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U.S. FOREIGN POLICY: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The foreign policy of a state is what it actually does in its relations with other states. Whatever else may be said about American foreign policy making since the end of the Second World War, there can be no doubt that tremendous academic attention has been focused on it. For more than forty year, the policy-making process has attracted a seemingly endless flow of studies. Many of them examining at a micro-level the broad range of relevant political and governmental institutions and processes. Some providing detail case studies of particular decisions or crises and a relative handful setting forth conceptual frame working or theories for the more illuminating study of the phenomena.¹

Foreign Policy is more than history and the events, personalities and decisions that comprise it. The modern era, brought a new complexity to the conduct of foreign affairs. American foreign relations are determined through a series of complex policy making decisions. Foreign policy became a melange of agencies, institutions, and specialties. Perhaps the most important dimension of American foreign policy which brought a whole new groups of actors and institutions into the foreign policy field--scientists, academicians, journalists and of course, policy research institution or think tanks.²

Of many influence on the US foreign policy formulation, the role of think tanks is among the most important and highly appreciated. A distinctively American phenomenon, think-tanks affect American foreign policy makers in five distinct ways: by generating original ideas and options


for policy, by supplying a ready pool of experts for employment in government; by offering venues for high level discussions; by educating US citizens about the world; and by supplying official efforts to mediate and resolve conflicts.³

Their greater impact is in generating ‘new thinking’ so that US decision-makers better perceive and effectively respond to various issues and challenges. Original insights can alter conceptions of the US national interest, influence the ranking of priorities, provide road maps for action, mobilize political and bureaucratic conditions, and shape the design of lasting institutions. It is not easy, however, to grab the attention of busy policy makers already immersed in information. To do so, think-tanks need to exploit multiple channels and marketing strategies publishing articles, books, and occasional papers, appearing regularly on television, op-ed pages and newspapers interviews. Congressional hearings provide another opportunity to influence policy choices.⁴

The US occupies a unique position in world affairs. Never in history has a country dominated the international scene to the extent that the US does today. No matter what the indicator- military power, economic strength, political influence, technological powers, cultural model- the US is in a league of its own. It is the only nation on earth able to project power in every part of the world and since 1990, it has been involved in resolving conflicts on every continent. As Secretary of state Madeleine Albright, stated in 1996, to the consternation of some diplomats in Washington, “the US is the indispensable nation whose work never stops”.⁵


⁵ Fraser Cameron, US Foreign Policy After the Cold War: Global Hegemon or Reluctant Sheriff? (New York: Routledge, 2002), p xv.
Being global leader, the United States of America is concerned about the issues like world democracy, eradication of world poverty, global warming and health issues (HIV). However, proliferation of weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), nuclear technology in the hand of rough states and issue of Terrorism are top priorities on the US foreign policy agenda. In a world shadowed by the threat of nuclear holocaust, continually plagued by limited conflicts around the world and the attacks on the world Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 proved that we live in truly interconnected global era. The Watchwords of all these events are speed, communication networks, interdependency and risk.

Although there is no significant threat to the US (apart from terrorism) it has had to confront with a number of difficult issues in the post-Cold War World. How is the US to relate to a world that is no longer bipolar, but increasingly complex? How is the US to meet the new security threats, including terrorism? How does it deal with failed states? Under what circumstances should it intervene overseas? When should it act alone, and when with allies? How does it deal with the rapid pace of globalisation.

Understanding the decision-making process in the U.S. foreign policy depends first on knowing that the policy making process begins with recognition that an issue is worthy of attention from political leadership. This process of issue recognition potentially involves the direct collection of information by governmental sources along with the impact of information from and other Lobbying efforts by concerned interest groups, both domestic and international. Once an issue is elevated to a position on the foreign policy agenda that issue is subject to interpretation by the bureaucracy, the Congress, and the President and members of his staff. Based on these varying interpretations of the issue, policy makers, interact, each attempting convince the other participants of the validity of their interpretation of the problem presented by the issue and the most
appropriate solution for the United States to adopt in addressing that issue. In formulating their arguments, decision makers are often well aware of the desire of the American public and relevant interest groups both domestic and foreign. As a matter of practice, participants in the policy making process tend to be more responsive to the concerns of domestic interest groups, particularly those interest groups with whom they interact most frequently. Once some form of consensus - even a marginal consensus - is achieved, then the administration proceeds to formulate and implement an agreed upon policy to address the issue in question. Although policy implementation is usually assigned to a lead agency, in practice many departments and agencies of the U.S. government co-ordinate their efforts to implement a policy.\textsuperscript{7}

The conduct of foreign affairs is divided into formulation and execution of policies. Since the emergence of the national states, these two branches have been recognised and institutionalised by all sovereign nations. American foreign policy is not created in a vacuum as some sort of indivisible whole with a single grand design. Rather, mixing foreign policy is a prolonged process involving many actors and comprising dozens of individual policies towards different countries regions, and functional problems. The complex process of determining foreign policy makes it difficult to decide who should be credited with initiating or altering any particular foreign policy.

In flow charts and diagrams outlining the foreign policy-making process, the role and responsibilities of the Executive, Congress, the National Security Council, the Pentagon, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency and other intelligence gathering agencies are clearly defined. However, the role and function of think tanks in the foreign policy-

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p. XVI.

making process has largely been ignored. The George W. Bush administration drew heavily on people working in the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, and other Pro-republic think-tanks when it took office in January 2001. Similarly many people who had worked in the Clinton administration were hired by think-tanks e.g. James Steinberg went to head the foreign policy programme at Brooking.

The relationship between political leaders and those who advise them is critically important to the study of governmental decision-making. By providing their expertise to members of Congress, the Executive and the bureaucracy, policy advisors play a vital role in formulating and injecting ideas into the policy making process. While policy makers in the United States continue to solicit the advice of experts in Universities, interest groups, professional and business associations, corporations, law firms and consulting agencies, they are relying increasingly on scholars from think tanks or policy research institutions to identify, develop, shape and at times implement policy ideas.8

In this increasingly complex, interdependent, and information rich world, governments and individual policy makers face the common problem of bringing experts knowledge to bear in governmental decision-making policy makers need basic information about the world and the societies they govern, how current policies are working possible alternates, and their likely costs and consequences.9

For policy makers in many countries it is not a lack of information that politicians and government officials are confronted with but an avalanche of information and paper. Indeed, policy-makers are frequently beseiged by more information than they can possibly use: complaints from constituents, reports from international agencies or civil society

---

organisations, advice from bureaucrats, position papers from lobbyists and interest groups, and exposes of the problems of current government programmes in the popular or elite media. The problem is that this information can be unsystematic, unreliable, and/or tainted by the interests of those who are disseminating it. Some information may be so technical that generalist policy-makers can not understand it or use it. Some information may be politically, financially, or administratively impractical, or contrary to the interests of the policy maker? Who must make decision based on information that they often feel is less than adequate. Other information may not be useful because it differs too radically from the world view or ideology of those receiving it. In developing and transitional countries, the basic data needs to make informed decisions often does not exist and must be collect and analysed and put into a form that is usable by parliamentarians and bureaucrats.¹⁰

In politics, information no longer translates into power unless it is in the right form at the right time. Governments and policy-makers are often moved to seize the moment because the right social and political forces are in alignment or because a crisis compels them to take action. In either case, they often move quickly and make decisions based on available information, which does not always lead to the most informed policy. In short, policy makers and others interested in the policy-making process require information that is timely, understandable, reliable, accessible, and useful.¹¹

There are many potential sources for this information, including, government agencies, university, based scholars, research centers, non profit consulting firms, and international agencies. But in countries around the world, politicians and bureaucrats alike have increasingly turned to a

---


specialised group of institutions to serve their needs. Independent public policy research and analysis organisations commonly known as ‘think tanks’ have filled policy-makers insatiable need for information and systematic analysis that is policy relevant.\textsuperscript{12}

