

12

Foreign Policy

Charles F. Hermann / Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Today two quite distinctive kinds of foreign policy studies exist side by side. One type involves description, evaluation, and prescription of specific, current foreign policy issues. It addresses—usually in an idiographic manner—problems confronting particular governments or other foreign policy actors. The other type of study involves the search for explanation, interpretation, and perhaps prediction of certain recurrent features of foreign policy. Using primarily a nomothetic orientation, it concerns the development of generalizable assertions about foreign policy and the conditions under which they are likely to occur. The boundaries between the two kinds of studies overlap, and seldom are individual analysts interested only in questions found in one area. The main thrust of each, however, remains distinctive. This chapter examines the second class of foreign policy studies.¹

I. THE ELUSIVE NATURE OF FOREIGN POLICY: REVELATIONS ABOUT THE STATE OF INQUIRY

A. Challenges to Traditional Definitions

Foreign policy consists of the plans, goals, and actions of national governments directed at entities outside the nation. Not long ago that statement might have passed for an acceptable textbook definition of foreign policy.² Challenges to such definitions reveal some of the ferment in the theory-oriented field of foreign policy studies. Consider these questions. If foreign policy comprises plans and actions, what about deliberate decisions not to act in a given international situation? How do the extemporaneous remarks of a visiting head of state constitute foreign policy if they are inconsistent with previous declarations of his government and if they are later “reinterpreted” by a press secretary? When a provincial government or other subnational government conducts a trade mission or establishes offices abroad to promote trade, investment, and tourism in its particular

jurisdiction, is it conducting foreign policy? What about the multinational corporation that conducts negotiations with various governments and seeks to arrange policies favorable to its interests? Are other nongovernmental groups and private individuals who try to mediate a dispute between governments or who deal directly with private groups and individuals in other countries conducting foreign policy? Even the idea that foreign policy is deliberately directed to entities outside a country has been questioned. If a large, internationally active country suffers an economic recession or other major changes in its economic condition, the results could be felt strongly in those countries that have extensive economic interactions with it. Is that foreign policy? Or what about the case of a deliberate policy action taken strictly for domestic reasons, but which has severe implications for those outside the country. Illustrations might include the termination of the research and development, for reasons of costs or inadequate technology, of a weapon system that foreign governments also had planned to purchase as a key element of their own defense. Is that foreign policy? What about a metropolitan government that refuses landing rights to all supersonic commercial jet aircraft because of pressure from domestic groups about noise pollution, which nevertheless bankrupts a foreign air carrier that had invested heavily in such aircraft for that specific route? Is it meaningful to refer to a given state's foreign policy if its actions are determined by a foreign government or international corporation or if its actions are countermanded by domestic guerrillas holding sizable parts of the country?

B. Orientations Minimizing the Need to Characterize Foreign Policy

For over a decade questions such as these have seriously eroded easy and simple definitions of foreign policy and have even led a number of observers to suggest that the distinction between domestic and foreign policy is no longer useful (e.g., Friedrich, 1966; Rosenau, 1969; Hanrieder, 1971; Katzenstein, 1978). Though that conclusion can be argued as premature, what is noteworthy is that the conceptualization of foreign policy is under scrutiny. Remarkable as it might seem to thoughtful individuals who do not normally attend to foreign policy as an era of research, those who do study foreign policy have tended in the past to treat the concept as a "given" or "undefined" term. The challenging questions have awakened the field from its indifferent slumber about the nature of the concept and the implications of any particular definition.

How can it be that until recently the meaning of foreign policy, beyond simplistic textbook statements, has been ignored? The answer to that question reveals a good deal about the nature of foreign policy research. It seems possible to classify most foreign policy research into one of five categories: single case studies, internal institution and process descriptions, independent variable studies, relational chronologies, and conflict analyses. These categories are not mutually exclusive, but a very large portion of research usually classified as concerning foreign policy can be assigned to one or more of these categories. Each one contains its own logic for making unnecessary any consideration of the nature of the concept of foreign policy and its implications.

Single Case Studies. Single case studies likely constitute the most numerous kind of foreign policy research.³ The author examines the development or evolution of a set of activities undertaken by a collective actor (usually a national government) in response to a

particular hi
cope or fail
investigators r
last 10 to 15
include the s
set of infere
happened ar
study focus
him or her t
stance? Wha
havior rathe
a particular

Internal Inst

the name im
made. Often
specific epis
Some are pr
ministry (e.g.
ment (e.g., K
chinery (e.g.
cated to the
Destler (197
tions for the
performed o
The latest im
a one-volume
ative studies
policies are n

Organiz
mode, and in
posals for th
analyst to co
any particul
are designed
that a carefu
almost never

Independent

icy? This qu
work as well
independent
will be exam
of variables
opinion (Alr
power capab
Rivera, 1968

Hermann

particular historical problem in world affairs. The researcher asks how did the government cope or fail to cope with a particular problem at a given point in time. Although the investigators need not be historians and frequently address cases in very recent history—the last 10 to 15 years—many of the research techniques are familiar to the historian. They include the search for and evaluation of original materials, the construction of a plausible set of inferences and interpretations consistent with all the available evidence of what happened and, at least to a degree, why it happened. Because the author of a single case study focuses on a discrete issue in time and space, the research design does not require him or her to ask seriously of what class of phenomena is this particular episode an instance? What are the defining properties that make this an example of one kind of behavior rather than another? In short, it is unnecessary to locate the case as representing a particular kind of foreign policy.

Internal Institution and Process Studies. Internal institution and process studies, as the name implies, examine the organizations and procedures by which foreign policy is made. Often case studies concentrate on the foreign policy machinery involved in the specific episode examined. Many process studies, however, do not invoke the case format. Some are primarily descriptive and concentrate on the operation of, for example, a single ministry (e.g., Bacchus, 1974), a type of policy (e.g., Destler, 1980), a branch of government (e.g., Robinson, 1962), or a survey of an entire government's foreign policy machinery (e.g., Wallace, 1975). Other process studies have an evaluative orientation dedicated to the development of recommendations for improving foreign policy procedures. Destler (1972), in his own study recommending modifications in governmental operations for the conduct of foreign policy, notes that no less than 11 major studies have been performed on the foreign policy procedures of the U.S. government since World War II. The latest in this apparently favorite American pastime (Murphy et al., 1975) consists of a one-volume summary report and seven oversized volumes of supporting research. Evaluative studies of this kind share a premise that the organizations and procedures by which policies are made can affect the quality of the resulting foreign activities.

Organization and process studies can be extremely informative in the descriptive mode, and in the prescriptive mode they provide a necessary foundation for any proposals for the modification of foreign policy procedures. Nevertheless, they permit the analyst to concentrate on small group, organizational, and administrative issues without any particular attention to the kind of public policy that the organizations and processes are designed to formulate. At least, a review of institution and process studies suggests that a careful examination of the nature of foreign policy and its distinctive qualities is almost never considered.

Independent Variable Studies. What factors shape the nature and quality of foreign policy? This question lies at the core of most independent variable studies. Much scholarly work as well as textbook material in foreign policy has centered on the investigation of independent or explanatory variables that can be used to account for foreign policy. As will be examined more fully in the second major section of this chapter, a large number of variables or clusters of variables have been identified and explored, including public opinion (Almond, 1950; Hughes, 1978), ideology (Ulam, 1971), national attributes and power capabilities (Sullivan, 1976, especially Chapters 4 and 5), leader personalities (de Rivera, 1968), types of political regimes (Brzezinski and Huntington, 1963; Waltz, 1967),

the national interests (Krasner, 1978), and the organizational decision process (e.g., Huntington, 1960; Allison, 1971), to name but a few. Some analyses of independent variables have considered only one class of factors, but others have enumerated many candidates (e.g., Thomson and Macridis, 1976), and some have engaged in systematic comparison of multiple sets of independent variables (e.g., Rosenau, 1966, 1974).

Studies of this kind serve an undeniable function in guiding explanations of foreign policy at a more generalized level than the discrete case study. They provide clues as to where to look for the cause or source of foreign policy activity. What is extraordinary about these studies is that—like the other categories noted above—they pay scant attention to the specification of the dependent variable that they seek to understand—foreign policy. To the outside observer such neglect in these studies may seem incredible. How is it possible to describe the effect of one kind of variable—such as public opinion or class structure—on another without being quite specific about exactly what that other variable is? The fact remains that many of these studies exclude any systematic consideration of the nature or kinds of foreign policy.

Relational Chronologies. Relational chronologies, the fourth category of foreign policy studies, consider the exchanges over a period of years between a pair of countries or a larger set located in the same geographic region or in a common military or economic alliance. Examples of this kind of study include the policies of China and the Soviet Union toward one another (Griffith, 1964), or relations among North Vietnam, China, and the Soviet Union (Zagoria, 1967), or the member states in the European Economic Community (Camps, 1966). In sharp contrast to the independent variable studies, relational chronologies do not omit mention of foreign policy. Instead they tend to describe in serial form the stream of discrete foreign activities, the reasons they were initiated, the effect they had on the recipients, and the foreign policy activities they triggered in response. As with case studies, however, relational chronologies tend to enumerate specific decisions and actions at a concrete level and in historical context without the critical examination of the more general kinds of policy these occurrences represented and, indeed, what properties make them “foreign.” To the extent that they group or cluster such activities, they tend to use the categories selected by the policy makers themselves or those offered by journalists (e.g., Truman Doctrine, *Ostpolitik*).⁴ Though analysts constructing a relational chronology may estimate the effects of policies and their success in achieving intended objectives, few have challenged the actor’s assertions as to what activities were foreign policies and what labels should be used to describe them.

Conflict Analyses. Conflict analyses have generally been more attentive to the nature of foreign policy behavior than the other four types. The distinctive feature of these studies is their concentration on a broad class of foreign policy activities that manifest some form of conflict (e.g., Holsti, 1972; Singer et al., 1972; Haas, 1974). Important differences exist among the concepts of crisis, war, aggression, hostility, and violence. Yet they have in common the investigator’s concern with those actions of governments and other international actors that are designed to harm or to threaten harm to the objectives if not the actual existence of other foreign entities. A number of these studies have been quite rigorous in their conceptual definition, their measurement, and their classification of types of conflict.

Much of other forms of this class of activity. In o ignored the o glect. For wh have tended eign policies, foreign polic kinds of con policy, the c sions of host

Until ver have seen wa importance o or deprived t tion. The gro less acceptab

A numb the concept o knew what fo about the con nized import. The causes o questions pos struggling to Plan—the larg ment as to th explication se

C. Status of

From this rev evident. Som

1. Over the that cons of various or anothe Western s foreign po more seni
2. For Weste descriptiv and proce “foreign”

Much of this conflict research has sought to associate particular factors to war or other forms of hostility in a systematic fashion. Certainly a strong case can be made that this class of literature has contributed to our understanding of one broad area of foreign activity. In one sense, therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that most of these studies have ignored the concept of foreign policy. In another sense, they have contributed to the neglect. For whereas they have generally been conscientious about defining conflict, they have tended to ignore setting such activity in a larger context. In the spectrum of all foreign policies, where do conflict and hostility fit? If conflicts are a recurrent phenomena in foreign policy, how should we understand the vast domain of subjects over which various kinds of conflicts arise? Rather than seeing conflict as one kind of expression of foreign policy, the concept of conflict and associated concepts of collective violence and expressions of hostility have replaced the concept of foreign policy.

