PART-ONE: MODEL-ORIENTED RESEARCH
CHAPTER I

A MODEL FOR THE ANALYSIS OF FOREIGN POLICY
a. The Case for an Analytical Model:

It is a truism that when one conjures up the world of foreign policy analysis from the vinatage position of the discipline in the mid-1950's, one is just amazed by a plethora of new concepts, categories, theories, approaches, models, that have been spawned over the years. These efforts marked the end of an era of the traditional analysts who viewed the state as an undifferentiated abstraction possessing all the anthropomorphic attributes of will, personality and perception. And it pursues its goals abroad which are derived from the objective conditions inherent in its role in world arena in the light of its geographic, political, historical, economic and strategic interests¹. These assumptions of reification of the State and objectification of its situation came under challenge from the scientific analysts, who recognized that ambiguous formulation, reified entities, and undisciplined modes of enquiry could never reveal the dynamics of the external behaviour of a state. Once the state is stripped of its veneer of reification, it becomes a visible embodiment of a set of interacting human officials who speak and act in the name of the state and allocate its values for realisation of

its goals by appropriate course of action in the realm of international system.

These human officials are known as decision-makers. They are concrete and identifiable actors, whose behavioural manifestations are not abstract or mystical and can be observed by any observer. Their behaviour is the product of causal processes and exhibit regularities and pattern of flows. So they can be measured and quantified. But explicit theory and operationalized concepts are necessary for any attempt at quantification and measurement. Hence, an unending quest started among scientific analysts to build models which serve this objective admirably well. The rationale is that an analytical model offers a host of advantages in the analysis of foreign policy.

As we know, a model denotes an orderly set of inter-related concepts and propositions designed to show how some institution or process functions\(^2\). All explanations and predictions are based on images regarding the way the things are arranged and how they function in the real world. Such images, even though never set down in ink or print, are models. That is, certain aspects of reality are abstracted

from the totality and form the basis of description of how things work, how people behave or what will happen. So, it makes possible to have an accurate description of the phenomenon under consideration which coincides with empirical referent to a considerable extent. As a result, it renders the data meaningful without which data will not fall into place. It also functionally identifies how the component of behaviour can be structured and how they relate to each other. It has also the capability to explain the relationship among the phenomena under investigation, as it is composed of a number of assumptions from which conclusions are derived. Besides, it treats causal relationship in such a fashion that it enables analysts not only to prove validity of explanation but also to achieve parsimony whose implications for any research strategy is considerable. However, to posit these merits, is not to argue that an observer is a prescient individual who can discover the "objective reality" of world politics through the simplification of his analytical model. The reality is always captured and designed in terms of the observer's mental model of the most relevant and distinguishing features of the phenomena. An eminent scholar cogently

observes: 4

"Unable to perceive and depict the universe of international phenomena in its entirety, the observer is forced to select some of its dimensions as important and in need of close examination, while dismissing others as trivial and unworthy of further analysis... Use of the diagrammatic technique serves as a reminder that though there may be an objective truth about world politics, the observer can never know it. He must select in order to know reality, and in so doing he must distort it."

So, it has been argued that as the students of foreign policy cannot validly break reality down into its simplest, most basic relationships, he should instead work with more complex and thus, hopefully less unrealistic analytical model. However, the fact that no model takes into account all possibly relevant factors does not make these intellectual tools less useless. As two Scholars observe: 5

"On the contrary, the abstraction of similar limited aspects from different concrete units that are unique in their respective totalities and the derivation of

5 Sprout, n.2, p. 41.
general descriptions from such abstractions form one of the most powerful techniques by which modern man reduces his complicated universe to some kind of intelligible and increasingly manageable order.

b. The Postulation of the Model:

The present model is delineated in the form of a diagram. Like all analytical models, it contains a set of inter-related concepts and assumptions. Hence, it is imperative to clarify the assumptions underlying it.

In the first place, if foreign policy can be defined as consisting of the external behaviour of states then it becomes legitimate to assume that it is this behaviour which can be treated as the fundamental unit of analysis - the phenomena one is primarily concerned for description and explanation. Consequently, what one studies are acts or behavioural activities and in foreign policy analysis this means one focuses on the things the states say and do abroad. So, by adopting the foreign policy acts as the unit of analysis, the study of foreign policy is placed within the philosophical and theoretical tradition of those scholars such as Margaret Mead (1938), Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (1960) and William H. Ricker (1957), who
emphasise the acts in the scientific analysis of foreign policy, even if, primary actor remains the nation-state.