Think-tanks may be defined as independent, non-interest based, non-profit organisation that produce and principally rely on expertise and ideas to obtain support and to influence the policy making process. The term ‘think-tanks’ was employed originally in the United states during World War II to refer to a secure room or environment where defence scientists and military planners could meet to discuss strategy.\textsuperscript{13} UNDP defines think-tanks as organisation engaged on a regular basis in research and advocacy on any matter related to policy. They are the bridge between knowledge and power in modern democracies.\textsuperscript{14}

These public policy research organisations had first appeared in the U.S and Europe at the turn of 20\textsuperscript{th} century when organisations such as the Brooking Institute of World Economics (1914), the Royal Institute for International Affairs (1920) were established. After World War II, the term was applied to contract researchers, such as RAND co-operation that did a mixture of deep thinking and programme evaluating for the military. The use of the term expanded in the 1960s to describe other group of experts who formulated various policy recommendations, including some quasi-academic research institutes concerned with the study of the international relations and strategic question.\textsuperscript{15} By 1970s, the term think-tanks was applied to institutions focusing not only on foreign policy and defence strategy, but also on current political, economic, and social issues’. At the

\textsuperscript{12} James McGann and Kent Weaver, \textit{ed}, \textit{n. 10}, pp. 2-3.
\textsuperscript{15} James Smith, \textit{n. 13}, pp. 13-14.
beginning of the 21st century, more than 1,500 think-tanks dot the American intellectual landscape. They are a heterogeneous lot, varying in scope, funding, mandate and location.  

The term ‘think tanks’ was employed originally in the United States during World War II to refer to a secure room or environment where defence scientists and military planners could meet to discuss strategy. This rather narrow usage of the term has since been expanded to describe over 2000 US based organisations that are engaged in policy analysis and approximately 2,500 other similar institutions worldwide.  

But why did such a massive proliferation of the think tanks take place following World War II? More specifically, why did so many think tanks specialising in foreign policy emerge? A number of explanations are worth exploring. First, as a result of casting aside its isolationist shell to assume the global responsibilities of a hegemonic power after World War II, the United States may have had to rely increasingly on policy analyst for advice on how to conduct its foreign relations. Moreover, as the American bureaucracy significantly expanded after the war, in response to growing domestic and foreign concern, so too did the opportunities for policy experts to share their insights to with government officials. According to Dennis Bark, a senior fellow and co-coordinator of the National Security Affairs Programme at the Hoover Institution, the combinations of these factors permitted such think tanks as the RAND Corporation, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to have ‘an enormous impact on US foreign policy’ during this period.  

The considerable access these and other think tanks had to policymakers during the first half of the twentieth century may very well have inspired the creation of the research institutions determined to leave their mark

---

16. Richard Hass, n. 3.  
17. James Smith, n. 13  
18. Abelson, n. 4, p50-51, ref)
on US foreign policy. However, since many of the most prominent foreign policy advisers to presidents following World War II, such as George Kennan, Dean Acheson, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew, Brezeninski, McGeorge Bundy, and Dean Rusk, to name a few, gained national prominence while they were employed in universities or in the foreign services, it is difficult to argue that their success alone was the sole motivating factor for individuals to create dozens of think tanks in the post war era.\textsuperscript{19}

The impact of anti war and civil rights movements in awakening the public conscience to political and social turmoil at home and abroad may have also contributed to the proliferations of think tanks. Not unlike interest group mobilising popular support against the war, may so called ‘liberal think tanks’ though no means to limited to, the institutes for policy studies, were created to provide scholars with an opportunity to challenge many of the underlying motivations of Americans domestic and foreign policy.\textsuperscript{20}

Similarly, during the 1960s and early 1970s, as several conservative academics were becoming increasingly disillusioned with what they considered to be a growing liberal bias among the faculty at American universities, an increasing demand for autonomous research institutions emerged. Dr. Thomas Henriksen, Associate Director of the Hoover Institution, maintains that think tanks such as the Institute for Contemporary Studies (1972), the Heritage Foundations (1973), and the Cato Institutes (1977) were founded to allow conservative academics to pursue their research institutes in a more congenial environment.\textsuperscript{21}

Generous corporate financing and tax-exemptions for non-profit organisations also appears to have provided an impetus for policy entrepreneurs, political leaders and aspiring office holders to create their own think tanks. By establishing private think tanks as non-profit organisations and employing sophisticated direct mailing techniques, founders of policy research

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid, pp50-51
\item \textsuperscript{20} Ibid, pp.50-51
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ibid, pp 50-51
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
institutions could, with the assistance of prominent political leaders, encourage corporations, philanthropic foundations and private citizens to contribute thousands of dollars to support and advance particular ideological and political perspectives on domestic and foreign policy issues. Contributing to the coffers of think tanks could also, according to some fun raising letters, provide corporate and private citizens with increasing access to decision-makers.\(^\text{22}\)

In additions to various tax loopholes and the growing desire of policy experts to peruse their research in a more hospitable environment, the proliferations of think tanks can also be attributed to the declining role of political parties in the United States. As Kent Weaver of the Brooking Institutes point out:

Weak and relatively non-ideological parties have enhanced think tanks role in several ways. The most important effect of the US party system is that parties have not themselves taken a major role in policy research arms of their own. Think tanks have helped fill this void.\(^\text{23}\)

Unlike Germany or else, where political parties have created their own political foundations to conduct policy research, in the United States, decision-makers in the White House and on Capitol Hill do not draw on the expertise of a party-based foundation, but actively solicit policy advice from multiple sources. The absences of party research institutions and the decline in importance of political parties in the United States, combined with a highly decentralised political system, have provided think tanks with considerable opportunities to market their ideas. Moreover, the willingness of the civil service to rely on contract research institutions to advise policy-makers on issues ranging from the economic implications of deregulating the airline industry to the utility or futility of developing and deploying a space–based defence system have also enable think tanks offering specialising expertise to fill an important void in the policy making community.\(^\text{24}\)

\(^{22}\) Ibid, pp. 50-51
\(^{23}\) Ibid, pp. 50-51
\(^{24}\) Ibid, pp. 50-51
In the early 1900s, the major industrialists set up philanthropic foundations to protect their money from taxation and to craft their legacy for generations to come. Later on, these magnates used their foundation to finance research institutions to play a role in the debates over policy.\footnote{Vijay Prashad, “The Think Tanks war Machine”, \textit{Frontline}, May 21, 2004, p. 64.}

Given the extensive ties between think tanks and government departments and agencies, as well as the frequency with which their members are appointed to higher level government positions, one cannot afford to disagree their growing involvement in the policy-making process. Through publishing brief and full length studies on a wide range of policy issues inviting decision-makers to conferences and seminars, providing commentaries on network newscasts, establishing liaison offices to develop and maintain contact with members of Congress and the Executive, serving on various Presidential boards, commissions, election task forces and transition teams and giving testimony before congressional committees and subcommittees, think-tanks have become permanent fixtures in the policy formation process.\footnote{Donald E. Abelson, \textit{n. 4}, p. 2.} Though not generally considered to be part of the formal structure of the American government\footnote{James A. Smith, \textit{n. 13}, p. 62.} for decades think tanks have managed to operate effectively within its parameters.\footnote{Donald E. Abelson, \textit{n. 4}, p. 65.}

By the mid 1990s, there was little question as to which think-tanks decision-makers turned to for advice. On domestic policy, the Brooking Institution had few rivals. On questions of foreign policy, members of the Council on Foreign Relations the Carnegie Endowments for International Peace and the Hoover Institution were frequently consulted. Yet by the early 1970s, this elite group of think tank could no longer monopolize the policy research community. As dozens of research institutions emerged in and around Washington in the decades following world Wart II the composition of the policy-making community began to change. Determined to influence
a wide range of economic, social and political issues, a new generation of think-tanks sought to be more actively involved in the policy-making process.²⁹

The increasing involvement of think tanks in the policy-making process requires scholars to re-evaluate various models and theories developed to explain how leaders make policy decisions. The black box of decision-making continues to conceal the inner working of the governmental process, however, a closer look at the behaviour of think-tanks will allow to peer a little further inside. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to analyse how and to what extent think-tanks have become involved in the political arena in America and to highlight the various governmental and non-governmental channels they rely on to participate in the policy making process. By analysing so, a more comprehensive understanding of the domestic sources of public policy would be possible. Further this study also deals with the key issue of foreign policy strategy i.e., what the U.S. national interest is and which policies serve it best.