Until very recently, many Western foreign policy and international relations scholars have seen war prevention as the paramount value to be addressed in their scholarship. The importance of social justice, economic development, and equality as other values realized or deprived through foreign policy activities is only now beginning to receive broad attention. The growing awareness of other values and dimensions of foreign policy makes it less acceptable to collapse all foreign policy into a continuum of conflict.

A number of reasons can be offered for the frequent failure to come to terms with the concept of foreign policy. There may have been a sense that every thoughtful person knew what foreign policy was and, accordingly, an unarticulated assumption of consensus about the concept prevailed. Furthermore, many particular questions of widely recognized importance do not require direct examination of the umbrella term, foreign policy. The causes of war offer an unambiguous illustration. So, too, on a more micro scale do questions posed by other kinds of studies, such as why a nation whose economy is still struggling to recover from the ravages of World War II commits itself to the Marshall Plan—the largest foreign assistance program in its history (Jones, 1955). In short, agreement as to the meaning of foreign policy was either frequently assumed or the concept's explication seemed unnecessary for the research task of interest.

C. Status of the Field as Revealed by the Definition Issue

From this review a number of characteristics of the study of foreign policy should be evident. Some of the major features can be summarized as follows:

1. Over the years a quite substantial number of single case studies have been conducted that consist of large quantities of descriptive material and some evaluative analysis of various actors' discrete policy activities—usually the subject is the United States or another country for which information about policy-making is accessible to Western scholars. Single case studies are a frequent subject of doctoral dissertations in foreign policy and are augmented by the occasional production of new studies by more senior scholars.
2. For Western nations and to a lesser degree for selected other countries, considerable descriptive and some evaluative material has been produced about the organizations and processes involved in the formulation of policies that would be widely regarded as "foreign" policies.

3. An extensive cataloging has been performed of the various factors or clusters of independent variables that plausibly might be expected to influence some kinds of unspecified foreign policy. A good deal of descriptive work has been performed with these variables, including some empirical analysis, usually using conflict data or U.N. voting as the dependent variable.
4. For some countries and time periods, descriptive accounts have been prepared of the declared foreign policies of two, three, or a larger grouping of governments toward one another and the effects of these policies.
5. A vigorous subset of studies using a variety of perspectives and research methods has analyzed the nature of war and other kinds of international conflict and hostility as one form of behavior in which nations engage across national boundaries.
6. In many of the kinds of research noted above there has been a rather close connection between scholarship and the policy community in the borrowing of the definition of problems and the selection of concepts, although the research results have often seemed to have had little recognizable utility to the policy community.
7. For much of the noted research it has not been necessary to delve into the meaning of the umbrella concept of foreign policy and the various forms it might take. Useful closure on the established research problem could normally be achieved without it, or it could be assumed that most researchers shared some common understanding of the undefined term.
8. The inattentiveness to the concept of foreign policy and to its implications is disappearing as the result of a series of challenging questions asked from various quarters about the actors who engage in foreign policy, the continued utility of distinguishing domestic from foreign policy, the appropriate way to treat unintended external effects of various actions or inactions, and the apparent breakdown of sovereignty as it has been assumed to exist for many states.

It should not be surprising that one conclusion from this review is that the cohesion of foreign policy studies as a field or area of inquiry has not been strong and that it is in considerable flux. There is a good chance that the field may look considerably different in the not too distant future from the way it looks today if consensus begins to emerge about the meaning of foreign policy, the units into which it can be classified or dimensionalized, and the basic questions about it that establish the core concerns of the field. Such a state does not exist today, but the questions noted earlier are producing a stream of literature grappling with various aspects of the issue concerning the nature of foreign policy (Meehan, 1971; Hermann, 1972; Rummel, 1972; Kegley, 1973; Kegley et al., 1974; Salmore and Munton, 1974; O'Leary, 1976; Callahan et al., 1982).

D. Toward a Definition of Foreign Policy

The fluidity of foreign policy studies at the present time makes any attempt at the definition of the concept of foreign policy a most provisional and personal exercise. Yet it may be unfair to end this section without the author stipulating one possible definition for consideration and use as a benchmark for examining others.

To begin, a distinction will be drawn between foreign policy and foreign policy behavior. Foreign policy consists of the development and conscious pursuit of some preferred goal or goals of an actor through the selective use of foreign policy behavior.

Foreign poli
political-leve
tions of one
the decision
nel through

Some ba
tities that ha
tempts to or
they rule or
or by contin
of affairs tha
In the latter
to be kept. C
the same goa
obtained the
ments. Politi
mit the resou
entity. Final
action. Actio

Of the n
at once. First
need not be
actors comm
tage against a
be reflexive o
behavior can
without expl
reason for it
or a domestic
lated behavio
external enti
selves be susc
havior do not
actions may

The prop
Foreign polic
side one's ow
behavior of a
ferent types
and norms, a
abroad. (Not
on the assum
are a matter o

It should
parties are no
foreign policy

Hermann

Foreign policy behavior is purposeful action resulting from the implementation of a political-level decision to act so as to attempt to influence attitudes, beliefs, and/or actions of one or more other actors where entities external to the political jurisdiction of the decision makers are either (1) the subject of the influence attempt or (2) the channel through which a message is conveyed to domestic individuals or collectivities.

Some basic terms in these definitions need elaboration. International actors are entities that have the resources and the motivation to undertake regularly influence attempts to or through entities residing outside the political jurisdiction of the nation they rule or in which they are chartered or otherwise established legally (e.g., citizens) or by continued residency (e.g., Palestinians in Lebanon). Goals are the preferred states of affairs that do not exist and are sought or that do exist and are desired to be retained. In the latter form, goals may be boundaries within which certain phenomena are desired to be kept. Collective entities may act in a goal-seeking manner when all members accept the same goals through consensus or when the goals are those of one or more leaders who obtained the necessary support of members through side payments of rewards or punishments. Political-level decisions are choices made by individuals with the authority to commit the resources of the government, ruling party, corporation, or other international entity. Finally, behavior is purposeful, as contrasted with unintended or unconscious, action. Actions undertaken in an attempt to influence others are, therefore, behaviors.

Of the numerous implications of these stipulated definitions, several should be noted at once. First, not all foreign policy behavior is in the service of foreign policy; that is, it need not be behavior initiated in pursuit of some clearly established goals. For many actors communication and influence attempts may be undertaken for momentary advantage against a traditional adversary or in support of a traditional ally. In short, they may be reflexive or habitual behavior that seems dictated by immediate circumstance. Such behavior can still be intentional and, hence, rightly labeled foreign policy behavior even without explicit, accepted goals. In short, the purpose of influence is present even if the reason for it is not. When, however, action has no intention to influence a foreign entity or a domestic one through a foreign entity, it is not foreign policy behavior. Both isolated behaviors and goal-seeking policies must be undertaken with the expectation that external entities will enable the transmission of a signal to someone else or will themselves be susceptible to influence. Unintended foreign effects of actions or domestic behavior do not constitute foreign policy or foreign policy behavior, but such unintended actions may trigger another entity to engage in foreign policy or foreign policy behavior.

The proposed definitions permit a distinction between domestic and foreign policy. Foreign policy and behavior require a deliberate attempt to use or affect entities outside one's own political jurisdiction. This distinction may yield sharp differences in the behavior of at least some kinds of international actors who may be expected to have different types of control within their own jurisdiction, may be affected by different laws and norms, and may enjoy different status and power domestically as compared to abroad. (Notice that the emphasis is on differences internally and externally and not on the assumption of sovereignty or more power domestically.) These differences usually are a matter of degree and apply more to some actors than others.

It should also be apparent that states, national government, and ruling political parties are not envisioned as the only entities capable of initiating foreign policy and foreign policy behavior. Subnational governments, private voluntary organizations, and

corporations are among the other candidates. Accordingly, it becomes extremely important to specify the kinds of international actors that a study program dictates should be investigated to explore particular research questions. Stating that one is studying foreign policy does not automatically reveal the actors included or excluded from the research.

Determining the goals of individuals, to say nothing of complex social entities such as governments, poses an extremely difficult task (Hermann, 1978b). They are often a matter of conjecture and frequently are not subject to direct examination. Foreign policy behaviors, by contrast, are observable, although governments may attempt to shield them from the scrutiny of outside parties. In every case there must be an actor and a recipient and the behavior should in most instances be evident to both (although the motives may not be). Such circumstances create a basis for observation in the contemporary world. Foreign policy behaviors often leave a trace in the form of written records. In the distinction between foreign policy and foreign policy behavior, the effort is made to create for foreign policy researchers a unit of observation that the traditional definitions which incorporate goals and plans frequently deny.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS AND CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES

The current unsettled state of the field of foreign policy studies is further revealed through the diversity of theoretical frameworks and conceptual approaches that characterize research. Some social scientists have given considerable attention to the role of paradigms in the development of various areas of scientific inquiry following the work of Kuhn (1963). If by a field or disciplinary paradigm one means a set of widely accepted, fundamental, and critical assumptions that characterize the phenomena being studied and that also indicate what questions, problems, and modes of inquiry appropriately constitute the frontier of knowledge, then foreign policy studies have no accepted paradigm. A subset of scholars concerned with the cross-national study of foreign policy using the scientific method have come close to adopting a paradigm based primarily on the works of Rosenau (1966, 1971, 1974), but that too seems in disarray (Kegley, 1979).

Lack of serious examination of the concept of foreign policy has not prevented its use in general orientations to foreign policy studies. The variety of current frameworks and approaches can be organized by the relationship envisioned between the usually undefined term, foreign policy, and other components in the framework. The five categories in the previous section used widely recognized features of research to suggest reasons in each set why the concept of foreign policy has seldom been seriously investigated. If one of the trends for the future is the fuller explication of the meaning and properties of foreign policy, we need to classify the existing designs in a different fashion to propose how foreign policy is incorporated and the functions it is expected to play.

The most pervasive orientation, which generates various approaches, views foreign policy as the dependent variable—that which is to be understood and explained. Some frameworks, however, assign foreign policy as the independent variable and consider its effects on other factors. Finally, there are approaches that interpret foreign policy as a mediating variable, usually in a continuous or cyclical process in which the distinction between independent and dependent variables may not be useful. Representative frameworks developed in each of these three broader orientations will be reviewed.

A. Foreign

Individual
developed arc
policy or in
characteris
Rivera, 196
makers. Th
involved in
and the rel
processing
1973; Hols
the means f
been develo
as Senator
(Edinger, 1
Beck et al.,
been advan
iences, and

One of
in terms of
individual p
mental poli
vidual chara
lem (routin
level bureau
a few people

Bureaucratic
a conceptual
Allison's (19
the Cuban m
the volume
unified acto
work compr
ment of a b
Huntington
ulated by Al
among other
suasion amo
or bureaucra
national inte
flict among
tively his ag
and other ba
the hybrid o
them. Burea
policy are wi

A. Foreign Policy as a Dependent Variable

Individual Characteristics. A number of quite distinctive research designs have been developed around a basic question dealing with what differences in the substance of foreign policy or in the orientation to foreign policy might be attributable to variation in the characteristics of an individual participant in the policy process (Kelman, 1965; de Rivera, 1968). One approach has sought to construct the cognitive maps of decision makers. The research focuses on the cognitive structures and processes of the mind involved in a person's set of causal assertions about the things in his or her environment and the relations that affect their operations. Such mental maps become the basis for processing information and calculating appropriate action (see Bonham and Shapiro, 1973; Holsti, 1976). Another effort centers on the political beliefs of policy makers and the means for assessing their effects on behavior. Pioneering work by Leites (1951) has been developed further by George (1969) and applied to a number of individuals such as Senator Frank Church (Johnson, 1977). Other research has pursued psychobiographies (Edinger, 1965; Wolfenstein, 1971) or has stressed social background experiences (e.g., Beck et al., 1973). Recently more integrative approaches to psychological factors have been advanced that take into account beliefs and attitudes, motives, background experiences, and interpersonal and decision styles (e.g., Hermann, 1980).