As a necessary corollary to the adoption of foreign policy acts as the unit of analysis, it can be argued that there is no level of analysis problem involved in foreign policy research. It was J. David Singer who was the earliest to recognise that there is such a problem. However, the main thrust of Singer's argument does not refer to analysis problem at all. It refers to what are commonly called "units of analysis", that is the units or cases across which one compares. What Singer is saying correctly is that an analyst cannot analyse both national subsystem and international system as though they are comparable units. But he never argues that one necessarily encounters an analytical problem when dealing simultaneously with variables at different levels of aggregation. Singer does not deny the possibility of cross-level relationship. It is analytically legitimate to relate a stats's foreign policy to both national characteristics and aspects of international system. To be sure, the levels of these variables are different but there is certainly no logical


7 Ibid., p. 265.
fallacy and presumably some theoretical merit in positing such relationship. An explanatory model of foreign policy necessarily requires inclusion of independent variables at all levels of aggregation, if it is to be valid and cogent, for it is intuitively obvious that both national and systemic factor condition the kind of behaviour emanating from the national actor. Once it is recognised, the empirical investigator can perform his conceptual task in such a manner in which the indicators of foreign policy behaviour of states are put in a clear format for data analysis, and will enable him not only to make useful inferences about the relative strengths of variables at multiple levels but also to trace the interaction effects among these variables. There are, however, very few quantitative studies in which variations in national behaviour are related to domestic factors and to factors arising in the international system. Even if, there is no level of analysis problem involved, the tendencies persist. Two researchers, who have developed and tested such multi-level models - Choucri and North - observed:

8 The simulation-based study by Crow and Noel is perhaps unique in its multiple focus on personality, organizational and situational factors, see Wayman J. Crow, and Robert C. Noel, The Valid Use of Simulation Results (Mimeo, 1965), Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, Ohio, U.S.A.

"A model focusing either on national or on international effects is likely to be vulnerable on theoretical terms (by reducing everything to internal factors or to considerations external to the system) and incomplete in operational terms... What we are suggesting, therefore, is that optimum specifications would, by necessity, include both internal and external variables. A mixed model of this sort is likely to yield greater pay-offs in the long run."

The second assumption is that if the concept of system can be used as a distinct method of analysis for foreign policy of states, then certain characteristics usually associated with it need to be postulated: 10

(a) the system to be investigated must be explicitly distinguished from its environment; (b) the internal elements of the system are explicitly stated; (c) the relationships between the system and its environment are to be explicitly stated; (d) where these relationships involve deductions, the canons of logical reasoning are employed; and assertions concerning relationships between the system and the real world are confirmed according to the canons of scientific method.

Since regular behaviour defines a system, it is legitimate to view the nation-state as a subsystem in an all encompassing international system, or a system composed of a network of subsystems, comprising an environment, a group of actors, and structures through which actors initiate actions to respond to challenges for preserving or modifying conditions in the environment and processes which sustain the flow of demands and the product of the system as a whole. They all occur continuously in a circular flow of demands on policy (inputs), policy processes and product of policy (outputs). The decision (outputs) feeds back into the system. As a result, the substance of inter-state relations becomes a flow of interactions. There is a continued circular flow of policy and action both within and between nations in a complex pattern. So, the relations are always established and disestablished by sequential occurrence of events. Since relations of nations, most of the time, find an ordinary level of operation in a kind of steady state of exchange and interaction, then it becomes easier to argue that changes in the state of relations between nations become the focus of analysis because of the dynamics of state's external behaviour.

It can, thus, be argued that a scientific comprehension of the external behaviour of states can be fruitfully made if one places the analysis on the level of nation-state defined as a sub-system and treats its external behaviour as the unit of analysis, precisely for two reasons. First, a comprehension of all states is to be based on an understanding of any one state through the use of a systems model which will enable the analyst to construct analytically the properties of action which is shared in common by all specific states. Secondly, the model becomes a fictional state whose characteristics are such as to permit the analyst to describe and explain about all real states regardless of their differentiation in the real world. Richard C. Snyder implicitly lends support to this line of thinking. While emphasis will always remain with the similarities of their behaviour rather than differences, on their continuities rather than discontinuities, it will help the analyst also to account for the significant differences.

