CONCLUSIONS

The primary aim of this research work was to bring out all the facets of the foreign policy and to reveal the various types of influences which impinge upon the foreign policy decisionmakers. The international environment at any time is dynamic and anarchic, but it has become even more turbulent as it is witnessing such fundamental and drastic changes, which would have been unthought of a few years back. For example the collapse and dismemberment of U.S.S.R. and its satellites in Eastern Europe.

The world is witnessing unprecedented changes in the last two or three years, the entire global scenario is fluid, uncertain and unpredictable due to which the whole environment is beset with tensions. Every nation is trying to improve its strategic position by acquiring a more dominant role in the emerging new world order. As the situation is in a flux and has not settled down there may be certain observations in the thesis which have aged and may not have the significance they were given, but all the same they are still relevant.

The post Second World War period was an era which was characterised by bipolarity. Two dominant powers: United States and Soviet Union having a cluster of mute followers. The Cold War had heighted their adversial relationship where one was bound to react to the actions of the other, even in issues and situations which did not have any direct benefit for them. But the orientation of their foreign policies was primarily aimed at opposing the other. Besides the two superpowers and their ardent supporters a new group of newly independent developing countries emerged in the form of Non Aligned Nations, who did not want to get entangled in the (useless for them) power politics of the superpowers. They tried to maintain a balanced stance.

With the break-up of Soviet Union the bipolarity of the world order has broken down and as yet the scenerio for the future geopolitical situa-
tion is not clear or predictable. Although in the changing scenario the United States is trying to achieve and ensure a even more dominant and all pervasive role for itself having hegemonistic, imperialistic tone. Which is portrayed by its role of World Policeman having all the positive attributes of being the guardian of morality and justice in the entire globe.

The change in the world order and power politics came with the release of control on the Eastern Europe by the Soviets in mid 1989. President Gorbachev was trying to restructure his country into more economically viable entity, because of which he gave up its commitment in Eastern Europe, but lost control of events which ultimately led to its collapse. The Gulf War was the outcome of the changed scenario which would not have been possible in the earlier bipolar world. Soviet Union would not have allowed the Western nations led by America to pass sanctions in the United Nations against Iraq. America would not have deployed force as it could have created a cascading effect and certainly America did not want an direct confrontation with the Soviets. The Gulf war was a major post-cold war violence which signifies the end of the old era and the beginning of an era which well be of American hegemony over the world.

The present day world scenario is no longer gripped in a Super Power rivalry but is undergoing unprecedented changes unthought of in the last four and a half decade. Like always when the world order changes significantly some changes in the institutions of foreign affairs are bound to take place, though what exactly they would be is difficult to predict. In such changing times it becomes difficult for the policymakers to fit their conceptual perceptions into the new reality. The change in concepts would follow the practical reality and ultimately would mesh into the new situation comprehensively.

A interesting point to note is that this present world order has not emerged out of a bloody war but its roots lie in economic inefficiency of the former Socialist nations. These former Socialist states are now realising that by just throwing away the Communist ideology and adopting the new ideology of open - market economic forces would not yield results overnight. The process of change is gradual, slow and painful, but ultimately would bear fruits.

In the last decade or so economic forces have come to play a more
dominant role in the political scenario than in the past. This is primarily due to various technological inventions which have fostered the growth of multinational corporations and international institutions. These international and transnational organizations are increasing the interdependence of states on one another and evolving a cosmopolitan environment which is beginning to affect the behaviour of states, big or small, weak or powerful in an observable manner. Obviously the degree of interdependence would vary from state to state, but no state can remain untouched by it.

The present scenario which is evolving can be described as multilevel interdependence. Here no single hierarchy explains the multiple structure of world politics. We could best analyse the distribution of power in three layers. The first layer comprises of the military power (traditional basis of power). Second, is the economic layer and the third, comprising of transnational interdependence. Presently the top layer is basically unipolar, for there is no real challenger of United States in that field. The middle layer is tripolar comprising of United States, Japan and European Community (EC). And the bottom layer of international and transnational interdependence shows a diffusion of power. Power is becoming multifaceted as military power is a poor predictor of outcomes in the economic and transnational layers of current world politics. The present multidimensional structure of power is more complex as states are more permeable and only one dimension does not portray a correct picture.