One of the continuing concerns about the search for explanation of foreign policy in terms of the psychological characteristics of individuals is the question of whether individual properties make any difference in complex social phenomena such as governmental policy making (e.g., Rosenau, 1968). The contention is that the effects of individual characteristics depend on a number of conditions such as the nature of the problem (routine versus crisis), the location of the individual (head of state versus middle-level bureaucrat), the decision-making process (numerous people involved versus one or a few people), or the style of the individual (passive versus active).

Bureaucratic Politics. Few volumes in the last two decades devoted to the explication of a conceptual framework in foreign policy have received the widespread attention given Allison's (1971) *Essence of Decision*. Allison offers three distinctive interpretations of the Cuban missile crisis depending on which of three frameworks is applied. Although the volume deserves examination on several grounds (e.g., the critique of the national, unified actor model of decision making), its explication of a bureaucratic politics framework comprises a dominant feature. A number of analysts contributed to the development of a bureaucratic politics framework prior to Allison, including Neustadt (1970), Huntington (1960), Hilsman (1967), and Schilling et al., (1962). It has been further articulated by Allison and Halperin (1972), Halperin and Kanter (1973), and Halperin (1974) among others. This orientation views foreign policy as the result of bargaining and persuasion among leaders or their representatives from different governmental organizations or bureaucracies. Each bureaucracy has its own interests and missions and interprets the national interests of the government so as to advance its own welfare. The resulting conflict among competing interests and the inability of any one individual to assert effectively his agency's preferences over all the others necessitates "log rolling," compromises, and other bargaining strategies that produce an agreed-upon foreign policy that is often the hybrid of many positions and not an effective strategy for the realization of any of them. Bureaucratic politics clearly asserts that the primary sources for explaining foreign policy are within the government itself and tends to minimize the effects of other

domestic factors as well as the behavior of international actors. It also highlights the implementation of policy as much as the acts of choice by high-level officials. It contends that considerable discrepancy can arise between decision and execution (if any) as a result of further bureaucratic politics. A basic question in the bureaucratic politics framework is what organizational actors or players have which skills and resources to shape in part a given policy, and how does the result reflect the tradeoffs made among the key actors?

The bureaucratic politics approach has attracted its share of critiques (e.g., Krasner, 1972; Art, 1973). Among the points that have been made are that it seems applicable only to the United States and perhaps a few other societies with modern bureaucracies and considerable distribution of power. Even in the United States it overlooks the distinctive role of the President in many major issues. Furthermore, key actors who are transitory political appointees may not have strong ties to the ministries they lead, and indeed, may have loyalties to one another that produce very different behaviors. (See the discussion of small group behavior below.) Nevertheless, the bureaucratic politics perspective has proven an attractive interpretative framework for many case studies of policy making. Additionally, it does what many approaches fail to do by developing clear linkages between independent variables (e.g., bargaining, compromising) and kinds of foreign policy (e.g., "paperclip" policies, deferred action, lowest-common-denominator agreements, etc.).

Small Decision Groups. Whereas bureaucratic politics postulates foreign policy as the result of conflict between major participants in the decision process, a major proponent of the small group perspective finds not group conflict but an excessive concern for consensus within the group as a source of danger to quality decision making. Janis (1972) contends that some groups of decision makers become so concerned with maintaining the well-being and the good feeling among fellow policy makers that they will distort information processing, banish alternative options, and engage in various forms of "group think" that significantly erode the likelihood of quality decisions. Empirical research has begun to sharpen the conditions under which such behavior also occurs (Tetlock, 1979).

From a somewhat different perspective, George (1972) also has noted that the premature closure on a single interpretation of the situation and prescription for dealing with it can lead a group to poorer decisions. He proposes the deliberate introduction of "multiple advocates," who argue the merits of competing options to prevent consensus without careful examination of various alternatives. Elsewhere, George (1974) has summarized the extensive literature on the effects of stress on small group decision making and applied it to the political process. Quick consensus and stress both may be problems in small decision groups, but equally important can be the various methods used to resolve substantive disagreement. Different conflict management techniques employed in a group can yield different results (Hermann, 1978a). At the core of research sharing this approach is an assumption that the processes used in small groups for processing information and handling conflict can influence the policies adopted. The difficulty of accessibility to the procedures of decision groups is an apparent criticism. So is the problem of distinguishing the reasons for consensus (e.g., "yes men" yielding to the preferences of a strong leader, excessive concurrence seeking to preserve the group's well-being, or a genuinely shared conclusion based on a thorough examination of the evidence). Variability

in the process
ion. Despite u
choice the de

Political System
suggest that a
of the political
effects of the
issue for study
(e.g., Long, 19
systems have
vironments have
vironment. TH
compared (Wa
asion, the am
as variables ap
more, 1978).

Normally
relevant aspect
affect foreign
means of nation
cal elites, to m
struct of polit
on the collecti
of societies an
elements of th
elites.

World War
research.
Through nation
Characteristics
members of a
ally determine
lationships, an
all resulted in
sion in many a
Klineberg, 195

Although
to hold less int
to shape politi
eign policy ren
young people i
political integr
in early sociali
became the ma
would reflect t
of Chinese fore

in the process and motives for consensus may have an effect on the quality of the decision. Despite unresolved issues, the small group perspective reminds us that at the point of choice the decision unit in foreign policy is often a small, face-to-face group.

Political System—Collective Beliefs and Organization. It may be stretching a point to suggest that anything approximating a unified framework exists to deal with the effect of the political system on foreign policy. Certainly a stream of research addresses the effects of the nature of government or regime types on foreign affairs. A long-standing issue for study has been the relative merits of democracies versus authoritarian systems (e.g., Long, 1966; Farrell, 1966), with the general argument being that authoritarian systems have greater flexibility and capacity to respond to changes in their external environment. The foreign policies of presidential and parliamentary systems also have been compared (Waltz, 1967). More recently, regime characteristics such as the degree of opposition, the amount of cohesion, and the responsiveness to political elites have been treated as variables applicable to any regime and as influencing foreign policy (Salmore and Salmore, 1978).

Normally, a regime is thought to include not only the rulers but also the politically relevant aspects of the entire society. These other aspects of a polity can be assumed to affect foreign policy. At various times scholars have sought to explain foreign policy by means of national character, political culture, public opinion, interest groups, and political elites, to mention a few of the elements that can be distilled from the umbrella construct of political system. These efforts can be divided between those who have focused on the collective beliefs, attitudes, and expressed opinions of politically salient members of societies and those who have concentrated on the organized representation of various elements of the public in the form of interest groups, political parties, and political elites.

World War II provided impetus to American scholars concerned with national character research. Studies were prompted by the need to understand the adversaries. Through national character, the investigator seeks to describe the enduring personality characteristics, unique life styles, and cultural behavior patterns shared by most, members of a nation. At their core the national character studies proposed that culturally determined practices such as child rearing, acceptable patterns of interpersonal relationships, and cognitive-perceptual-reasoning practices promoted by language structure all resulted in shared attitudes toward authority or variations in values that found expression in many aspects of public behavior, including foreign policy (e.g., Leites, 1948; Klineberg, 1950; Brodersen, 1961).

Although the attempt to attribute foreign policy to a modal national character seems to hold less interest in recent scholarship, the concern with a society's collective efforts to shape political beliefs—political socialization (Renshon, 1977)—and the effect on foreign policy remains an active area of inquiry. For example, Inglehart (1967) found that young people in four Western European countries had more positive attitudes toward political integration than did older generations. He attributed the difference to changes in early socialization practices in those countries and forecasted that as those youngsters became the majority of the voting-age population, the foreign policies of their countries would reflect that increased commitment to European integration. A recent major study of Chinese foreign policy (Bobrow et al., 1979) seeks to establish the "national decision

culture" of China as manifested in basic beliefs and decision logics that can be applied in dealing with foreign policy. In contrast to the previously noted work on belief systems of individuals (e.g., George, 1969), Bobrow and his associates search for the shared beliefs that can be the bases for decision rules of an entire elite.

An influential book by Almond (1950) suggested that the American society could be conceived as a pyramid with the mass public as the large base, a small attentive public near the top and, at the apex, the policy and opinion elites who include among them the actual policy makers. With respect to foreign policy, he noted the differing role of each group, the mobility between strata, and the interaction in terms of policy influence and mobilization of the public. That book and the continuing advances in survey methodology have triggered an extensive literature—both conceptual and empirical—on the role of public opinion (e.g., Rosenau, 1964; Cohen, 1973; Mueller, 1973; Deutsch et al., 1967). Though not lending itself readily to the type of aggregate data analysis found in many public opinion studies, research on interest groups in American foreign policy has been continuous (Bauer et al., 1963; Cohen, 1963; Chittick, 1970; Trice, 1976). Following the lead of scholars in American and comparative politics, efforts to discern the role of interest groups in the foreign policies of other countries also has become a subject of inquiry (Hellmann, 1969; Spielmann, 1978).

To date no major effort has been made to conceptualize how such components of the political system as interest groups, public opinion, political parties, and political elites interact to affect foreign policy in other kinds of societies, but several efforts have been made for the United States. Cohen (1957) traced through their interaction in a case study of the American decision to conclude a peace treaty with Japan years after World War II. More recently, Hughes (1978) characterized six alternative models of the foreign policy decision process (e.g., pluralist, power elite, rational actor). Based on a review of various studies and data from opinion surveys, Hughes concluded that the extent and nature of public and group influence on foreign policy decision making depends on issue type (economic, security, and diplomatic), the locus of decision within the government (executive versus legislative), and the speed with which a decision is made. He contends that the adequacy of the various decision models to account for the role of nongovernmental components of the political system depends on the configuration of the issue, decision locus, and decision time variables.

The frameworks and approaches that take elements of the political system as independent variables suggest that foreign policy decision makers are influenced by the political system of which they are a part. They are affected both as a result of values and beliefs that were acquired as part of their own political socialization and as a result of explicit preferences and direct influence attempts of those outside of the government or ruling party. A problem that is hardly unique to these approaches, but which they dramatically illustrate, is one of causality. It has been difficult to demonstrate empirically that public opinion or interest group activities are responsible for observed policy actions. Furthermore, the problem of assessing effect becomes acute when—as often happens—collective beliefs or organizational positions are divided.

