Albert, Mathias 11
 Allison, Graham T. 6, 32-4, 39-40, 42-4, 96, 116
 Almond, Gabriel 56
 Arab-Israeli war (1973) 88
 Art, Robert J. 34, 39
 'ASEAN way' 52
 authoritarian regimes 51-2, 58, 100, 102
 Axelrod, Robert 23
- balance of power 15, 41
 balance of terror 17
 bargaining strategies 17-18
 Barkawi, Tarek 71
 Barnett, Michael 12, 97
 Bay of Pigs invasion (1961) 25
 Bayart, Jean Francois 68
 BBC *see* British Broadcasting Corporation
 behaviourism 4-6, 19-20, 118
 Bendor, Jonathan 39-40, 44
 bilateralism 3, 61, 71, 96
 'black box' of foreign policy decision-making 4, 9, 20
 Blair, Tony 24, 36, 57
- Blavokos, Sypros 97
 'borders of violence' 71, 81, 87-8, 91, 113
 Boulding, Kenneth 5, 21
 'bounded rationality' concept 15, 26-7
 Bourantonis, Dimitris 97
 Bright, John 54
 brinkmanship 17
 British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) 57
 bureaucracies: actors in 6, 43; and executive function 6, 37-9, 41, 44; and foreign policy 6, 12, 31-6, 38, 40-1, 43-4, 59, 65, 96; and human agency 36-9, 44; and the national interest 33; politicians' role in 41-2; resistance to change in 12, 97-8; standard operating procedures of 32, 36-7
 bureaucratic politics model (BPM) 6, 31-4, 36-45, 96, 116, 118; criticisms of 34-5, 37, 44
 Bush, George W. 72
 Buzan, Barry 52, 115
- Campbell, David 106-8
 Castro, Fidel 23
 Chabel, Patrick 68
 change: and foreign policy 3, 11-12, 92-5, 97-100, 103, 105-9; resistance to 12, 22, 97-8; types of 93