FOREIGN POLICY: A THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

Foreign policy refers to a consistent course of action followed by one nation to deal with another nation or region, or international issues. A country’s foreign policy is usually based on values (such as democracy, rule of law), interests (such as defence of or expansion of territory), and may reflect broad national objectives or be a very specific response to a particular situation. A country can achieve its foreign policy goals by employing a variety of instruments ranging from political, diplomatic, and military to economic, social, and cultural. Foreign policy is often influenced by many different variables; including a country’s historical ties to other nations its culture, type of government, size, geographic location, economic strength, and military power. A country’s foreign policy is usually aimed at

²⁹. Ibid
preserving or promoting its economic and political interests abroad and its position in the world.\textsuperscript{30}

It is one of the truisms of Political Science that every state has a foreign policy. Each sovereign political unit can not escape having some kind of relations with them. These relations should be ordered and governed by some more or less national plan. Therefore, foreign affairs always one of the major fields of government actions, has grown in importance under the conditions of modern technology. So that today it is the principal concern of many states and is of primary significance to all. It is also because:\textsuperscript{31}

- it seeks to protect the territorial integrity of the country and protect the interest of its citizens, both within and outside the country.
- the objective of foreign policy is maintenance of link with other members of international community and adoption of policy of conflict or co-operation towards them with a view to promote its own interest.
- the primary interest of each state is self preservation, security and well being of its citizens.
- the foreign policy aims at enhancement of the influence of the state either by expanding its area of influence or reducing that of other states to the position of dependency.

The study of foreign policy is not an easy task. And this task has been rendered even more difficult by the new perspective which has been provided by the behaviouralist in recent years. This perspective has given rise to the fundamental question as to what should be the focus of our inquiry in the study of foreign policy. Traditionally one of the approaches which dominated the studying foreign policy has been historical or descriptive. This approach\textsuperscript{26} is based upon the idea that we should study

\textsuperscript{30} Frasser Cameron, \textit{n. 5}, p. xvi.
\textsuperscript{31} M. Kumar, \textit{Approaches, Theoretical Aspect of International Politics}, (Agra: Shivalal Agarwala & company), pp.323-329
diplomacy with as much accuracy as possible. Those following this approach are not interested in formulating general laws or constructing special scheme of international behaviour. They are reluctant to deal with contemporary events. The main weakness of this approach is that it underestimates the relationship between political power and interests of foreign policy. The second traditional approach to the study of foreign policy has been ideological. It insists that the various general ideologies should be applied to an understanding of the international community.  

The behaviourists view both these approaches as inadequate. They proceed with the assumption that nations have a complex pattern of interest which provides a general framework for the policy makers to formulate and implement their policies. Then the various patterns of interests have to be classified in accordance with their comparative significance. One of the most important tasks of the policy makers is to establish a hierarchy of interests and to relate them to the interests of other nations or of the whole world community. The policy-makers are also expected to develop a community of interests. Thus the behaviourists insist on an analytical approach which emphasizes that we should be interested more in the study of foreign policy processes rather than in that of the actual narration of foreign policies registered in the past. Thus the focus of the analytical approach is on those factors which determine the nature of the international environment.

It is this approach which has set some writers to examining the question of the frontier of foreign policy. These writers have brought some fresh insights into our study of foreign policy. They insist on going beyond the apparent content of foreign policy and reach the indirect factors

influencing foreign policy decisions and to approach the analysis of foreign policy behaviour in a scientific manner. By being scientific is meant striving for objectivity and precision and for valid generalizations. James Rosenace is for most among those who have argued for recognizing the need for bringing about scientific precision in our study of foreign policy.

Foreign policy is conceived as a social and political process. It is on-going affairs, not one that may be seized and studied in all its ramifications at a particular moment in time. Dynamism is the Keynote of all international relationship, and our analysis should be so oriented as to take account of unceasing evolution and change. Only by devising techniques that encompass the notion of process can we develop a picture of foreign policy that is at all relevant to reality. We can list the steps of the process as follows:

- the establishment of the criteria;
- the determination of the relevant variables in the situation;
- the measurement of the variables by criteria;
- the selection of a goal;
- the elaboration of a strategy to reach the goal;
- the decision to act;
- the action itself;
- the evaluation of the results of the action in terms of the original criteria.

The makers of foreign policy act in accordance with the instruction of the community which they represent and on whose behalf they speak and act. The policy makers are an essential component of the process of foreign policy. In shaping the foreign policy on behalf of the community, they have to operate at two levels with the community which gives them instructions and supplies the resources with which to carry out their functions, and with

34. Mehendra Kumar, n.31, pp. 323-329
other states whose behaviour the policy makers try to change or regulate. George Modelski calls the flow of actions from the community towards the policy makers the "input" and the actions of the policy makers towards other nations the "output". Thus the task of policy makers is to transform inputs into outputs.\textsuperscript{36}

Foreign policy cannot exist in a vacuum. It can function only in the context of interest, and objectives. State action in pursuit of an objective may assume any of a great variety of forms. Modern technology has added greatly to the supply of foreign policy techniques available to the statesman. Despite their increased number, however, they all fall into one of the four traditional categories of tool and techniques, the four channels of state action. These four are: Political action, through the mechanism of diplomatic representation; economic action, through the productive and destructive system of the state; psychological action, through the techniques of mass persuasion, Military action: through armed forces. From among these four types a statesman chooses in such combination as seems to him to be best suited to the particular purpose he has in mind.\textsuperscript{37}

Although the formulation of a foreign policy may be caused by a variety of elements, policy maker can attempt to proceed without keeping in mind some basic factors that impose limitations upon his planning and to a considerable extent, predetermine his course of action. These factors are partly measurable in scientific terms, partly imponderables full of uncertainty.

Academics have sought to describe and explain US foreign policy through a variety of factors. Some of these factors involve the nature of the world faced by the United States as it formulates policy. Other factors relate to physical and fiscal (available dollars) capacities of the United States to

\textsuperscript{36} See F. Jones, \textit{Analysis Foreign Policy}, (London, 1970).
develop and implement policy on a regional or global scale. Further sources of US foreign policy relate to the norms, historical experience, ideological preferences, and perceptual biases of US policymakers and the US public (or at least the informed and politically active Sectors of the US public). The mix and relative power of the interest groups seeking to influence US policy on any given issue represent yet another important determinant of U.S. foreign policy. Finally, US foreign policy is in some way a product of the decision-making process itself.38

The analysis of U.S. foreign policy has changed over time. Initially, analyses resembled diplomatic history in which specific policy events were described in great detail but largely devoid of overall theoretical grounding. By 1960s, analysts increasingly attempted to identify patterns and regularities in factors influencing policy formulation. The eventual emergence of a more structured analysis of U.S. foreign policy owes a great debt to James Rosenau and his development of a pre-theory of foreign policy.39 This multicausal pre-theory postulated that American foreign policy, like any other country’s foreign policy, was a product of five general factors. The first of these factors is the nature of the international system. Included in this factor are geographic realities, the basic configuration of power in the international system, the level and dispersion of technological capabilities among the states and non-state actors in that system. The second factor identified is the nature of U.S. society. It includes the value system driving the society, the relative variety of interest groups in U.S. society at a given point in time, and the economic condition of the United States. The nature of the U.S. governmental system represents the third influence on U.S. foreign policy development. This factor includes the influence of basic Executive Legislative relations in the United States, as well as the capacities of the U.S. bureaucracy, both civilian and military. Role factors, as fourth

38. Mahendra Kumar, n. 31, p. 323.
factors, concern the influence of existing norms of behaviour for U.S. leaders as well as precedents of proper behaviour established by the action of past U.S. leaders. These norms and behavioural precedents established by past US leadership to some degree establish the proper role and relationship of the various governmental actors involved in the policy process. Finally, Rosenau proposed that the personality (including the personal preferences and perceptual biases) of the specific US decision makers, such as the President and his key advisors, could shape US foreign policy responses. These are called idiosyncratic factors.