National Attributes. Explanations of a nation's foreign policy have long been attributed to the variety and quality of its national attributes, which often are interpreted as elements of capability or power. For example, this has been a key element in the realist perspective on foreign policy and international relations (see Morgenthau, 1967; Krasner,

1978). Where aspects of social approaches do not serve the same purposes as those used on national attributes—has a behavior (e.g., Indicators of foreign policy behavior). The most extensive have been conducted in his development of a set of underlying factors for pairs of national behavior. And, policy behavior relative to its actions that can

All attributes that shape mutual relations between certain states that some attributes between two states that drive political chain of reasons. Attributes still remain that attributes of certain attributes of their use. Thus, resources will

External and S point have sources located inside seem logical that outside the jurisdiction. Takings have been thematic variables. *dependent variables* reasons for this conceptual development (Sprout, 1965) of policy making

Harf and Harf between external exogenous to the with that actor

Hermann

1978). Whereas the political system frameworks discussed previously concentrate on aspects of society that pertain consciously and directly to governance, national attribute approaches deal with human and nonhuman resources that can be used for many different purposes and that have no intrinsic political intent. The emergence of aggregate data on national attributes—properties applicable to an entire nation but variable across nations—has encouraged numerous empirical studies that seek to correlate attributes with behavior (e.g., Clark et al., 1971; Kean and McGowan, 1973; East and Hermann, 1974). Indicators of wealth and size frequently have been found to be associated with such foreign policy behaviors as general conflict or the total amount of international activity. The most extensive effort to interpret foreign policy in terms of national attributes has been conducted by Rummel (1972, 1977, 1979), who has sought to use national attributes in his development of field theory. Numerous attributes are reduced statistically to a set of underlying components. The distance between the values of these components for pairs of nations is theorized to represent social forces that determine foreign policy behavior. Another major attribute approach to account for war as one kind of foreign policy behavior proposes that as the population and technology of a society increase relative to its internal resources, the nation will engage in “lateral pressure”—external actions that can lead to war (North and Lagerstrom, 1971; Choucri and North, 1975).

All attribute studies assume that there are identifiable properties of an entire nation that shape much of its foreign policy. Empirical analyses generally support correlations between certain behaviors and classes of attributes, but why? Realists have suggested that some attributes provide power capabilities; Rummel suggests that the difference between two countries' attributes creates status differentials and generates social forces that drive policy. The development of the underlying logic for the relationship, the chain of reasoning, and the necessary conditions for the greater or lesser effects of attributes still remains to be done. One effort in that direction by East (1978) contends that attributes generate variation in the policy makers' “capacity to act.” The absence of certain attributes would constrain certain actions, but their existence does not impel their use. Thus, unanswered from a national attributes perspective is when available resources will be used.

External and Systemic Factors. The frameworks and approaches reviewed up to this point have sought to explain foreign policy as a consequence of various domestic factors located inside the jurisdiction or territory of the nation state or other actor. It would seem logical that parallel frameworks would have been developed to consider sources outside the jurisdiction or boundaries of an international actor. Remarkably few undertakings have been built around the identification of specific types of external and systemic variables as independent variables that treat foreign policy exclusively as the *dependent variable*. Rosenau (1972) and Hanrieder (1967, 1971) have speculated on the reasons for this neglect and cite difficulties in levels of analysis, availability of data, and conceptual development. Without specifying kinds of variables, the Sprouts (Sprout and Sprout, 1965) have stressed that the environment can influence the foreign policy choices of policy makers only through the perceptions of those in the decision-making process.

Harf and his associates (1974) have advanced a now widely acknowledged distinction between external and systemic variables. External variables are qualities that are (1) exogenous to the acting nation or other actor and (2) dependent on their relationship with that actor for their meaning and assignable value. Thus, the concept “alliance

partners" would be an external variable, the nature and number of which would vary from country to country. Systemic variables refer to characteristics of the entire international system and have the same value (although not necessarily the same implications) for all members of the system (e.g., the amount of conflict occurring in the world at any given time). East (1978) has provided an explicit systemic framework for examining foreign policy that is keyed on five systemic, independent variables that characterize the complexity of the international system and the resources available in it. This singular effort to date involves no empirical analysis.

Somewhat more has been done with external variables and foreign policy. Deutsch (1966b) has proposed how external variable effects can be transmitted through domestic groups who act as receivers and conveyers of inputs. A different focus has been adopted by Brady (1978), who emphasizes the properties of transitory international situations as sources of foreign policy. One specific set of situational variables can be stipulated as crises that when perceived by policy makers as having certain features (e.g., short time, high threat, and surprise) can substantially affect the foreign policy process and the resulting behavior (Hermann, 1969). The previously cited study by Harf et al. (1974) offers some preliminary empirical evidence for several external variables concerning a nation's likelihood of becoming involved in war. Actually, the amount of attention to external variables is greater than indicated by the survey in this section, as will be evident when the relationship between external variables and foreign policy is cast in other than the independent-to-dependent variable format. It appears that when investigators conceptualize the relationship between an international actor and its external environment, they find the postulation of foreign policy as a dependent variable a less intriguing perspective. Why this should be so is a matter for conjecture.

Multilevel, Integrated Analyses. Not surprisingly, after a review of approaches such as those described in the six previous sections, there have been repeated calls for a more holistic or integrated perspective in the efforts to account for foreign policy behavior. A series of frameworks have been advanced suggesting that foreign policy must be seen as the interaction of multiple variables at different analytical levels—the individual, the group, the organization, the entire society, and so on. It should also not be startling that such overviews find gaps in the array of explanatory factors usually considered (McGowan, 1976a).

One effort at a more comprehensive framework has been undertaken by Brecher and his associates (Brecher et al., 1969; Brecher, 1972), who organize explanatory variables as operational environment components (subdivided into domestic and external) connected by communication through decision elites to a psychological environment (attitudinal prism and elite images), which, in turn, lead to the formulation and implementation process that yields foreign policy outputs. Though differing in some details, the broad set of categories proposed by Cohen and Harris (1975) seems generally similar.

Yet the question may be asked here as it was of national attribute research: Where is the connective tissue—the underlying logic that provides the reasoning for suggesting how various categories of explanatory variables are to be combined and the conditions under which specific interactions occur with particular policy results? Rosenau (1966), in a conceptualization that has inspired much subsequent work (e.g., Rosenau, 1974),⁵ has proposed that the basic question is not how the variables interact, but the circum-

stances und
policy. In o
beginning, h
areas might
accounting
M. G. Herm
linkages mig
interaction
proach intro

The mo
date has bee
et al., 1980)
framework t
into five ma
account for
an undiffer
categories b
developing
tion. It still
ceptual logi
variables in
tistical mode

B. Foreign

Most—but c
variable con
for differen
unit that is
static quality
foreign polic
proaches ex
a few except
more orient
the distincti
as an analyti
closed cyclic
dependency

Linkage Poli

as a result of
with compar
mally conce
within that p
system facto
tional politic
politics offer

stances under which one class of variables prevails over others in accounting for foreign policy. In other words, which category of explanatory variables is more "potent"? As a beginning, he proposes that a set of genotypic categories of nations and types of issue areas might be used as conditions for ordering the salience of explanatory variables in accounting for foreign policy.⁶ As an alternative, a group of investigators (Salmore, M. G. Hermann, Salmore, and C. F. Hermann, 1978) have proposed that specific causal linkages might be established among particular kinds of variables, thus permitting new interaction effects rather than the override of one kind of variable by another. That approach introduces considerable complexity and has yet to be investigated empirically.

The most ambitious empirical investigation of an integrated framework reported to date has been conducted by the Interstate Behavior Analysis (IBA) Project (Wilkenfeld, et al., 1980). Using a partial least-squares model of analysis, the investigators apply their framework to data on 56 countries. The framework itself groups explanatory variables into five major clusters ranging from psychological to global components and seeks to account for six dimensions of foreign policy behavior. Rather than treat all nations in an undifferentiated fashion, the IBA analysis follows Rosenau in grouping nations into categories based on three dimensions. This research represents an important advance in developing comprehensive models of foreign policy susceptible to empirical investigation. It still leaves to the future the task of constructing models that advance the conceptual logic for the interaction of various categories of independent and mediating variables in explaining foreign policy (as opposed to interaction stipulated by the statistical model used in the analysis).

B. Foreign Policy as an Independent or Mediating Variable

Most—but certainly not all—of the frameworks that treat foreign policy as a dependent variable concentrate on domestic sources of explanation; that is, they seek to account for differences in foreign policy by examining differences within the society or other unit that is the policy-initiating entity. Furthermore, most such approaches have a certain static quality. Conditions exist in the factors assumed to be relevant, and certain kinds of foreign policy are assumed to result. That is the end of the conceptualization. The approaches examined in this section tend to view foreign policy in a different manner. With a few exceptions, they concentrate on the environment outside the actor, and they are more oriented to a continuous process of action-reaction or interaction. In that context the distinction between independent and dependent variable becomes much less useful as an analytic device. The first two approaches reviewed do not explicitly introduce a closed cyclical process, but they do emphasize interaction. They are linkage politics and dependency theories.

Linkage Politics. The phrase "linkage politics" was advanced by Rosenau (1969) in part as a result of his observation of a gap in political science research between scholars dealing with comparative politics and those dealing with international relations. The former normally concern themselves only with the effects of domestic politics that are experienced within that political system and ignore the external consequences of domestic political system factors. International relations specialists tend to ignore the effects of international politics on domestic politics. Rosenau noted that thoughtful observation of actual politics offered numerous illustrations of the effects occurring across the gap created by

the self-imposed boundaries of the two fields. He urged that attention be given to this neglected linkage. Rosenau imposed no direction of causality to the continuous cycle of interaction between domestic actors and their international environment. Instead he noted that there were many cases that ought to be studied in which domestic politics generated international political consequences and vice versa.

Beyond the contributors to his initial volume, the scholars who responded most vigorously to the Rosenau (1969) appeal were those interested in the relationship between domestic and international conflict. Early empirical studies (e.g., Rummel, 1963; Tanter, 1966, Haas, 1968) found little support for the "scapegoat hypothesis" that internal violence produces external violence because policy makers seek to reduce domestic disruptions by public appeals for support against external dangers often interpreted as the cause of domestic difficulties. Associating themselves with the linkage approach, Wilkenfeld (1973a) and several of his contributors sought to show that a relationship between internal and external violence did occur in certain types of political regimes. Such analysis, while addressing the gap noted by James Rosenau, appears to have drawn little of its explanatory reasoning from the linkage perspective. Indeed it might be argued that linkage politics is less a framework that suggests how classes of variables interact than the observation of an important gap in knowledge.

Dependency Theories. Whereas the research on the "scapegoat hypothesis" examines the effect of domestic politics on foreign policy, dependency research considers the effects of one or more countries' (or corporations') foreign policy on the domestic conditions in another society. It seems inappropriate, however, to associate this work with linkage politics, because some significant contributions substantially predate the linkage conceptualization and little of it explicitly draws on linkage politics. In general, dependency frameworks advance a relationship between a country's asymmetrical reliance on an external entity and its internal development. Although both Marxist and non-Marxist interpretations of dependency abound, the seminal works of Marx and Engels with their focus on imperialism of capitalist countries and the effects on the economic development of satellites or colonies has provided the conceptual foundation. New scholarship has expanded the various forms of dependence (e.g., dependency on a single foreign source; amount of foreign penetration of domestic markets) and on types of dependency (e.g., trade, assistance, investment). Recent conceptual developments and arguments by Frank (1970), Bodenheimer (1971), Sunkel (1972), and Moran (1978) have been complemented by increasingly sophisticated empirical research. The effects of foreign dependency on economic growth remain unclear. Galtung (1971), Chase-Dunn (1975), Alschuler (1976), and Bornschier (1977) find that greater dependence is associated with lower economic growth. Kaufman and associates (1975), McGowan (1976b), and Ray and Webster (1978) tend to find either no relationship or a positive one. The smaller number of studies of the effects of dependency on internal inequality (e.g., in land or income distribution) have found a small positive association (e.g., Galtung, 1971; Rubinson, 1976, 1977). As with the "scapegoat" hypothesis, the possibility that critical mediating conditions have a significant influence seems worth investigation. Gobalet and Diamond (1979) consider the conditioning effect of the recipient's own internal strength. Other considerations worth investigation as intervening conditions might include regional differences, various time lags, the status of the overall world economy, and the effects of different

operationalizat
development b
and fourth wor
ency can be ap
the periphery r
source of inter
dependency on
influencing dom
in land or incom
Kegley, 1980).