Thirdly, it is further assumed that the most perplexing questions, of goals, motivations and purposes in national policy can be answered if the behaviour of officials of the states is treated as the unit of analysis. Here another problem crops up as to whether they pursue goals consciously or not. Although there is no consensus on this, it is generally viewed that they move towards outcome of which they have little knowledge, and over which they have less control but nevertheless do prefer and therefore select particular outcome and attempt to realise it by conscious formulation of strategies. Similarly, if it is asked why specific goals are preferred, one can answer it by assuming identical goals of all the national actors. But different conclusions can be arrived at if one investigates the processes by which national goals are selected, the internal and external factors that impinge on the processes, and institutional matrix from which they emanate. As a matter of fact, if the analyst intends to explain a nation's foreign policy he cannot settle for the mere postulation of these goals. He is compelled to go back a step and enquire into their genesis, and the processes by which they become the crucial variables. Another significant implication of this is that it is only within this particular framework that one can expect any useful application of the decision-making approach. It is true, the decision-making variables
should not be conceived as synonymous with the foreign policy behaviour itself. Its main merit is to relate the variable attributes of the decision-making units and processes to foreign policy outputs. 13

Fourthly, it is also assumed that the most intractable phenomenological issue is resolved. The phenomenologists contend that the individual or groups are not influenced by the objective forces of their milieu but by the fashion in which these forces are viewed, perceived and evaluated by them, however distorted such perceptions may be. So, if one embraces a phenomenological view of causation, then he is compelled to adopt a phenomenological model for explanatory purposes. It is precisely because the analyst's concern extends beyond the description of "what happens" to the realm of explanation and the omission of "cognitive and perceptual linkages" would be "ontologically disastrous". The analyst may observe correlation between all sorts of forces in the international system and the behaviour of nations but their causal relationship must remain "strictly deductive and hypothetical" in the absence of empirical investigation of

its causal chain which links the two. Since nation-state is seen as a group of individuals operating within an institutional framework, it makes perfect sense to focus on the phenomenal field of those individuals who allocate values for the state in the policy-making process.

The earliest in the field of international politics to recognize this was Snyder whose decision-making approach was based on the core premise that foreign policy choices would be fruitfully analysed from the decision-maker's perspective and his "definition of the situation". It received greater support after the publication of one book and an article by Kenneth E. Boulding entitled 'Image' and 'National Images and International System' in 1956 and 1959 respectively.° The initial stimulus was also provided by Harold and Margret Sprout with their distinction of the psychological and operational environment.° So, the earlier assumptions that foreign and defence policies could be best understood and formulated exclusively on the basis of unitary and rational actor model as manifested in the


works of Raymond A. Bauer in 1961 and Charles E. Osgood in 1959 were thrown overboard. Even Graham T. Allison in his study of the Cuban missile crisis within the framework of organizational model did not consider the cognitive process model but the potential value of it was clearly admitted by him in his conclusion, since no significant correlation between the bureaucratic role and the decision-making was revealed. This suggested at least some limitation to the core premise of the bureaucratic model: "Where you stand depends on where you sit". Similarly, Jhon D. Steinbruner's study of the proposed multilateral force (MLF) for NATO tested four alternative conceptions of decision-making: rational, adaptive rational, bargaining, and cognitive process models and reached the same conclusion. However, research made tremendous strides


17 He concludes that "the handling of multiple objectives and the response to the structural uncertainty required explanations at the level of the individual decision-maker and it was the cognitive process model which contd..."
after Alexander L. George's reconceptualization of the Operational Code which offered an approach regarding the role of belief systems in decision-making that spurred an impressive array of case studies in recent years, pioneered first by Ole R. Holsti, Michael I. Shapiro and G. Mathew Bonham and Robert Axelrod. Holsti argues that for some decisions a cognitive process perspective is fundamental and should be the starting point of the analysis. It shares an assumption which differentiates belief system and cognitive process from mere ideology and policy preference. Substantively belief system refers to a more or less integrated set of beliefs about man's physical and social environment. In case of political leaders, beliefs about history and the nature of politics may be especially

f.n.17 contd...