Various contemporary analysts of US foreign policy including Kegley and Wittkopf, Rosati, Hastedt and Snow and Brown – either explicitly or implicitly apply Rosenau’s framework as they provide detailed analyses in their texts of the actors and processes involved in the formulation policy. Although these and other texts on the formulation of U.S. foreign policy differ to some degree in how they address the impact of systemic, societal, governmental, role, and idiosyncratic factors, they all recognize the importance of these five categorical factors in shaping policy.  

Therefore, in approaching American foreign policy, there over a dozen different categories of data on which enquiry should be based. Each of them has some relevance to the foreign policy the United States is conducting. Each has a place in the model of American foreign policy process. Each, therefore, forms part of the American foreign policy. The list that follows may includes 13 separate components.

1) The national interest of the United States as tradition and concept.
2) Specific formulations of the national interest.
3) The historical background of American foreign policy.

---

4) The mechanism and procedures for making and executing American policy.

5) The international milieu in which United States is acting.

6) The policies of other states to which the United States must react.

7) The capabilities of the United States, general and specific.

8) The general international action pattern of the United States.

9) The specific objectives sought by the United States.

10) The courses of action taken by the United States to attain its objectives.

11) The evaluation of the policies of the United States.

12) The unresolved issue remaining in American foreign policy.

13) The probable future course of American foreign policy.

FOREIGN POLICY POLITICS:

Foreign policy politics is the “process of choice”, the making of foreign policy through the political institutions and aimed at societal influences of the American Political System.\(^\text{41}\)

In addition to the executive and legislative branches that remain principal initiator of American foreign policy, there are now more relevant players, more issues, and more pressures. Single issue interest groups have proliferated, professionalised and now regularly promote their policy goals within the legislative and executive arenas. The explosion of group activity has been particularly evident in the foreign policy realm, which had been relatively free of strong, broad-based group pressures. Add to these multiple and increasingly powerful organizations a much larger pool of academic and policy experts in foreign and military affairs who go in and out of government and who also represent many international interests. Today most multinational companies and even foreign government hire Americans with legislative and executive experience and “contacts” to represent them.

on pending issues in which they have an interest. Foreign policy has become more people's business, debated and conducted for the most part by more people with substantive training and experience in foreign affairs from both the public and private sectors.43

President and Congress:

The US system of government is characterized by a strongly functioning separation of powers. The constitution states that power is shared between the presidency and a bicameral congress plus a Supreme Court. The constitution of the United States did not expressly delegate authority for the conduct of foreign affairs to any specified agency. However, the President is the most important actor in the foreign policy decision making process. The famous inscription on President Truman's desk "The Buck stops here". Remain true today.44 If the Executive branch of the government speaks with several voices on foreign affairs, the problem becomes still more complicated when congress gets involved. All the Presidents have needed to use congress to ratify their foreign policies. Therefore, executive and legislative branches each play important roles that are different but that often overlap.45

One of the oldest conflicts in the American system of government is that between congress and the President over the right to formulate and implement foreign policy. Is the President solely responsible for the conduct of external relations? Is the Congress an equal partner? Or does Congress have the right to shape U.S. policy by enacting legislation which prescribe a President's flexibility?46

42 Christopher Herrick and B McRae, n 7, p. 7
44 Stephen J Wayne, "The Multiple influences on U.S. Foreign Policy-making", International Information Programme, Electronic Journal of US Department of States
45 Frasser Camron, n 5, p 38 s
46 John G. Tower, Congress Vs the President: " The Formulation and Implementation of American Foreign Policy", Foreign Affairs, Winter, 1981/2,
When people think of foreign policy-making in the United States, they usually think of the President. After all, President has been the chief architects and implementer of American foreign policy since the beginning of the Republic. The framers of the Constitution were mindful of the advantages that the Presidency brought to this endeavour: a hierarchical institution with a single head, the one institution that would be in continuous tenure, and the one that could act with greatest “energy, dispatch, and responsibility, “to quote James Wilson, one of the delegates at the Constitutional convention.  

Robert Dahl wrote in 1950 that “perhaps most important fact about Congress and its role in foreign policy therefore, is that it rarely provides the initiatives”.  

But the framers also were fearful of arbitrary and irresponsible actions by a chief executive. To reduce the likelihood that a President might engaged in activities that would be harmful to the national interest, the Constitution imposed checks on a range of executive powers, particularly those of war and peace. Treaties were subject to Senate ratification by a two-third vote, while executive appointments, including those of ambassadors, required concurrence by a majority of the Senate. Also vested in Congress was the authority to regulate foreign Commerce, declare war; raise, maintain, and make rules for a standing army and navy; call up the militia, and appropriate money for the operations of government and conduct of foreign policy. So, these are five specific powers related to foreign policies are given to Congress in the American constitution. These are:

- Congress is given the power to regulate trade.
- The Senate must pass a declaration of war by a 2/3 majority.
The Senate must give “advice and consent” to the President’s cabinet including all political appointees ambassadors and senior military appointments by a simple majority.

The Senate must pass all treaties negotiated by the President by 2/3 majority.

Congress must also approve or “appropriate”

Table 1.1 Principal Foreign Policy Provisions of the Constitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power granted to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>War power</strong></td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commander in chief of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>armed forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treaties</strong></td>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratification of treaties, by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two-thirds majority (Senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments</strong></td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominate high-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign commerce</strong></td>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit power “to regulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foreign commerce”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General powers</strong></td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive power; veto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative power; power of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the purse; oversight and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Congressional committees are powerful bodies that provide oversight of the executive branch and hold hearings. Where government officials and experts testify about all aspects of US foreign policy. Staffs play a vital role in preparing briefing papers and speeches for Congressmen. Furthermore, divided partisan control of government contributed to the closer scrutiny that Congress gave to Presidential foreign policy initiatives and matters of implementation. The party that controlled one or both houses of Congress, but not the White House, gained political advantage from investigating irregularities, mismanagement, and failures in the conduct of foreign policy by the executive branch as is the case of Iraq.

51. Bruce W. Jentleson, *n.43*, p. 34.
52. Stephen J. Wayne, *n. 44*.
On the other, President's power much depends on the political landscape in which he operates as well as the personality and political skill. The qualities needed to ensure an effective presidency includes the ability to communicate, persuade and rally public support. An important aspect of the President's power is his ability to set the agenda and to use the prestige of the office as a "bully pulpit" to explain and seek public support for his policies. It has been shown how President Wilson failed to persuade Congress of the merits of the League of Nations while President Roosevelt was able to win a huge majority to support US membership of the United Nation.53

Throughout American history there have been ebbs and flows of Presidential and Congressional dominance in making foreign policy, variously defined by different scholars. One study classified the period 1789-1829 as one of Presidential initiative; 1829-1898 as one of Congressional supremacy, and 1899 through the immediate post World War II period as one of growing Presidential Power.54 Another study defined three periods of Congressional dominance 1837-1861, 1869-1897 and 1918-1936, with a fourth one beginning towards the end of Vietnam War in 1973.55 During the Reagan and Bush Administrations the Pendulum swung back towards Presidential dominance, reaching its height in 1991 during operation Desert Storm against Iraq.56 In the post-Persian Gulf war era, both President and the Congress are confronted with issues in foreign policy that may well define which branch of government will play the dominant role during the first decade of the twenty first century. But cooperation between the two branches is necessary for a strong and effective U.S. foreign policy.57

President's Advisors: Big Fours

In the post Cold War World, there is an increasing number of foreign policy actors involved in the executive branch. As foreign policy has become more of a political football, the President has come to depend more and more on his closest advisors in the white House and National Security Advisor.