Stimulus-Respo
stimulus-respor
government B o
Arms race mod
especially Chap
et al., 1964, 19
model—S-r:s-R-
state A's actual
be perceived an
its own new act
would become
state B would b
tant features we
actor's own resp
objective indica
perception amo
der and his asso
nition of the sit
foreign policy p
actor as an impo
in research by Z
and Modigliani,
been modified b
that when polic
by others, they
(accurately or n
and respond wit
to them.

The introdu
duces a decision
relations orienta
camel's nose unc
tation of the rol
in many indeper
havior from exte

Hermann

operationalizations. Finally, it should be noted that whereas the problem of economic development becomes a major—if not the major—task of foreign policy for most third and fourth world countries (see for example, Weinstein, 1976), the concept of dependency can be applied to nations that for other than economic development reasons are at the periphery rather than the center of an international system. Thus, for example, a source of international weakness that causes peripheral status on some issues could be dependency on external sources of energy. Dependency also can be viewed not only as influencing domestic factors (e.g., overall rate of economic growth, internal inequality in land or income), but also the dependent state's foreign policy (e.g., Richardson and Kegley, 1980).

Stimulus-Response Mediated by Perception. As applied to foreign policy, the basic stimulus-response model would suggest that government A's response behavior toward government B can best be estimated based on government B's prior behavior toward A. Arms race models in their basic form follow this precept (Busch, 1970; Zinnes, 1976, especially Chapter 14). In the 1960s the Stanford Conflict and Integration Project (Holsti et al., 1964, 1968) advanced what they called a two-step, mediated stimulus-response model—S-r:s-R—as a modification of the basic formulation. In continuous interaction, state A's actual behavior toward state B would constitute a stimulus (S), which would be perceived and interpreted as a response (r) by state B, which in turn would perceive its own new action toward A as a new stimulus (s), which when manifested as behavior would become the "actual" response (R) to the initial stimulus (S). This response of state B would become a stimulus for state A and the process would recycle. The important features were (1) the introduction of the perceptions of other's behavior and the actor's own response, (2) the combination in empirical research of perceptual data with objective indicators, and (3) the view that this interaction of foreign policy behavior and perception among states was a continuous process of international communication. Snyder and his associates (1962) had earlier emphasized the decision makers' subjective definition of the situation that is rather equivalent to the "r" in the Stanford studies of the foreign policy process. This attention to the perception of behavior directed toward an actor as an important attribute of the actor's own actions has been a major component in research by Zinnes (1966, 1968; Zinnes et al., 1972) as well as that of others (Gamson and Modigliani, 1971, Jervis, 1976). The model advanced by the Stanford group has been modified by Phillips (see Phillips and Crain, 1974; and Phillips, 1978). He contends that when policy makers cannot identify a clear signal in the behavior addressed to them by others, they tend to repeat their own prior responses; when the stimulus is perceived (accurately or not) by all key decision makers as unambiguous, then they reciprocate and respond with the same kind of behavior as that which they interpreted was addressed to them.

The introduction of the actor's perceptions to an action-reaction framework introduces a decision-making perspective and, it can be argued, transforms an international relations orientation into one involving foreign policy processes. Having permitted the camel's nose under the tent, so to speak, do these analysts provide an adequate representation of the role of foreign policy decision making? As we have seen, the policy process in many independent-dependent variable frameworks entails more than interpreting behavior from external entities. Must domestic pressures and capabilities be considered?

What about the actual process of decision making with multiple participants and the possible slippage in implementation? Even if the analysis is limited to perceptions, is it adequate to confine them to those indicators of collective official perceptions found in government documents? Many of these issues appear susceptible to further empirical analysis.

Cybernetics and Adaptation. Both of the last two frameworks reviewed address the effects of one entity's behavior on another. In one the dominant and asymmetrical power relationship of a given state or corporation influenced the economic development of another society. In the other framework, the behavioral interaction of two or more foreign policy-producing entities was seen to be dependent on each side's perception of those behaviors. In this last framework to be considered, the focus shifts from two or more interacting entities to the decision-making process in a single entity interacting with a complex and rather unspecified external environment. Both the cybernetic and adaptive approaches posit a goal-seeking entity that constantly adjusts its foreign policy behavior in the pursuit of its goals based on a continuous monitoring of selected features of its environment. The feedback from the environment stimulates either continuation of existing policy or some corrective if the policy goals seem to be becoming less obtainable. Deutsch (1966a) and Steinbruner (1974) have proposed the most extensive explications of the cybernetic approach applied to foreign policy using a systems and decision-making orientation, respectively. Steinbruner (1974) offers the cybernetic approach as an alternative to the rational or analytic model for explaining decision making. He suggests that the requirements of the analytic approach are unrealistic for complex decision making under conditions of uncertainty. His cybernetic alternative contends that decision makers or their representatives focus on a few indicators flowing from the environment to monitor the status of a goal. The monitoring activity moves to finer or more macro sets of indicators depending on the stability of the feedback received.

As advanced by Rosenau (1970a, 1970b), adaptation can be regarded as a cybernetic framework in which the goals are specified. He posits that all national societies are shaped by four essential structures (physical, political, economic, and social) and that maintaining these structures within certain boundaries becomes the task (goal) of both foreign and domestic policies. Because a given configuration of the structures defines any given society, if the status of any structure exceeds its critical limits, then the society is transformed. Policy makers, because of their power stake in the existing configuration, act to prevent transformation. Depending on a regime's responsiveness to the mix of internal and external demands, it will pursue one of several different strategies in its foreign policy—always adjusting to retain the configuration of structures. Using some modifications of Rosenau's ideas, McGowan (1974a, 1974b; and O'Leary, 1974) has sought to operationalize some of the key concepts in Rosenau's adaptation framework. An alternative perspective on adaptation has been proposed by Thorson (1974a, 1974b), who introduces an artificial system perspective following the developmental work in other contexts by Simon (1969).

Central to all cybernetic or adaptation frameworks is the positing of goals for foreign policy entities. Although Thorson (1974b) stresses that foreign policy goals can be constraints and Rosenau (1970a) views goals as boundaries or limits not to be exceeded, the idea of a complex, collective entity behaving in a goal-seeking manner requires careful examination. At conceptual level, what it means for a state or organization to pursue

goals can be a useless. Equally actors in a valid few clues as to

C. Illustrative

Before we draw some representative permit insight world of foreign framework in v sions generaliz statistical analy trated relation ditions.

Individual Char
personal charac
have a greater e

Bureaucratic P
career rewards
they are to inte
welfare of their
formulation of

Small Decision
well-being and
tion into the gr
the group on a

Political System
the greater is th
of the issue (Mi

National Attrib
is its participati

External and Sy
posals, concessi
other state disp
lated to negotia

Multilevel, Integ
gether account
additional contr
action-reaction)

Linkage Politics
greater tendency
followed by ext

goals can be a difficult problem. Agreement on goals may not exist or be so vague as to be useless. Equally troublesome is the task of empirically determining goals for particular actors in a valid manner that again avoids the vague and broad definitions that provide few clues as to appropriate associated behaviors.⁷

C. Illustrative Findings from Research Frameworks

Before we draw implications from the frameworks reviewed, it may be useful to examine some representative propositions suggested by the various approaches. These examples permit insight into what the frameworks tell us at the present time about the observable world of foreign policy. They also suggest the kinds of questions and problems each framework investigates. Of course, the evidence for the propositions varies from conclusions generalized from one or two case studies to results confirmed by several separate statistical analyses using aggregate data. The reader is cautioned that none of the illustrated relationships should be regarded as strongly substantiated for any specifiable conditions.

Individual Characteristics. When predominant leaders lack training in foreign policy, the personal characteristics of degree of distrust of others, need for power, and nationalism have a greater effect on foreign policy behavior (Hermann, 1980).

Bureaucratic Politics. The more dependent officials are for promotion, status, and other career rewards on the bureaucratic organization of which they are a part, the more likely they are to interpret the foreign policy interests of the entire government in terms of the welfare of their organization and insist on the recognition of this interpretation in the formulation of foreign policy (Allison and Halperin, 1972).

Small Decision Groups. The more members of a decision group are concerned with the well-being and maintenance of the group, the more likely they are to resist the introduction into the group of new information or analysis when consensus begins to emerge in the group on a preferred alternative (Janis, 1972; Flowers, 1977).

Political System. The less the importance of a foreign policy issue to the general public, the greater is the likelihood of any concerned interest group's influence on the outcome of the issue (Milbrath, 1967).

National Attributes. The more economically developed and larger the nation, the greater is its participation in international affairs (Rummel, 1972).

External and Systemic Factors. A national government is more likely to make new proposals, concessions, or agreements in international negotiation with another state if that other state displays cooperation toward the acting country on issues external and unrelated to negotiations (Hopmann, 1972).

Multilevel, Integrated Analyses. Global, interstate economic, and societal factors together account for most of the variance in constructive diplomatic behaviors, with no additional contribution from the prior interactions of the parties (i.e., sequences of action-reaction) (Wilkenfeld et al., 1980).

Linkage Politics. In nations having dictatorial and highly centralized regimes, there is a greater tendency than in nations not having such regimes for domestic conflict to be followed by external conflict (Wilkenfeld, 1973b).

Dependency Theories. Direct investment and foreign aid dependence increase domestic inequality (Bornschiefer, 1977).

Stimulus-Response Mediated by Perception. The more the policy makers of a state perceive their country to be the subject of another country's hostility, the more likely those policy makers are to express hostility toward that source (Zinnes, 1966).

Cybernetics and Adaptation. Small, closed, poor political systems tend to pursue a pro-motive foreign policy in which the policy makers are equally unresponsive to signals from their country's external environment and to those concerning domestic structures (McGowan, 1974b).

A much larger number of propositions of this type could be presented (see Jones and Singer, 1972; McGowan and Shapiro, (1973), although a few of the frameworks would account for a disproportionately large percentage of the available results. It can be argued, however, that the list above is generally representative. They reveal the kinds of issues at the core of the considered materials.

D. Observations About Frameworks and Approaches

Compatibility. As one reviews the array of frameworks, it is reasonable to speculate whether these diverse pieces could be fitted together into a more comprehensive mosaic. Some of the approaches do seem complementary and even compatible in a more fundamental sense. For example, the mediated stimulus-response approach with its concern about policy makers' perceptions appears to complement developments at the level of individual characteristics that address how perceptions are shaped (e.g., cognitive mapping or operational codes). Similarly, the bureaucratic politics approach invites consideration of the way membership in a government ministry structures a person's world view. It introduces an organizational element indicating that under some conditions the perceptions of governmental policy makers will conflict depending on the different bureau memberships represented among participants.

Between other frameworks the proposed dynamics appear to be in conflict. The group processes advanced by Janis (1972) result in a reduction in the quality of decision making when the concern for concurrence among members becomes too great. The reverse is argued in bureaucratic politics because conflict among representatives of competing bureaucratic interests is viewed as the potential source of reduced performance. Cybernetic models assume that policy makers sufficiently share goals to permit their behavior to be guided by monitoring indicators that reveal unequivocally whether the nation is moving toward or away from its goals. Bureaucratic politics would suggest concurrence on goals in a specific fashion would be quite difficult. Accordingly, agreement on the status of goals and indicators of them might prove impossible. Dependency theory would propose that for a nation locked in an asymmetrical relationship, the corrective goal-seeking actions of the government would have no effect on those aspects of its national life (e.g., economic development) that are controlled externally. Thus, policy makers operating according to the cybernetic model would be unable to affect any changes in the goal of economic development.