provided the best fit with the phenomena observed"; see John D. Steinbruner, "The Mind and the Milieu of Policy Makers: A Case History of the MLF" (Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 1968), pp. 538.

important. Cognitive processes refer to various activities associated with problem solving - perception, appraisal, interpretation and information-processing strategies for coping with ambiguity, decision-rules and the like. These cognitive activities assumed to be in interactive relationship with individual belief systems as well as with the environment.

Lastly, it is assumed that although the cognitive process model is central to the study of decision outputs other three alternative conceptions of decision-making like unitary rational model, organizational model and bureaucratic politics are also not without potency. So, the research on belief system should be embedded in a broader context and the problems of linking and interrelating theories and concepts that are oriented to the individual decision-maker and to the behaviour of dynamics of group and organization need to be addressed simultaneously taking into account variables at different levels of aggregation. Such is the rationale of the present model which will enable the analyst to perform the task of establishing the linkages in the various situational contexts of the decision-making.

Coming to the concepts employed in the model one finds no compelling concern for their explicit elaboration. Such major concepts like "system", "inputs", "decision-making", "outputs", "process", "environment", "structure", "pattern", "function" are cast in oft-beaten mould. They have been admirably conceptualized by David Easton and Gabriel A. Almond and others.  

In the foregoing, the analytical model is delineated containing some inter-related concepts and broad assumptions. But the main purpose of a model is to throw up some theoretical propositions about the behaviour of the decision-maker which is bound to be as diverse as the targets of his behaviour and the circumstances under which he makes his choice. So, the model should be provided with materials out of which such propositions can be fashioned. It is the political environment, with respect to which decisions are made, constitutes the material. As we know, political environment which lies outside the decision-making organization serves as the matrix from which internal and external stimuli emanate for the decision-maker. So any attempt at theorising decisions must include an effort to have some notion about the nature of stimuli and its levels.

of aggregations to which the decision-maker is exposed. It is a much explored idea that the processes comprising political environment is as crucial as those occurring in the mind of the decision-maker. To reconstruct the objective world from the perspective of the decision-maker the analyst must first, examine the world itself so that he can comprehend the dynamics and limits of the decision-maker's perspective. Even if the decision-maker serves as the organizing focus for enquiry, and the variables within the decision-making organization are crucial, it should not be forgotten that they vary depending upon the events outside it. Therefore, in the first place, a systematic segregation of stimuli at their various levels of aggregation is essential to identify and establish the major variable clusters affecting foreign policy choice. Again these major variable clusters need to be elaborated for all the inputs which each of them subsume. Because, the analyst must know how to proceed with the line of enquiry for a comparative analysis. So, what is most imperative is to suggest the relative strength of these major variable clusters under varying conditions, and to outline a method for comparing them. Added to this, the inputs subsumed under each major cluster is to be elaborated in detail for the analyst needs "if-then" proposition that will enable him

to process data in terms of the interactions presumed to take place within and among the major variable clusters.

Now, the major variable clusters can be segregated in the systemic aggregation continua. The systemic aggregation continua distinguishes between those that originate in the idiosyncracies of the decision-maker himself, those that arise out of the procedures and the institutions of the government, those that emanate outside the government but within the society, those that derive from circumstances external to the society in the regional subsystem and those that arise from situations external to the region but within the international system. In the model, they are termed as idiosyncratic, governmental, societal, regional sub-systemic and systemic variables.  