The National Security Council (NSC) operating under the direct authority of the President has steadily increased its authority in recent years and the NSC advisor has become the key figure in the US foreign policy machine. The National Security Act was passed in 1947 to establish a National Security Council. The formal NSC comprises the President's main external relations advisers including the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defence the Chairman of the Joint Chief Staff, the Director of the CIA, and the National Security Adviser. It is the NSC staff, however, that provide the steady stream of briefing papers for the President. The National Security Adviser is the hinge between the formal NSC and the working machine. Over the past few decades, the National Security Adviser has often emerged as the most important foreign policy aid to the President. The National Security Adviser has a number task including advising and briefing the President, managing the decision-making process and explaining and defending the policies of the administration in public. A piano-playing-child Prodigy, Condoleezza Rice, had a role in the George W. Bush administration going beyond foreign policy.\textsuperscript{58}

Constitutionally, the \textbf{State Department} is the lead executive agency for the conduct of U.S. diplomacy, a mission based on the role of the Secretary of State as the President's principal foreign policy adviser. In fact, Secretary of State is the first cabinet officer in line to succeed to the Presidency (The succession starts with the Vice President, the speaker of the

\textsuperscript{58} Frasser Camron, \textit{n. 5}, pp. 41-44.
House, the President of the Senate, and the Secretary of State). The State department has the primary role in

- Leading and coordinating US representation abroad.
- Conducting negotiations and concluding agreements and treaties.
- Managing the international affairs budget.
- Coordinating and supporting international activities of other US agencies.

Several Secretaries of State, John Hay, Evans Hughes, Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Henry Kissinger, James Barker, Madeline Albright, and Collin Powell have a record of achievements.  

In constitutional terms, the Department of Defence (DOD) – is responsible for the formulation of general defence policy, in particular the military strategy and the definition of the “mission Statement of the armed forces. In terms of defining an overall approach and policy regarding national security issues, however, the DOD is but one actor and the NSC has increasingly taken lead in defining the overall national security strategy. Apart from its seat on the NSC, the Pentagon also plays an important role in US external relations through its foreign bases its training and assistance programmes and its regional military commanders. Because of its size and enormous resources the Pentagon plays an increasingly important role in the formulation of US foreign policy.  

The intelligence community – The US has the largest intelligence apparatus in the world with the various agencies making a round the clock input into the formulation of US foreign policy. The Director of the CIA is simultaneously director of the intelligence community, of which CIA is but one component. President expect that, for what they spend on intelligence, the product should be able to predict coup, upheavals, riots, intentions, military moves and the like with accuracy. President and his national security team usually are ill informed about intelligence capabilities.

59 Ibid, pp. 44-46.
60 Ibid
61 Ibid, pp. 53-54.
Therefore, they often have unrealistic expectations of what intelligence can do for them. Oversight of the intelligence community is exercised by the NSC and the President’s foreign intelligence advisory board. There are also two congressional oversight committees that have a remit to review operations and the senate must approve the director of intelligence.  

Department of Homeland Security – Among the most significant responses of the Bush administration to the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have been its incremental steps to establish the Department of Homeland Security (DOHS). The establishment of the DoHS brought a variety of governmental functions and agencies into a single cabinet level department in order to move effectively against the threat posed by domestic and international terrorism.

As American foreign policy has grown increasingly complex, foreign policy politics in the executive branch do not occur only at the senior advisory level. As table below shows, the foreign affairs bureaucracy is vast and complex.

Table 1.2: The Foreign Affairs Bureaucracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Economic Policy</td>
<td>Commerce Dept.</td>
<td>Treasury Dept.</td>
<td>Agriculture Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Economic Affairs (State Dept.)</td>
<td>U.S Trade Representative</td>
<td>International Trade Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Democratization, Economic Development</td>
<td>Agency for International Development (AID)</td>
<td>Bur. of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (State Dept.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Agencies</td>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
<td>National Security Agency</td>
<td>Defense Intelligence Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalized Domestic Policy</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Office National Drug Control Policy</td>
<td>Bur. of International Labour Affairs (Dept. of Labor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 Ibid, pp 61-65
63 Office of the Counter Terrorism of the US Department of State, 30 September, 2001.
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MAJOR DECISION INFLUENCERS:

In addition to the executive and legislative branches of government, there are numerous other actors that seek to influence US foreign policy. These include a multitude of lobby groups, business interests, trade unions, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), think-tanks and international organization.

Interest Groups: These are formal organisation of people who share a common outlook or social circumstances and who band together in the hope of influencing government policy.\(^{65}\) There are five main types of foreign policy interest groups based on differences in the nature of the interests that motivate their activity and their forms of organization.\(^{66}\)

Table 1.3. **A typology of foreign policy Interest Groups\(^{67}\):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>General Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic groups</td>
<td>Organisations of trade unions, national associations of manufactures, consumer federations of America,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity groups.</td>
<td>Jewish Americans, Cuban Americans, Greek Americans,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issue groups</td>
<td>Refugee internationals, committee on present dangers world wild life fund,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state and local government</td>
<td>Local elected officials for social responsibilities, California world trade commissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign governments.</td>
<td>Washington law firms, public relations companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Interest Groups includes Multination Corporations (MNCs) and other businesses labour unions, consumers whose lobbying is motivated principally by how foreign policy affects the economic interests of their members. Identity Groups are motivated less by economic interests

---

than by ethnic or religious identity. Ethnic identity groups have sought to influence U.S. relations with the country or region to which they trace their ancestry or heritage. Political Issue Groups include groups that are organised around support or opposition to a political issue that is not principally a matter of their economic interests or group identity. These are anti-war groups, Environment group etc. State and local Governments, although they do not fit the term interest groups in the same way, increasingly seek to influence foreign policy as it affects their interest.  

Interest groups seek to influence foreign policy according to many different strategies aimed at the various foreign policy actors. To influence Congress, lobbyists regularly meet privately with Senators and representatives who are allies to set strategy, count votes and in some cases even to help write the legislation and financial contribution at the of election. Interest groups also try to influence directly executive branch departments and agencies as they formulate and implement foreign policy on day-to-day basis. Groups also take their efforts to influence foreign policy outside the halls of Congress and the executive branch, mobilising protests and demonstration to show "shoulder to shoulder" support for their causes. Especially in recent years, foreign policy interest groups have become quite astute at using the media as a magnifying glass to enlarge their exposure and as a megaphone to amplify their voice. Samuel Huntington has noted that for an understanding of American foreign policy, it is necessary to study not only the interests of the American state in a world of competing states but rather the play of economic and ethnic interest in American domestic policies.  

**News Media:** Despite the declining coverage of foreign policy, prior to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, one can not ignore its presence. Nearly

---

68. Ibid., p. 49-58.  
69. Ibid., pp. 49-58.  
all government and congressional offices have a television screen, usually tuned to CNN. And thus have instant access to news from around the world. Other than CNN for coverage of foreign policy, first rank still goes to major newspapers (such as: New York Times and Washington Post) major television networks (ABC, NBC and Fox News) and major news magazine (Times, New Week). The internet also has substantially enhanced the capacity of NGOs, think tanks, and others to become independent sources of information, analysis and advocacy.\textsuperscript{71}

The manner in which television and print media cover news stories influences public perception of events and subsequently, their political attitudes. This in turn, influences the actions of the policy makers themselves. Administration, spokesmen, Congressmen, think tanks specialists and other pundits are rarely absent from the screen, usually offering instant comment and analysis on the latest developments in a crises.\textsuperscript{72}

Television in particular has a major agenda-setting impact. Studies by media scholar Shanto Iyenger and other shows that when people are asked to identify the most significant problem facing the nation, they name something that has been on television news recently. The media also influence the relative priority the public gives to one issue over another, as well as the criteria by which the public makes its judgment about success or failure. These framing and priming effects occur both directly through the general public’s own exposure to the media and indirectly through “opinion leaders” – political, business community, educational and other leaders to whom the public often looks for cues. Another type of influence is directly on policy-makers”. What will the press thinks? Is common question inside the White House and the State Department. It is asked in an anticipatory manner and thus can affect policy as it is formulated. In a more informal sense, policy makers draw on dispatches and analyses by the more

\textsuperscript{71} Bruce W. Jentleson, \textit{n. 43}, pp. 61-62.