Taken at face value, some frameworks seem more congenial with one another than do others. Significantly, the underlying assumptions regarding the dynamics and logic of

many approaches compatible.

Incomplete De
 tions in various
 ment of a limited
 theoretical fra
 very few schol
 dependent inve
 of scholars hav
 larger number
 empirical rese
 systematic inq
 to the bureauc
 captured the at
 separate featur
 the framework
 approaches the
 haps one shoul
 sidering the fin
 must constantly

III. BRIEF CO

"Waiting for Ke
 state of foreign
 paradigm state
 the critical assu
 collective antici

Considerabl
 of frameworks t
 cept—has for to
 retical statemen
 associates (1980
 that incorporate
 tication about su
 tematic, compar
 sophistication in
 ard, 1973; Brem
 the comparative
 longitudinally—s
 for the applicati
 the serial and un

If the foreign
 or group who can

many approaches are not sufficiently explicated to make reliable judgments about their compatibility.

Incomplete Development. The suggested lack of explication of the underlying assumptions in various frameworks may be part of a larger pattern that results from the involvement of a limited number of investigators whose efforts are spread across a diversity of theoretical frameworks. Thus, research on most approaches depends on the efforts of a very few scholars. When propositions are investigated, the luxury of multiple tests by independent investigators using varying techniques and data is beyond reach. A fair number of scholars have examined the internal-external conflict hypothesis, and perhaps an even larger number from more diverse theoretical orientations are currently concerned with empirical research on dependency theory. Although they have to date produced little systematic inquiry, a substantial group of academics and practitioners have been attracted to the bureaucratic politics model. Similarly, parts of Rosenau's multilevel analysis have captured the attention of a set of investigators, many of whom have tended to examine separate features. Even in these four cases, the actual number of people contributing to the framework at any one time may be no more than 10 or 12. With respect to the other approaches the committed human resources are even less. Under the circumstances, perhaps one should marvel at how much has been done. It does mean, however, that in considering the findings of the field such as the illustrative propositions presented above, we must constantly remember that most are based on one or two unreplicated studies.

III. BRIEF CONCLUSIONS

"Waiting for Kepler" was the title used by Munton (1973) to characterize the present state of foreign policy studies. His phrase captures important qualities about the pre-paradigm state of inquiry in the field of foreign policy. Though no one has yet provided the critical assumptions and organizing theory that most can share, one senses a certain collective anticipation.

Considerable conceptual and empirical mapping has been performed as the diversity of frameworks testify. If foreign policy—which should have been a key organizing concept—has for too long remained an undefined term, that too is changing.⁸ Recent theoretical statements such as those by Bobrow and associates (1979) and Wilkenfeld and associates (1980) move forward on the task of developing more integrated explanations that incorporate features from clusters of variables at various analytic levels. New sophistication about such long-established techniques as the case study [now treated in a systematic, comparative fashion, for example, George and Smoke (1974)] parallel the sophistication in the application of new techniques such as computer simulations (Howard, 1973; Bremer, 1977). An increasing comprehension of the merits and problems of the comparative approach to the study of foreign policy—both cross-nationally and longitudinally—seems evident. Comparative analysis has become more than a code word for the application of the scientific method to foreign policy and certainly more than the serial and unrelated examination of the foreign policies of selected countries.

If the foreign policy field needs a Kepler equivalent or, more exactly, an individual or group who can establish in a compelling way the critical assumptions needed to

organize the field, the conditions to facilitate such a development have substantially improved over the past 15 years. Undoubtedly further improvements can be made in creating an environment for inquiry that encourages major advances. One possible candidate might be greater consciousness in framework development concerning the underlying assumptions, explanatory dynamics, and necessary conditions for the postulated relationships to hold. Another condition to encourage is the increased identification of puzzles that exist in the observable world of foreign policy and the contradictory hypotheses and findings about that world. Highlighting these features might sharpen the focus on potentially key theoretical mechanisms.

If the number of committed investigators in the foreign policy field does not diminish, these and other aids to improved explanation seem likely. In fact, perhaps the most concise summary statement about the field of foreign policy is that the present fluidity and diversity contain many of the features needed for significant theoretical development over the next decade or so.

NOTES

1. The concerns of the other domain of foreign policy studies are reflected in such journals as *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, *Journal of International Affairs*, *Orbis*, and in surveys such as *The International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Analysis* (e.g., Jones, 1975) and *The United States and World Development* (e.g., Sewell, 1977).
2. It is revealing that most foreign policy textbooks offer a more extensive treatment of the concept of foreign policy than do most research materials on the subject. Presumably, unlike students, professionals in the field know what foreign policy is, its dimensions, and implications. Representative of definitions found in textbooks are the following: Lentner (1974: 3-10); Berkowitz et al. (1977: 1-3); Spainer (1960: 1-4).
3. Because single case studies are so numerous, it is impossible to cite even a small sample to suggest the volume and scope. Several well-known foreign policy cases that are frequently cited are Jones (1955), Paige (1968), and Newhouse (1973). These three show the continuing popularity of single case studies throughout the postwar period and the diversity of backgrounds of the authors. In the three cited examples, one author is a policy maker, another an academic, and the third a journalist.
4. Of course, there is no reason why policy makers and journalists cannot construct useful categories of foreign policy. Their purposes, however, may differ from the researcher, who seeks classifications that are mutually exclusive, exhaustive, and theoretically useful (i.e., the categories participate in relationships with other variables). Policy makers may wish to create symbolic categories for political purposes or to organize their understanding. Journalists may provide their audiences with categories to organize and to simplify diverse events. These are worthy purposes, but may not produce useful categories for scholarship.
5. It is the work of James Rosenau (see References) and its subsequent elaboration, described elsewhere in this chapter, that may comprise the closest approximation to a paradigm for some scholars interested in the comparative study of foreign policy. An effective summary of Rosenau's framework as developed over a period of years is offered by McGowan (1974a), and the problems with its continuation as a paradigm are reviewed by Kegley (1979). Allison (1971) and Steinbruner (1974) suggest

- that the r
national p
nearly un
6. As an ind
policy of
out the re
trasted wi
the relativ
ance expl
7. For a furt
mann (19
8. Nowhere
eign polic
see the rev

REFERENCE

- Allison, G. T.
Allison, G. T.,
policy im
Almond, G. A.
York.
Alschuler, L. E.
Studies Q
Art, R. J. (197
Sciences 4
Bacchus, W. I.
Press, Prin
Bauer, R. A., F
icy. Ather
Beck, C., Flerc
(1973). *C*
Berkowitz, M.,
Policy. Pre
Bobrow, D. B.,
cisions. Fr
Bodenheimer,
underdeve
(Eds.). F. I
Bonham, G. M.
foreign pol
McGowan
Bornschiefer, V.
ment and i
738.
— (1977). *M*
Bulletin of
Brady, L. P. (19
S. A. Salm

- that the rational actor or analytic model may have been a prevailing paradigm in international politics, but, if so, they also note its demise as a set of critical assumptions nearly universally shared.
6. As an individual who has worked intensively with the factors involved in the foreign policy of one nation, Weinstein (1976: 25-26) stresses the severe difficulty in sorting out the relative importance of explanatory variables on a conceptual basis as contrasted with a statistical process. Representative of the careful efforts to differentiate the relative role of explanatory variables in a statistical manner (i.e., amount of variance explained) is the research of Moore (1974).
 7. For a further discussion of the use of the concept of foreign policy goals, see Hermann (1978b).
 8. Nowhere is the current concern for exploring the dimensions and categories of foreign policy more clearly evident than in the work on foreign policy issue areas; e.g., see the review of Potter (1980).

REFERENCES

- Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of Decision*. Little, Brown, Boston.
- Allison, G. T., and Halperin, M. H. (1972). Bureaucratic politics: A paradigm and some policy implications. *World Politics* 24: 40-79.
- Almond, G. A. (1950). *The American People and Foreign Policy*. Harcourt, Brace, New York.
- Alschuler, L. R. (1976). Satellization and stagnation in Latin America. *International Studies Quarterly* 20: 39-83.
- Art, R. J. (1973). Bureaucratic politics and American foreign policy: A critique. *Policy Sciences* 4: 467-490.
- Bacchus, W. I. (1974). *Foreign Policy and the Bureaucratic Process*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Bauer, R. A., Pool, I. D., and Dexter, L. A. (1963). *American Business and Public Policy*. Atherton Press, New York.
- Beck, C., Fleron, E. F., Jr., Lodge, M., Waller, D. J., Welsh, W. A., and Zaninovich, M. G. (1973). *Comparative Communist Political Leadership*. McKay, New York.
- Berkowitz, M., Bock, P. G., and Fuccillo, V. J. (1977). *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Bobrow, D. B., Chan, S., and Kringen, J. A. (1979). *Understanding Foreign Policy Decisions*. Free Press, New York.
- Bodenheimer, S. (1971). Dependency and imperialism: The roots of Latin American underdevelopment. In *Readings in U.S. Imperialism*, K. T. Fann and D. C. Hodges (Eds.). F. Porter Sargent, Boston.
- Bonham, G. M., and Shapiro, M. J. (1973). Simulation in the development of a theory of foreign policy decision-making. In *SAGE Yearbook of Foreign Policy*, vol. I, P. J. McGowan (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 55-71.
- Bornschiefer, V. (1975). The effects of international economic dependence on development and inequality: A cross-national study. *American Sociological Review* 40: 720-738.
- (1977). Multinational corporations in the world economy and national development. *Bulletin of the Social Institute of the University of Zurich*, No. 32.
- Brady, L. P. (1978). The situation and foreign policy. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 173-190.