---

22 This is based on Rosenau's classification of the major cluster of variables constituting the main sources of foreign policy. For elaboration, see his article "The Study of Foreign Policy" in James N. Rosenau, Kenneth Thompson and Govin Boyd, eds., *World Politics: An Introduction* (New York, 1976), pp. 15-35. The regional sub-systemic variables which is added is based on Michael Brecher's model set out in his article, "The Subordinate State System of Southern Asia", *World Politics* (Princeton), vol. 15, no. 2, January 1963, pp. 213-35, where he indicates that comprehension of the global system cannot be achieved unless analysis proceeds at the regional sub-systemic level. Rosenau, claims that his categorization schema contained in this article is designed out of his pretheories and theories of foreign policy. But in this article he observed, "...all foreign policy contd...
Again the inputs subsumed under each of these major clusters are elaborated. 23

Secondly, it is observed that the process of interaction occur in specified locales and through concrete actors; namely in the agencies of government and through the actions and relationship of those officials charged with the formulation and conduct of foreign policy. It should be borne in mind that whether inputs emanate from the national system or the international system or idiosyncratic sources, they are converted into outputs - decision and action - only as they are experienced, evaluated and reconciled by

f.n. 22 contd....

analysts either explain the external behaviour of the societies in terms of five sets of variables or proceed in such a way that their explanations can be recast in terms of the five sets... the five sets are what we shall call the individual, role, governmental, societal and systemic variables", see his book The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy (New York, 1971), pp. 95-150. What made him to revise his earlier opinion to drop "role" variable in his later categorization schema in 1976 is quite intriguing. Because he was the first scholar to have tested the relative potency of role and individual variables, see his article, "Private Preferences and Political Responsibilities: The Relative Potency of Individual and Role Variables in the Behaviour of US Senators" in J. David Singer, ed., Quantitative International Politics (New York, 1968), pp. 17-50.

23 See my framework for analysis. It is a combination of James N. Rosenau's categorization schema with that of the Michael Brecher's with slight modification. some of their sub-variables are dropped as there was difficulty to establish them for lack of adequate data.
identifiable decision-makers. And this conversion of inputs occurs, interestingly, both within and among individual decision-makers. At the intra-individual level, the analyst must focus on the belief system and cognitive process that act as the filter through which policy-planners identify, gather, shift and evaluate information and alternative choices to reach a particular policy preference which leads to formal decision. At the interindividual level, the analyst must concentrate on the pulls and pressures of the organizational and the bureaucratic dynamics that operate between the decision and action or output. This will enable the analyst not only to comprehend the dynamics of decision-making of a particular state but also for a cross-country comparison.

Now, coming to the diagrammatic representation of the model, one finds that in the national system usually the top decision-makers along with lesser policy-makers take the decision. As outlined in this model, a, b, and c represent President, Prime Minister, and Foreign Minister. They, first of all, engage themselves in the broad intellectual and interactive task of diagnosis, search and analysis of the situations abroad to which they must respond and make a policy preference. The manner in which these policy-making tasks are performed is likely to establish the boundaries
within which decisions are made. For example, the definition of the situation, or the extent of search and analysis may eliminate certain policy options from considerations or may focus on others. They may have shared beliefs or intellectual differences. But in both cases, it is very saliently crucial even if at policy preference stage, other variables do influence. In the former case, the central belief systems of all the collective leaders predominate while in the latter case, the top decision-maker's belief system and cognitive style not only prevails, but he also bypasses the hierarchy. But it should be assumed that belief system and cognitive style do not unilaterally determine the individual's choice of action, as decisions may also be sensitive to other variables as outlined in the model. The influence of an actor's beliefs is more likely to be weighty in his policy preference, the option he prefers than in determining the option he finally chooses. Hence, it is essential and useful to regard the decision-maker's policy preference rather than his final choice of action as the dependent variable. But in the model, it is shown that the policy preference which results in decision is again subject to the pulls and pressures of

dynamics of the organizational and the bureaucratic politics which are likely to be operative between decision and action and what finally emerges is termed as the foreign policy action or behaviour of the state. It is important, in this connection, to recognize here the distinction between decision and action, because the literature on the bureaucratic politics tends to gloss over many potential sources of slippage between executive decisions and the implementation of policy in the form of foreign policy actions. 25

Coming to the methodology for constructing the belief systems and cognitive style of the decision-makers, it would be very useful and relevant to adopt the "Operational Code" (OC) approach of Alexander L. George who formulated ten questions, of which the first five concern "philosophical issues" while the rest five are most specifically oriented towards the instrumental or policy questions, having to do with goals-means relations. 26

In designing a model of this kind, no originality is claimed, as its basic concepts are formulated and


26 See my seventh chapter for detailed elaboration.
Operationalized and assumptions explored by scholars long back. Nor it originated as a reaction against deficiencies of earlier ones. The variables are simply incorporated into the model which are arrayed according to the levels of analysis. Such levels are usually associated with the levels of aggregation so that units at a lower level of analysis such as the behaviour of the state can be combined to form a higher level of analysis. Although the state and international system level of analysis are most common in the foreign policy analysis, it may be useful to consider the intermediate level of analysis such as the international region. This multi-level analysis, is its only merit and its theoretical pay-offs will be judged to the extent it throws up certain theoretical propositions when successfully applied to the analysis of the foreign policy of states.  