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 61-62.
prominent foreign affairs journalists as additional and independent source of information to supplement even their own intelligence sources.\textsuperscript{73}

**PUBLIC OPINION:** Public opinion also exercises profound influence on the foreign policy of America. Public opinion influences American foreign policy in many ways. First by parameter setting which means that public opinion imposes limits on the range of President’s policy options. Public opinion influences the President through Presidential election. Voting analysts identify three factors as key to attributing significant electoral impact to a foreign policy issue: the issue must be demonstrated through survey question to be highly salient, there must be significant differences between the positions of the Republic and Democratic candidates; and the public’s awareness of these differences must be evident. Public opinion also has its impact on Congress. Congress is very responsive to the public opinion on foreign policy. It responds both to polls on specific issues and to more general assessment of whether the public really cares much about foreign policy at all. Often this translates into Congress’s paying the most attention to the groups that are the most vocal and the most politically potent.\textsuperscript{74}

President wants to be liked by the public because the level of their popularity with the American people affects their ability to work with Congress and achieve policy goals. The more popular president’s are domestically, the more they are free of constraints to do as they wish abroad.\textsuperscript{68} Every four years the Pew Research Centre for the People and the Press does a survey on what Americans think about their country and its place in the world. In November 2005 survey, it polled decision makers, from the media, covering newspapers, magazine, television and radio, the foreign policy and security elites, a sample of governors of Americans states and mayors of majority cities, the head of think tanks and leaders of universities, religious leaders, scientists and engineers, the military, along with the public. It contained a wealth of materials about the present moment and long term trends.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., pp 61-62.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., pp 67-68
The news survey found that about 2/3 of Americans were dissatisfied with the way things are going in their country today, while 29% were satisfied. The report notes that this “the most negative national assessment in nearly 10 years”. The have different priorities from the Bush administration. There are sign of a growing isolationist sentiment. An important part of this unease is the sense Americans have of the current standing of their country in the world. 2/3 of them say the US is less respected by other countries than in past. An overwhelming majority of American (71%) and opinion leaders (87%) believe the war in Iraq is a major factor for this.\textsuperscript{75}

It is clear that the number of actors involved in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy has steadily increased since II world war thus limiting the executive’s freedom of action to decide and implement policy.

Far from operating in a vacuum, think tanks participate in the policy process alongside a range of resources of research that also include academics, private sector consulting firms, interest groups, and government bureaus. Think tanks are most numerous organisational forms devoted to policy research and they are often among the most focused and visible sources of idea and analysis in contemporary policy making.

\textbf{Figure 1.1 : US Foreign policy making}\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{75} Zia Mian, How American See the US, Economic and Political Weekly (EPW), June, 2006.
\textsuperscript{76} Frasser Cameron, n. 5, p. 37.
MODELS OF DECISION MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT OF THINK-TANKS

The literature on American foreign policy-making continues to grow, but only recently has the participation of think-tanks in the policy formulation process been discussed. Contemporary models and theories of foreign policy-making need not be supplanted to account for the increasingly active involvement of think-tanks in the policy-making process. Rather their parameters simply need to be expanded to take into consideration the changing role of policy research institutions in the United States. By treating think-tanks as important inputs into the policy-makers process, instead of passive observers of American politics, foreign policy analysts can provide a more detailed explanation of the various actors competing for power in the political arena.\(^77\)

The Rational Actor Model:

One of the most popular of the simplified models is the black box or the billiard ball model. This notion has termed as the “strategic model” by Roger Hilsman.\(^78\) It derived directly from the theories of realism as propagated by the Hans Morgenthou, Kenneth Waltz, etc. This model was termed as the Rational Actor Model by Allison. The rational actor model assumes that the state acts as rational, unitary decision-makers, and can identify and select a course of action which will maximise its strategic goals and objectives.\(^79\)

However, while the rational actor model provides international relations theorists with a relatively straightforward explanation as to how states are supposed to make foreign policy decisions, the assumption on which the model is based are problematic. To begin with, it is unrealistic to

\(^77\) Donald E. Abelson, *n* 4, pp. 117-118
assume that states behave as unitary decision-makers. In highly decentralised political systems like the United States, where non-governmental organisations representing a multitude of political and economic interests have innumerable opportunities to reach decision-makers the government rarely has the luxury of speaking with one voice.

According to Herbert Simon, a renowned authority on organisational behaviour, the efforts of leaders to reduce the requirement for information in part explains why states often make irrational decisions. Most theories of individual and organisational choice employ a concept of “comprehensive rationality” according to which individuals and organisations choose the best alternative taking account of consequences, their probabilities and utilities. However Simon argues that the concept of ‘bounded rationality’ more accurately reflects how individuals and organisations process information. In short, Simon theory of bounded rationality states that “The physical and psychological limits of man’s capacity as alternative generator, information process or, and problem solver constrain the decision-making processes of individuals and organisations. Because of these bounds, intendedly rational action requires simplified models that extract the main features of a problem without capturing all of its complexity.

Simon’s theory of bounded rationality only sheds light on the limitations of the rational actor model, but more importantly, helps explain why leaders often fail to fully explore the potential consequences of their actions. Unable to rely on perfect information particularly during periods of crisis, policy-makers have few alternatives but to speculate on the outcome.

---
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of their decisions. At times the consequences of their foreign policy decision are favourable. At other times, they can prove to be catastrophic.\(^4\)

The rational actor model provides a useful point of departure to examine how think-tanks can be integrated into formal theories of foreign policy decision-making. Assuming, as proponents of the rational actor model do that decision makers acting on behalf of the state assess the advantages and disadvantage of pursuing certain courses of action before making a policy decision, one would expect leaders to rely on various sources of policy advice. Since few decision-makers possess expertise in every policy area, it is not surprising that they frequently turn to their inner circle of policy advisers for guidance. Moreover, as discussed throughout this study, Presidents and Presidential candidates, not to mention members of Congress and their staff, often solicit the input of think-tanks scholars in the process of developing and shaping specific policies.\(^5\)

However, while the rational actor model provides scholars with a relatively straight forward, if not simplistic explanation of how states make foreign policy decisions, its proponents have paid little attention to how over one thousand think tanks attempt to provide policy advice to decision makers. By examining how think-tanks formulate and transmit ideas to decision-makers, theorists employing the rational actor model could, at the very least, evaluate an important source of policy information. Since think-tanks constantly provide decision-makers with information and advice on a wide range of issues through seminars, publications and other channels, their contribution to important policy debates should not be overlooked. Even those scholars who have sought to develop more sophisticated theories about the nature of foreign policy-making have failed to take into consideration how policy research institutions participate in the decision-making process.\(^6\)

\(^4\) Donald E. Abelson, *ibid*, p 105  
\(^5\) *ibid*, p 106  
\(^6\) *ibid*, p 106
Bureaucratic Models of Decision Making:

Graham Allison, in his study, Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile crises, reveals the inherent weakness of the rational actor model by constructing two alternative paradigms to explain how foreign policy decisions are made; the organisational process models and the government (bureaucratic) politics model. For Allison, proponents of the rational actor model overlook two important features of the policy-making process; the extent to which bureaucratic departments limit the policy options available to political leaders\(^7\) and the intense competition between government officials to advance their political and personal interests.\(^8\) The Bureaucratic politics model views the policy-making process as a game involving players competing for high personal and political stakes.\(^9\)