- Brecher, M. (1972). *The Foreign Policy System of Israel*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Brecher, M., Steinberg, B., and Stein, J. (1969). A framework for research on foreign policy behavior. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 13: 75-101.
- Bremer, S. A. (1977). *Simulated Worlds*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Broderson, A. (1961). National character: An old problem re-examined. In *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, J. N. Rosenau, (Ed.). Free Press of Glencoe, Glencoe, IL, pp. 300-308.
- Brzezinski, Z., and Huntington, S. P. (1963-1964). *Political Power: USA/USSR*. Viking Press, New York.
- Busch, P. A. (1970). Appendix: Mathematical models of arms races. In *What Price Vigilance?* B. M. Russett (Ed.). Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, pp. 193-233.
- Callahan, P., Brady, L. P., and Hermann, M. G. (1982). *Describing Foreign Policy Behavior*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Camps, M. (1966). *European Unification in the Sixties*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Chase-Dunn, C. (1975). The effects of international economic dependence on development and inequality: A cross-national study. *American Sociological Review* 40: 720-738.
- Chittick, W. O. (1970). *State Department Press, and Pressure Groups*. Wiley, New York.
- Choucri, N., and North, R. (1975). *Nations in Conflict*. Freeman Press, San Francisco.
- Clark, J. F., O'Leary, M. K., and Wittkopf, E. R. (1971). National attributes associated with dimensions of support for the United Nations. *International Organization* 25: 1-25.
- Cohen, E. C. (1957). *The Political Process and Foreign Policy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- (1973). *The Public Impact on Foreign Policy*. Little, Brown, Boston.
- Cohen, B. C., and Harris, S. A. (1975). Foreign policy. In *Handbook of Political Science*, vol. 6. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- de Rivera, J. H. (1968). *The Psychological Dimension of Foreign Policy*. Merrill, Columbus, OH.
- Destler, I. M. (1972). *Presidents, Bureaucrats, and Foreign Policy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- (1980). *Making Foreign Economic Policy*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Deutsch, K. W. (1966a). *The Nerves of Government*. Free Press, New York.
- (1966b). External influences on the internal behavior of states. In *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, R. B. Farrell (Ed.). Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL, pp. 5-26.
- Deutsch, K. W., Edinger, L. J., Macridis, R. C., and Merritt, R. L. (1967). *France, Germany and the Western Alliance*. Scribner's, New York.
- East, M. A. (1978). The international system perspective and foreign policy. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 143-160.
- East, M. A., and Hermann, C. F. (1974). Do nation-types account for foreign policy behavior? In *Comparing Foreign Policies*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage-Halsted Press, New York, pp. 269-303.
- Edinger, L. J. (1965). *Kurt Schumacher*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

- Farrell, R. B. (1970). *Approaches to Foreign Policy*. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL.
- Flowers, M. L. (1970). *Foreign Policy Hypotheses*. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL.
- Frank, A. G. (1970). *Development and Foreign Policy*. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Friedrich, C. J. (1970). *Foreign Policy Systems in the United States*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- Galtung, J. (1970). *Foreign Policy*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- Gamson, W. A., and Mazzi, G. (1970). *Foreign Policy*. Boston.
- George, A. L. (1970). *Political Science*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- George, A. L. (1970). *Quarterly Journal of International Law* 40: 1-25.
- (1974). *Adaptation to a changing group, and the Hamburg, and the*
- George, A. L., and Shambaugh, D. (1970). *Foreign Policy*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- Gobalet, J. G., and Gobalet, J. G. (1970). *Economic growth and foreign policy*.
- Griffith, W. E. (1970). *Foreign Policy*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- Haas, M. (1968). *International Politics*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- (1974). *International Politics*. (Ed.). Norton, New York.
- Halperin, M. H. (1970). *Washington, D.C.*
- Halperin, M. H., and Halperin, M. H. (1970). *A framework for foreign policy*.
- M. H. Halperin (1970). *Foreign Policy*.
- Hanrieder, W. F. (1970). *Adaptation to a changing group*.
- (1971). *Foreign Policy*.
- General Learning (1970). *Foreign Policy*.
- Harf, J. E., Hoovl, J. E. (1970). *Foreign Policy*.
- Methods*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.).
- Hellmann, D. (1970). *California Press*.
- Hermann, C. F. (1970). *Politics and Foreign Policy*.
- (1972). *Politics and Foreign Policy*.
- (1972). *Politics and Foreign Policy*.
- (Eds.). Free P

Hermann

- Farrell, R. B. (1966). Foreign policies of open and closed political societies. In *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, R. B. Farrell (Ed.). Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL, pp. 167-208.
- Flowers, M. L. (1977). A laboratory test of some implications of Janis' groupthink hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 35: 888-895.
- Frank, A. G. (1970). The development of underdevelopment. In *Imperialism and Underdevelopment*, R. I. Rhodes (Ed.). Monthly Review Press, New York, pp. 4-17.
- Friedrich, C. J. (1966). International politics and foreign policy in developed (Western) systems. In *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, R. B. Farrell (Ed.). Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL, pp. 97-119.
- Galtung, J. (1971). A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research* 8: 81-117.
- Gamson, W. A., and Modigliani, A. (1971). *Untangling the Cold War*. Little, Brown, Boston.
- George, A. L. (1972). The case for multiple advocacy in making foreign policy. *American Political Science Review*. 66, 3 (September): 751-790.
- George, A. L. (1969). The operational code: A neglected approach. *International Studies Quarterly* 13 (June): 190-222.
- (1974). Adaptation to stress in political decision making: The individual, small group, and organizational contexts. In *Coping and Adaptation*, G. V. Coelho, D. A. Hamburg, and J. E. Adams (Eds.). Basic Books, New York, pp. 167-245.
- George, A. L., and Smoke, R. (1974). *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Gobalet, J. G., and Diamond, L. J. (1979). Effects of investment dependence on economic growth. *International Studies Quarterly* 23: 412-422.
- Griffith, W. E. (1964). *The Sino-Soviet Rift*. M. I. T. Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Haas, M. (1968). Social change and national aggressiveness, 1900-1960. In *Quantitative International Politics*, J. D. Singer (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 215-244.
- (1974). *International Conflict*. Bobbs-Merrill, Columbus, OH.
- Halperin, M. H. (1974). *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*. Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Halperin, M. H., and Kanter, A. (1973). The bureaucratic perspective: A preliminary framework. In *Readings in American Foreign Policy: A Bureaucratic Perspective*, M. H. Halperin and A. Kanter (Eds.). Little, Brown, Boston.
- Hanrieder, W. F. (1967). Compatibility, consensus, and an emerging political science of adaptation. *American Political Science Review* 61, 4 (December): 971-982.
- (1971). *Foreign Policies and the International System: A Theoretical Introduction*. General Learning Press, Morristown, NJ, pp. 1-24.
- Harf, J. E., Hoovler, D. G., and James, T. E., Jr. (1974). Systemic and external attributes in foreign policy analysis. In *Comparing Foreign Policies: Theories, Findings, and Methods*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 235-267.
- Hellmann, D. (1969). *Japanese Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Hermann, C. F. (1969). International crisis as a situational variable. In *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, rev. ed. J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 409-421.
- (1972). Policy classification: A key to the comparative study of foreign policy. In *The Analysis of International Politics*, J. N. Rosenau, V. Davis, and M. A. East (Eds.). Free Press, New York, pp. 58-79.

- (1978a). Decision structure and process influences on foreign policy. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 69-102.
- (1978b). Foreign policy behavior: That which is to be explained. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 25-47.
- (1980). Explaining foreign policy behavior using the personal characteristics of political leaders. *International Studies Quarterly* 24, 1 (March): 7-46.
- Hilsman, R. (1967). *To Move a Nation*. Doubleday, New York.
- Holsti, O. R. (1972). *Crisis, Escalation, and War*. McGill University Press, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- (1976). Foreign policy decision makers viewed psychologically: "Cognitive process" approaches. In *In Search of Global Patterns*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 120-144.
- Holsti, O. R., Brody, R. A., and North, R. C. (1964). Measuring affect and action in international reaction models. *Journal of Peace Research* 3-4: 170-190.
- Holsti, O. R., North, R. C., and Brody, R. A. (1968). Perception and action in the 1914 crisis. In *Quantitative International Politics*, J. D. Singer (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 123-258.
- Hopmann, P. T. (1972). Internal and external influences on bargaining in arms control negotiations. In *Peace, War, and Numbers*, B. M. Russett (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 213-237.
- Howard, N. (1973). A computer science system for foreign policy decision making. *Journal of Peace Science* 1 (Autumn): 61-68.
- Hughes, B. B. (1978). *The Domestic Context of American Foreign Policy*. Freeman, San Francisco.
- Huntington, S. P. (1960). Strategic planning and the political process. *Foreign Affairs* 38, (2): 285-299.
- Inglehart, R. (1967). An end to European integration? *American Political Science Review* 61(1): 91-105.
- Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink*. Houghton-Mifflin, Boston.
- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Johnson, L. K. (1977). Operational codes and the prediction of leadership behavior: Senator Frank Church ad midcareer. In *A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders*, M. G. Hermann (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 80-119.
- Jones, J. M. (1955). *The Fifteen Weeks*. Harbinger Press, New York.
- Jones, P. (Ed.). (1975). *The International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Analysis*, vol. 2. Crane and Russak, Oberlin, OH.
- Jones, S. D., and Singer, J. D. (1972). *Beyond Conjecture in International Politics*. Peacock Press, Itasca, IL.
- Katzenstein, P. J. (1978). *Between Power and Plenty*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- Kaufman, R. H., Chernotsky, H., and Geller, D. (1975). A preliminary test of the theory of dependency. *Comparative Politics* 7: 303-330.
- Kean, J. G., and McGowan, P. J. (1973). National attributes and foreign policy participation: A path analysis. In *Sage International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies*, vol. 1, P. J. McGowan (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 219-252.
- Kegley, C. W., Jr. (1973). A general empirical typology of foreign policy behavior. In *Sage Professional Papers in International Studies* 2, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 02-014.

- (1979). The... presented at... Institute of... vember 29...
- Kegley, C. W., Jr. (1973). A general empirical typology of foreign policy behavior. In *Sage Professional Papers in International Studies*, vol. 2, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 02-014.
- Kelman, H. C. (1978). *International Relations: A Theory of Foreign Policy*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Klineberg, O. (1978). *Research in International Studies*, vol. 179.
- Krasner, S. D. (1978). *De...*
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Leites, N. (1948). *Authoritarianism and Democracy*. Vol. I, No. 1.
- (1951). *The*
- Lentner, H. H. (1967). *The*
- Long, N. E. (1967). *International Politics*, pp. 155-166.
- McGowan, P. J. (1973). *In Comparative Politics*, 44.
- (1974b). *Ad...*
- Rosenau, J. N. (Ed.). (1976a). *The*
- (1976b). *Global Patterns of International Politics*.
- (1976b). *Economic and Social Change in Modern America*.
- McGowan, P. J., and Kean, J. G. (1973). *A Survey of Science in International Politics*.
- Meehan, E. J. (1973). *W. F. Harbinger*.
- Milbrath, L. W. (1973). *Foreign Policy, J...*
- Moore, D. W. (1973). *closed national systems*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 02-014.
- Moran, T. H. (1973). *distas and non...*
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1973). *The*
- Mueller, J. E. (1973). *The*
- Munton, D. (1973). *sociation mee...*
- Murphy, R. D., and McGowan, P. J. (1973). *the Governme...*
- Washington, D. C.