27 James N. Rosenau once remarked in 1972: "In the long run, if not in the short run as well, the course of international history seems likely to be shaped by the convergence of forces in which talents, aspirations and prospective of particular individuals are of relatively minor importance", see his book review in American Historical Review (Washington), vol. 77, no.5, December 1972, pp.1415-16. But in 1976 in his article, "The Study of Foreign Policy", cited earlier, he implicitly refutes this by admitting the fact that "intra-individual variable distorts the rational model of policy-making. This "intra-individual variable" is nothing but can be termed as the other name of belief system and cognitive style of the decision-maker.

Of late, in a seminal work, both James N. Rosenau and Ole R. Holsti have come together and recognized how the foreign policy perceptions, belief systems and contd...
c. The applicability of the model to Pakistan:

The analysis of foreign policy of Pakistan is to be based on this model which will incorporate Pakistani contents into its skeletal forms. So, it is an empirical challenge to relate the concepts and assumptions underlying the model to comprehend the dynamics of its external behaviour.

The state of Pakistan can be designated as a national sub-system in the subordinate system of the South Asia in an all encompassing international system. If regular behaviour defines a system, an analyst can well explore how the subsystem of Pakistan since 1947 is engaged in continuous interaction with other subordinate systems of the South Asia and the West Asia in the international system. So there will be no difficulty to delineate its manifest political boundary which is a prime requisite for the existence and operation of a system. It is within this

orientations of American leaders are central to the role played by the United States in the World. In the same vein, both of them have clearly admitted: "Thus reader will not find exhaustive discussions of the pressures and constraints within the international and domestic arenas nor of all the ways by which these make themselves felt or ignored in foreign policy process". See Ole R. Holsti and James N. Rosenau, American Leadership in World Affairs : Vietnam and the Breakdown of Consensus (Boston, 1984), Introduction, p. (XIV).
boundary, that it has been exposed to stimuli and in turn responded to challenges of events in the international system.

Like all systems, it has core elements. It has a group of actors identified as its strategic decision-makers, like Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Liaquat Ali Khan, Ghulam Mohammad, Ikander Ali Mirza, Mohammad Ayub Khan, and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. The analyst can trace their pattern of interaction with other actors in the international system through their manifold actions. It has a structure to perform certain functions which includes Parliament, and the Cabinet, and such decision-implementing agencies the Foreign and Defence Ministries and other related Ministries and Services.

Like all decision-makers, the Pakistani leadership was subjected to stimuli emanating from five major sources: systemic, regional systemic, societal, governmental and idiosyncratic. Before responding to any challenges of events unfolding within the boundary, they receive the stimuli from all these sources and get engaged in the intellectual task of diagnosis, search, analysis and policy preference, and reach a decision. At the policy preference stage their belief systems and cognitive style predominate and act as the prism through which policy preference leads
to decision. Between the decision and the output, the organizational interests and the bureaucratic bargaining of the Military Services, the Defence and the External Affairs Ministries act as the intervening variables, which shape the external behaviour of Pakistan. And there has been a continuous flow of demands on policy inputs, policy processes and product of policy (outputs). The relationship was always established and disestablished by a sequential occurrence of events that has been vibrating its international life since 1947.

As its outputs which constitute its external behaviour, are products of interactions among the inputs being filtered through the prism of the cognitive beliefs of its decision-makers and again subject to the vagaries of the organizational and the bureaucratic dynamics, the analytical challenge remains to empirically trace how its decision to join the Western alliance system by concluding a military security agreement with the United States in 1954 can be systematically explained through a model based on a systems approach as a distinct method of analysis of the foreign policy of a state.