Although flow charts of the foreign policy making process illustrate how the executive and legislative branches of government share responsibilities in international affairs they rarely reveal the political bargaining which takes place among key players in the white House and on Capital Hill. For Allison, unless foreign policy observers pay attention to the political struggle among high-level decision-makers to promote their institutional and personal interests, they cannot possibly paint an accurate portrait of the decision-making process. Allison’s governmental (bureaucratic) politics model focuses on the competition between decision makers to promote their political and bureaucratic objectives. By identifying key players in the policy-making process and the importance they assign to a particular issue, the bureaucratic politics model attempts to explain what motivates certain individuals to influence the outcome of policy debates.\(^9\)


\(^{8}\) Donald E. Abelson, n 5, p 107

\(^{9}\) Priya Singh, n 2, p 108

\(^{10}\) Donald e. Abelson, n 4, p 108
According to Allison the Governmental politics model sees no unitary actor but rather many actors as players—players who focus not on a single strategic issue but on many diverse intra-national problems as well; players who act in terms of no consistent set of strategic objectives but rather according to various conceptions of national, organisational and personal goals, players who make government decisions not by a single rational choice but by the pulling and hauling that is politics.\textsuperscript{91}

By reviewing the decision-making process as a policy game Allison attempts to demonstrate how government officials throughout the bureaucracy rely on various tactics to assert their influence in major policy debates. Although the extent to which policy-makers influence key decisions is difficult to quantity, Allison argues that their success in the policy making arena ultimately depends on a number of factors including the importance of their position in the bureaucratic hierarchy, the amount of expertise they possess in a particular issue area and their ability to persuade colleagues to support their position.\textsuperscript{92} The policy positions individual leaders advocate is not difficult to predict. According to Allison, ‘where you stand depends on where you sit’.\textsuperscript{93}

The organisational process and bureaucratic politics models focus on important aspects of the policymaking process, that it is to say, how individual leaders and departments attempt to advance their interests in the bureaucratic hierarchy. Nonetheless, they virtually ignore the individuals and organisations operating outside the formal parameters of government who also have a vested interest in influencing decisions at the highest levels of government. As organisations committed to influencing public policy and public opinion, think-tanks have made a concerted effort to expand their lies throughout government. By developing, their own areas of expertise and

\textsuperscript{91} Allison, \textit{n 87}, p144
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{ibid.} p.169
\textsuperscript{93} \textit{ibid.} 176
establishing contacts with officials in various departments and agencies, think-tanks have attempted to ensure long-term access to decision-makers. Some think-tanks such as the Rand co-operation the Hudson Institute and the Urban Institute, by virtue of their contractual relationship with particular federal departments, considerable access to key government officials. On the other hand, think-tanks such as the Heritage Foundation and the Institute for policy studies which do not solicit government contracts must employ a number of other strategies to capture the attention of decision-makers.\textsuperscript{94}

Consequently, both the organisational and bureaucratic models of decision-making neglected to explore in any detail the relationship between bureaucratic departments and think-tanks. Despite this oversight, the involvement of think-tanks in the policy-making process could easily be incorporated into the parameters established by the organisational process and bureaucratic politics models.\textsuperscript{95}

Since many high-level government officials come from or return to think-tank after leaving office, it is possible to comment further on the political motivations of decision-makers. For instance, Edwin Meese's fund raising efforts for the Heritage Foundation, could explain why he was offered a position at the Washington-based think-tanks after leaving the Reagan administration. In other words while the bureaucratic politics model examines how and why leaders attempt to advance the interests of the departments they represent, it could also take into consideration the benefits high-level officials derive by promoting positions supported by prominent think-tanks. The appearance of cabinet officials and members of Congress at think-tanks seminars and lunches may enhance the visibility and prestige of research institutions but it also provides government officials with an opportunity to solidify their ties to potential employers.\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{94} Donald e. Abelson, \textit{n.5}, p 109

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid. p.110

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid. 110
Although the rational actor model assumes that states select a course of action which will maximise their objectives, Allison argues that the inability and unwillingness of bureaucratic departments to perform certain tasks constrains the policy alternatives available to decision-makers. According to Allison’s organisational process model, since individual departments are required to adhere to standard operating procedures (SOP), they may also have the flexibility to alter their behaviour in such a way as to satisfy the objectives and preferences of decision-makers. As Allison points out in his analysis of the events which led to the decision of Kennedy’s Executive Committee\(^7\) to order a naval blockade around Cuba, Decision-makers strongly favoured an air strike but were forced to reconsider this option when high ranking officials in the US Air Force expressed reservations about the success of such an operation. In other words Allison argues that while political leaders may prefer to adopt a particular strategy, bureaucratic constraints may compel them to pursue alternative courses of action.\(^8\)

**PSYCHOLOGY OF DECISION-MAKING:**

According to Steinburner, policy-makers do not engage in sophisticated mental calculations before making value maximising decisions as the rational actor model suggests. Rather, he argues that political leaders instinctively rely on survival mechanisms to resolve policy problems. Bombarded by information from multiple directions and sources, policy makers can possibly digest all pertinent data before making critical decisions. As a result, Steinburunber argues that they must develop a highly structured and stable environment in which to address and examine policy issue.\(^9\)

---
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Steinbruner’s cybernetic theory of decision making is useful in explaining how decision-makers attempt to reduce uncertainty in their environment by screening out certain types of information. However, his contention that policy decisions are the result of programmed responses requires closer scrutiny. Although individual leaders may attempt to immerse themselves in stable and protective environments, the views they promote and the ideals they embrace may be influenced by a multitude of factors. For instance, surrounded by political advisers and policy experts from various government departments and think-tanks, decision-makers may be forced to alter their most preferred course of action, despite having previously processed highly selective information.\textsuperscript{100}

Recognising that decision-makers rarely have the time to digest all information necessary to make rational policy decisions, several think tanks have attempted to provide them with concise analyses of major domestic and foreign policy issues. The Heritage, RAND Corporation, Carnegie etc are most effective think tanks at inundating members of Congress and the executive with synopses of domestic and foreign policy issue. By providing elected officials and their staffs with information that can easily be incorporated into briefing notes, memos, and speeches, think-tanks have in some respect helped reduce uncertainty in the decision-makers environment. This is not to suggest that think-tanks directly influence specific policy decisions but rather that they provide a valuable source of policy information and advice which can help shape the environment in which leaders make decisions.\textsuperscript{101}

In this way, Steinbruner’s framework provides additional opportunities to observe how think-tanks attempts to shape the policy environment in which political leaders make policy decisions.

\textsuperscript{100} ibid. p. 112

**Elite and Interest Group Models of Decision-Making:**

By examining the formulation and conduct of policy elites, Robert Dhal and C. Wright Mills among others, have provided much-needed insight into how elites in different policy-making circles attempt to influence the content and direction of public policies. Moreover, David Truman among others, has written extensively on how interest groups in pluralistic societies immerse themselves in policy debates.¹⁰²

Contrary to the assertions of some theorists who argue that the political process is controlled by a group of elites committed to the promotion of corporate interests, Dahl’s¹⁰³ research indicates that leaders responsible for overseeing important community issues do not necessarily share the same goals and objectives. In fact, as his study demonstrates, groups or organisations often engage in a bitter competition to advance their institutional interests. Dahl’s observations about the presence of multiple elites and their participation in the policy making process sheds additional light on the domestic sources of public policy. Sections are often unable to monopolise the attention of government officials in every conceivable policy area. The presence of several hundred policy research institutions competing for power might give the impression that think-tanks are influential players in the policy-making process.¹⁰⁴

C. Wright Mills¹⁰⁵, in Power Elite, argues that the American political process is dominated by what is commonly referred to as the military-industrial complex. Political leaders, in cooperation with the military and defence contractors, formulate and implement domestic and foreign policies which will further promote their common interests. Mills study presents a rather conspiratorial view of the political system, yet his

---

¹⁰² Donald E. Abelson, *5, P 113
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insight into the intimate relationship between the military and defence contractors can not be casually dismissed. Similarly the relationship between the military and individual think-tanks must be taken into account, the reliance of the military on such think-tank as the Rand Corporation and the Hudson Institute provides policy research institutions with considerable opportunity to help shape vital national security policies.\textsuperscript{106}

William Domhoff\textsuperscript{107} and Thomas Dye\textsuperscript{108} contend that non-military focused think tanks also form an integral part of a more extensive institution in the United States called the ruling elite. As institutional composed of academics whose research is supported by corporations philanthropic foundations thin tank such the Brooking Institution and the Council on Foreign Relations, play a vital role in furthering corporate interests in the US. Still, it is difficult to argue that the sole objective of think tanks is to advance the economic interests of their clients. Since think tanks differ significantly in size, scope, and political leavings, their agenda are often influenced by multiple concerns.\textsuperscript{109}

The intense competition between think-tanks for influence in the market place of ideas has led some scholars to treat policy research institutions as another type of interest group committed to influencing public policy. However, by reviewing the group theory approach to decision-making the fundamental differences between think-tank and interest or pressure groups can be revealed.