- policy. In *Why Nations*
e, Beverly Hills, CA,
- ed. In *Why Nations*
e, Beverly Hills, CA,
- characteristics of
): 7-46.
- y Press, Montreal, Que-
- ily: "Cognitive process"
Ed.). Free Press, New
- ffect and action in inter-
0-190.
- and action in the 1914
. Free Press, New York,
- aining in arms control
d.). Sage, Beverly Hills,
- cy decision making.
- ign Policy. Freeman,
- rocess. *Foreign Affairs*
- n *Political Science Re-*
- Boston.
- l *Politics*. Princeton Uni-
- f leadership behavior:
xamination of *Political*
80-119.
- York.
- n *Policy Analysis*, vol. 2.
- nternational *Politics*.
- ity of Wisconsin Press,
- liminary test of the theory
- and foreign policy partici-
of *Foreign Policy Studies*,
219-252.
- foreign policy behavior. In
Beverly Hills, CA, pp.
- (1979). The comparative study of foreign policy: Paradigm lost? Unpublished paper presented at conference on the future of International Studies and the ISA at the Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, November 29-December 1.
- Kegley, C. W., Jr., Salmore, S. A., and Rosen, O. J. (1974). Convergences in the measurement of interstate behavior. In *Sage International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies*, vol. II, P. J. McGowan (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 309-339.
- Kelman, H. C. (1965). Social-psychological approaches to the study of international relations: Definition of scope. In *International Behavior*, H. C. Kelman (Ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, pp. 3-39.
- Klineberg, O. (1950). *Tensions Affecting International Understanding*. Social Science Research Council, New York.
- Krasner, S. D. (1972). Are bureaucracies important? *Foreign Policy* 7 (Summer): 159-179.
- (1978). *Defending the National Interest*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1963). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Leites, N. (1948). Psycho-cultural hypotheses about political acts. *World Politics*: Vol. I, No. I, pps. 102-119.
- (1951). *The Operational Code of the Politburo*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Lentner, H. H. (1974). *Foreign Policy Analysis*. Charles E. Merrill, Columbus, OH.
- Long, N. E. (1966). Open and closed systems. In *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, R. B. Farrell (Ed.). Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL, pp. 155-166.
- McGowan, P. J. (1974a). Problems in the construction of positive foreign policy theory. In *Comparing Foreign Policies*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 25-44.
- (1974b). Adaptive foreign policy behavior. In *Comparing Foreign Policies*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 45-54.
- (1976a). The future of comparative studies: An evangelical plea. In *In Search of Global Patterns*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 217-235.
- (1976b). Economic dependence and economic performance in Black Africa. *Journal of Modern African Studies* 14: 25-40.
- McGowan, P. J., and Shapiro, H. B. (1973). *The Comparative Study of Foreign Policy: A Survey of Scientific Findings*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Meehan, E. J. (1971). The concept of "foreign policy." In *Comparative Foreign Policy*, W. F. Hanrieder (Ed.). David McKay, New York, pp. 265-294.
- Milbrath, L. W. (1967). Interest groups and foreign policy. In *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 231-251.
- Moore, D. W. (1974). Governmental and societal influences on foreign policy in open and closed nations. In *Comparing Foreign Policies*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 171-200.
- Moran, T. H. (1978). Multinational corporations and dependency: A dialogue for dependistas and non-dependistas. *International Organization* 32: 1. pps. 79-100.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1967). *Politics Among Nations*, 4th ed., Knopf, New York.
- Mueller, J. E. (1973). *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*. Wiley, New York.
- Munton, D. (1973). Waiting for Kepler. Paper prepared for the International Studies Association meeting in New York.
- Murphy, R. D., and Commission Members (1975). *Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy*. U.S. Government Printing Office Washington, DC, 022-000-00108-6.

- Neustadt, R. E. (1970). *Alliance Politics*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Newhouse, J. (1973). *Cold Dawn: The Story of SALT*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- North, R. C., and Lagerstrom, R. (1971). *War and Domination: A Theory of Lateral Pressure*. General Learning Press, Morristown, NJ.
- O'Leary, M. K. (1974). Foreign policy and bureaucratic adaptation. In *Comparing Foreign Policies*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 55-70.
- (1976). The role of issues. In *In Search of Global Patterns*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 318-325.
- Paige, G. D. (1968). *The Korean Decision*. Free Press, New York.
- Phillips, W. R. (1978). Prior behavior as an explanation of foreign policy. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 161-172.
- Phillips, W. R., and Crain, R. C. (1974). Reciprocity and uncertainty in foreign study. In *Sage International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies*, vol. II, P. J. McGowan (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 227-268.
- Potter, W. C. (1980). Issue area and foreign policy analysis. *International Organization* 34(4): 405-427.
- Ray, J. L., and Webster, T. (1978). Dependency and economic growth in Latin America. *International Studies Quarterly* 22: 409-434.
- Renshon, S. A. (Ed.) (1977). *Handbook of Political Socialization*. Free Press, New York.
- Richardson, N. R., and Kegley, C. W. (1980). Trade dependence and foreign policy compliance. *International Studies Quarterly* 24: 191-222.
- Robinson, J. A. (1962). *Congress and Foreign Policy Making*. The Dorsey Press, Inc., Homewood, IL.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1964). *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy*. Random House, New York.
- (1966). Pre-theories and theories of foreign policy. In *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, R. B. Farrell (Ed.). Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL, pp. 27-92.
- (1968). Private preferences and political responsibilities: The relative potency of individual and role variables in the behavior of U.S. Senators. In *Quantitative International Politics*, J. D. Singer (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 17-50.
- (1969). *Linkage Politics*. Free Press, New York.
- (1970a). Foreign policy as adaptive behavior. *Comparative Politics* 2: 365-387.
- (1970b). *The Adaptation of National Societies*. McCaleb-Seiler, New York.
- (1971). *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*. Free Press, New York.
- (1972). The external environment as a variable in foreign policy analysis. In *The Analysis of International Politics*, J. N. Rosenau, V. Davis, and M. A. East (Eds.). Free Press, New York, pp. 145-165.
- (Ed.) (1974). *Comparing Foreign Policies*. Sage-Halsted Press, New York.
- Rubinson, R. (1977). Dependence, government, revenue, and economic growth, 1950-70. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 12: 3-28.
- Rummel, R. J. (1963). Dimensions of conflict behavior within and between nations. *Yearbook of the Society for General Systems* 8: 1-50.
- (1972). *The Dimensions of Nations*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- (1977). *Field Theory Evolving*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- (1979). *National Attributes and Behavior*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Salmore, B. G., and Salmore, S. A. (1978). Political regimes and foreign policy. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 103-122.

- Salmore, S. A. (1978). Foreign policy behavior. pp. 329-342.
- Salmore, S. A. (1979). Toward a theory of foreign policy and C. F. Hermann (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 1-12.
- Schilling, W. R. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Sewell, J. W. (1978). *The Foreign Policy of the United States*. Free Press, New York.
- Simon, H. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Singer, J. D. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Snyder, R. C. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Spanier, J. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Spielmann, K. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Sprout, H. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Steinbruner, J. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Sullivan, M. P. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Sunkel, O. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Tanter, R. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Tetlock, P. E. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Thomson, T. W. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Thorson, S. J. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Thorson, S. J. (1979). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Trice, R. H. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Ulam, A. B. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Wallace, W. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Waltz, K. N. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Weinstein, F. B. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.
- Wilkenfeld, J. (1978). *Foreign Policy and the Business Cycle*. Free Press, New York.

- Press, New York.
- Rinehart and Winston,
- A Theory of Lateral*
- tion. In *Comparing For-*
pp. 55-70.
J. N. Rosenau (Ed.).
- k.
- ign policy. In *Why*
n (Eds.). Sage, Beverly
- ainty in foreign study.
vol. II, P. J. McGowan
- International Organization*
- growth in Latin Amer-
- on. Free Press, New
- ce and foreign policy
- The Dorsey Press, Inc.,
- andom House, New York.
- Approaches to Comparative*
rn University Press, Evan-
- The relative potency of
ors. In *Quantitative*
York, pp. 17-50.
- World Politics 2*: 365-387.
Seiler, New York.
- ss, New York.
- policy analysis. In *The*
s, and M. A. East (Eds.).
- Press, New York.
- conomic growth, 1950-
2: 3-28.
- n and between nations.
- CA.
- Hills, CA.
- nd foreign policy. In *Why*
nn (Eds.). Sage, Beverly
- Salmore, S. A., and Munton, D. (1974). An empirically based typology of foreign policy behavior. In *Comparing Foreign Policy*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 329-352.
- Salmore, S. A., Hermann, M. G., Hermann, C. F., and Salmore, B. G. (1978). Conclusion: Toward integrating the perspectives. In *Why Nations Act*, M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, and C. F. Hermann (Eds.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 191-209.
- Schilling, W. R., Hammond, P. Y., and Snyder, G. H. (1962). *Strategy, Politics, and Defense Budgets*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Sewell, J. W. (1977). *The United States and World Development*. Praeger, New York.
- Simon, H. (1969). *The Sciences of the Artificial*. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Singer, J. D., Bremer, S., and Stuckey, J. (1972). Capability distribution, uncertainty, and major power war, 1820-1965. In *Peace, War and Numbers*, B. M. Russett (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 19-48.
- Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., and Sapin, B. (1962). *Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Free Press, New York.
- Spanier, J. (1960). *American Foreign Policy Since World War II*, 8th ed. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Spielmann, K. F. (1978). *Analyzing Soviet Strategic Arms Decisions*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Sprout, H., and Sprout, M. (1965). *Ecological Perspective on Human Affairs*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Steinbruner, J. D. (1974). *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Sullivan, M. P. (1976). *International Relations: Theories and Evidence*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Sunkel, O. (1972). Big business and dependencia: A Latin American view. *Foreign Affairs 50*: 517-531.
- Tanter, R. (1966). Dimensions of conflict behavior within and between nations, 1958-60. *Journal of Conflict Resolution 10*(1): 41-64.
- Tetlock, P. E. (1979). Identifying victims of groupthink from public statements of decision-makers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37*: 1314-1324.
- Thomson, T. W., and Macridis, R. C. (1976). The comparative study of foreign policy. In *Foreign Policy in World Politics*, R. C. Macridis (Ed.). Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 1-31.
- Thorson, S. J. (1974b). Adaptation and foreign policy theory. In *Sage International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies*, Vol. II, P. J. McGowan (Ed.). Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pps. 123-139.
- Thorson, S. J. (1974a). National political adaptation. In *Comparing Foreign Policies*, J. N. Rosenau (Ed.). Sage-Halsted Press, New York, pp. 71-116.
- Trice, R. H. (1976). *Interest Groups and the Foreign Policy Process: U.S. Policy in the Middle East*. Sage International Studies Series 02-027. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Ulam, A. B. (1971). Soviet ideology and Soviet foreign policy. In *The Conduct of Soviet Foreign Policy*, E. P. Hoffmann and F. J. Fleron, Jr. (Eds.). Aldine-Atherton, Chicago, pp. 136-153.
- Wallace, W. (1975). *The Foreign Policy Process in Britain*. The Royal Institute of International Affairs, London.
- Waltz, K. N. (1967). *Foreign Policy and Democratic Politics*. Little, Brown, Boston.
- Weinstein, F. B. (1976). *Indonesian Foreign Policy and the Dilemma of Dependence*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Wilkenfeld, J. (1973a). *Conflict Behavior and Linkage Politics*. McKay, New York.

- (1973b). Domestic and foreign conflict. In *Conflict Behavior and Linkage Politics*. J. Wilkenfeld (Ed.). MacKay, New York, pp. 107-123.
- Wilkenfeld, J., Hopple, G. W., Rossa, P. J., and Andriole, S. J. (1980). *Foreign Policy Behavior*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Wolfenstein, V. E. (1971). *The Revolutionary Personality*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Zagoria, D. S. (1967). *Vietnam Triangle*. Pegasus Press, Indianapolis, IN.
- Zinnes, D. A. (1966). A comparison of hostile behavior of decision-makers in simulate and historical data. *World Politics* 18(3): 474-502.
- (1968). The expression and perception of hostility in prewar crisis: 1914. In *Quantitative International Politics*, J. D. Singer (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 85-122.
- (1976). *Contemporary Research in International Relations*. Free Press, New York.
- Zinnes, D. A., Zinnes, J. L., and McClure, R. D. (1972). Hostility in diplomatic communications. In *International Crisis*, C. F. Hermann (Ed.). Free Press, New York, pp. 139-164.

13

Military Policy

Edward A. Ko

I. INTRODUCTION

Military policy is the principal policy of their ruling elite. It is the policy that goes beyond the state's borders. It is the policy that is considered the most important in international relations and actions. It is the policy that emphasizes authority and control. It is the policy that emphasizes physical means of power. It is the policy that is seen from the perspective of the authoritarian order.

The definition of military policy is the principal policy of the state, organized in separate spheres. The structures assert the authority in the territorial space over the physical violence. It is the policy that is much of international relations, moral or legal authority. It is the ultimate arbiter of a fundamental interest. Its objectives, and the disputes between states, depend on the system.

The system of objectives on "o