The present international economy is tripolar as it revolves around the three economic giants - America, Japan and EC. Although at the end of the Second World War both Europe and Japan were totally shattered and had to be given massive economic aid to revive their war torn economies. Today both Japan and EC along with United States are contenders to the position of top economic power.

The contemporary world is witnessing the emergence of some new powers who have the potential of becoming major actors in the international scene. They are India, Brazil and Nigeria. All three developing nations beset with problems of development but still going ahead.

The emerging actors are making their influence felt in the international arena though still of a limited type, which could be seen by the
the changed perception of United Nations. The current Secretary General is revamping the U.N. organisation, closing the defunct organs and agencies and providing a more comprehensive role for it. Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali is proposing that there should be ten permanent members in the Security Council. These should include the five older ones plus Japan, Germany, India, Brazil and Nigeria. This reflects the current international perception of power. In case of Germany and Japan it is the recognition of the status quo while the other three have the potential of becoming world powers.

Due to rapid development in communication and transportation technologies states can no longer remain isolated. They are more permeable to various influence which are easily witnessed by the transnational activities of guerilla and terrorist groups, movement of drugs etc. in the negative way and the activities of social and environmental groups like Green Peace, Red Cross, and multinational corporations in the positive direction.

Predictions of the dynamic anarchic world are at all times difficult. But the difficulty has been greatly compounded in the present fluid global environment due to the following reasons - first, politics has a habit of taking unpredictable turns. Second, only rarely does a single factor determine the way how politics will work out. Even the best propositions are set in terms of conditions and probabilities.

Third, when actors are seeking advantage over others, generalisations may be particularly short-lived as each is free to use any new knowledge to estimate how others will behave and outwit them.

Fourth, unless national behaviour and international outcomes are entirely determined by the external environment, there is bound to be significant room for choice for leaders and states.

Fifth, the current world situation is unprecedented. World scenario has rarely been altered without a major war so drastically. In fact, looking at the condition and behaviour of Russia, one could infer that it has just lost a war. The enormous domestic failure is the equivalent of a major military defeat. But this is a change which was not brought about by another state. The future also remains unprecedented while Russia is economically and politically weak there is no visible contender to the remaining superpower. And whether C.I.S. would remain united or not is a debatable issue.
Sixth, when elements are tightly interconnected, as they are in international politics, changes in one part of the system produce ramifications in others. Thus international politics is characterized by unintended consequences, interaction effects, and patterns that cannot be understood even by breaking the system into its component parts. With complex interaction and feedback, not only can small causes have large effects, but prediction is inherently problematic as the multiple ways through which the system responds to a stimulus are difficult to trace even after the fact, let alone predict ahead of time.

Seventh, even if we knew what generalisations held in the past, and even if they were not sensitive to details and idiosyncrasies this knowledge would not and could not provide a sure guide for the future, if the generalisations themselves are no longer valid. In some cases generalisations will no longer hold even though the basic laws on which they were based, are still valid. Leaders will continue to be guided primarily by considerations of national security, but their behaviour will be different if there are changes in the problems they face and the solutions they see. It probably is still true that states are more likely to pushed into war by the expectation that they will suffer grave losses unless they fight, than they are pulled into war by the attraction of opportunity and expected gains. But this law will work itself differently if there are changes in the magnitude and kinds of threats that states confront.

Finally, perception like always will play a significant part on how we predict the world. No two individual would view the world exactly in the same manner thus the contemporary global scenerio which is very fluid, uncertain and unpredictable is bound to alter certain fundamental relationships and institutions. And it is only after the world has once again settled down that the complete picture would emerge.