Contrary to Truman’s assumptions, the government or for that matter decision-makers, do not simply behave as referees moderating between competing interests. In developing and formulating policy ideas, decision-makers do not simply await the views of interest groups, but
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actively draw on and solicit the opinions and advice of a wide range of individuals and organisations. As a result while think-tanks could be incorporated into studies on interest group behaviour, their active involvement in the policy formulation process distinguishes them from the thousands of other organisations which may have a more visible presence in the public arena, but whose access to decision-makers is for more limited. Similarly, thousands of interest groups lobby decision-makers to introduce legislation which is compatible with their institutional interests, very few are actually called upon by the Executive or Congress to develop and shape policy ideas. Although members of interest groups often give testimony before Congressional committees and subcommittees, they rarely provide decision-makers with detailed blueprints on how to develop a particular policy idea. Think-tanks, on the other hand, are approached by decision-makers to provide them with practical advice on how to develop and implement domestic and foreign policies. Furthermore during Presidential elections and the transition period that follows, Presidential candidates have surrounded themselves with advisers from think tanks. While the positions of influential interest groups are often taken into consideration in developing election platforms and in shaping public policies, think tank scholars, not interest group representatives are called upon to advise political leaders on how to govern effectively.\textsuperscript{110}

CONCLUSION: The recent decades have witnessed much progress in the study of foreign policy, particularly of American Foreign policy. One of the consequences of this renewed interest in foreign policy analysis has been the emergence of conflicting opinions regarding the understanding of a country's foreign policy. One of the primary assumption which is now commonly shared by most foreign policy experts is that foreign policy is not an independent variable and as such is conditioned by several factors, While it is universally accepted that a states external behaviour is, definitely,
conditioned by the international environment, it is equally true that the goals, contents and conduct of that behaviour are also to a significant extent shaped by the domestic context out of which it arises. As the saying goes, "foreign policy begins and ends at home."\(^\text{111}\)

The promise and peril of globalisation has transformed how we view international relations and opened the policy-making process to a new set of actors, agendas, and outcomes. International relations was once the exclusive domain of diplomats, bureaucrats, and states, but today policy-makers must consider a diverse set of international actors when formulating foreign policy that includes CNN, ASEAN, etc. While these actors were not born of globalisation, they have been empowered by it. Consider the simple fact that in 1950 there were only 50 nation states and a limited number of intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations operating in the world and one begins to understand the complexity and unique challenge policy-makers face when trying to fashion an effective foreign policy. The challenges for U.S. policy-makers are even more daunting given America's super power status, global commitments and the range of transnational actors and issue it must confront on a daily basis.\(^\text{112}\)

Making policy about any particular issue occurs not in a single moment, by a single decision, with a consistent set of actors but rather over a series of moments in a lengthy period that typically involves scores of different actors and different types of decision.

In addition to the executive and legislative branches of government and the media, there are numerous other actors that seek to influence US foreign policy. These include a multitude of lobby groups, business interests, trade unions, non-governmental organisations (NGOS), think-tanks, foreign governments and international organisation. Far from operating in vacuum, think tanks participate in the policy process along side a range of
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other source of information and influence. But think-tanks are among the most numerous organisational forms devoted to policy research and they are often among the most focused and visible sources of ideas and analysis in contemporary policy making. ¹¹³

Since 1900s, most officials and non-officials in charge of setting American foreign policy have consistently sought to engage the United States deeply in political and economic affairs beyond the water's edge. At the start of twenty-first century, the United States is the World's only "superpower, or "hyper power" as French Foreign Minister, Hubert Vedrine, famously described it. The use of "hyper power aroused considerable controversy in the U.S. in the "new era of globalisation there is a real sense of uncertainty among many analyst today, even leading some to speculate, that the American century is giving way to the era of American decline."¹¹⁴ But on the other hand many like the US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice do not believe in that and are very optimistic about American future. She argued that the US will continue to use free trade, foreign aid and all elements of its power to promote an open international order based on political liberty, free markets, self determination and nation of sovereignty. This is not a status quo objective. But that does not make it impractical. Indeed, helping states to transform themselves, to improve themselves, is the most realistic approach to the problems the America is now facing", Rice said.¹¹⁵

The recent Russia-China-India meeting in New Delhi (Feb, 2007) of the three Foreign Ministers, therefore, assumes a heightened significance. It is still early days to predict where this dialogue is headed because each country of this evolving triangle seeks better relations with the US.
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Nevertheless, the idea also is to counter US unipolarity and unilateralism through a loose tripartite arrangement seeking to build a more balanced multi-polar world. The fact that these three countries, together, account for 2/5 of the world’s population, 1/5 of the economy that is growing rapidly to reach 2/5 in the decades ahead, the largest armies in the world and are nuclear armed would not be lost on commentators and strategic planners. A strategic reorientation may be taking place.116

Like all other countries the US has always acted in defence of its national interests but a continuous threat of idealism has also found a place in American foreign policy. Throughout its history the US has viewed itself as having a unique mission in the world, to promote its values of freedom, independence, and democracy” and its market economy or capitalist economic system. Other countries, including all other permanent member of UN Security Council, (UNSC), France, the UK, Russia and China, share their own messianic vision. Few have been in a position to promote their values abroad to the same extent as the US, especially in the later half of 20th C. The 1990s were the Climax of “the American century”. Not only had the US won the Cold War but its economy raced ahead of other industrial nations and its culture and technology had spread to every corner of the globe.117

Of course, even its geographical advantages cannot protect the US from terrorist attacks, but the enormous size of the US, plus its population and economic base, gives its unique position in the world. True, there are countries larger in size (Russia, Canada) and population (China, India) but no other country enjoys the panoply of resources that benefit the term “super power” or “hyper power”.118
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The main conclusions from these scenarios can be summed up as follows:\ref{119}:

- Most likely for the next decade or two is a continuation of the present polarity structure of one superpower and several great powers.

- It is unlikely during the next 25 or 80 years that the US will face other powers actively seeking to assert super status. The EU & China are the most plausible candidates but both have much to do before they could qualify. China has further to go in material terms than EU, but is probably more plausible on political grounds than EU.

- It is by no means impossible that the US, could step down from its superpower role, producing a world with no superpower and a set of great powers. This is perhaps not likely any time soon unless the ‘War on terrorism’ produces such negative consequences as to precipitate a major rethink of American foreign policy along the lines of withdrawal from forward defence and global engagement.

At the start of a new millenarian, with a new administration taking over in Washington, there were many debates on the future direction of American foreign policy. This changed, however, in the aftermath of the 9/11 Sept. 2001 terrorist attacks on US. Throughout its history, the US had veered between isolationism and internationalism, between idealism and realism, between protectionism and free trade. A host of reports poured out of Congress, think-tanks, and various national commissions seeking to define American external interests and priorities. Given the importance of US in World affairs it is important to understand how the debate on the global role of the US is evolving, what US priorities are and how the US exercises its power and influence on the World stage. The coming chapter would discuss these in detail.