



Role Of Foreign Policy Making

Bisman Kaur

Student

Amity Institute of International Studies

Amity University Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

This article aims to explain the concept of foreign policy and the various theories attached to it. It also aims to explain the various factors responsible while formulating foreign policy. The factors influencing foreign policy can be considered as complicated like the geopolitical situation, political and economic developments, political leadership, national and military capabilities, and domestic and international environment. Foreign policymaking is considered as an important area, hence, understanding its behaviour is a complex matter. However, analysing this behaviour presents various challenges which range from defining basic terms to more fundamental methodological issues. This article also aims to establish the relationship between domestic and international environment and foreign policy. It also aims to explain the role of environment in helping the leaders to formulate appropriate foreign policies.

Keywords- foreign policy, domestic, international, environment

Introduction

Foreign policy is a set of strategies, goals, and events that the government uses to manage its interactions with other countries and international organizations. The country's foreign policy reflects its values, interests, and preferences. It may also include goals such as defence, economic benefits, and humanitarian aid. The foreign policy process is considered as complicated and one or another includes various factors such as the geopolitical situation, political and economic development, political leadership, national and military abilities, domestic and international environment. Foreign policy creation itself is an important area, and therefore the development of understanding its behaviour is a complex matter. However, an attempt to analyse this behaviour is various intellectual challenges that range from defining basic terms to more fundamental methodological problems. Foreign policy is considered to be more important than other areas of politics because it has close ties to national interests rather than special interests and basic values. Another visible aspect of the process of creating foreign policy is that because it evokes different political reactions, it is usually accepted that political institutions work in different ways when they face foreign policy issues. In addition, various institutions are also involved, as some state authorities are exclusively or significantly involved in foreign policy.

About Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is an area of government activities that deals with state and other actors, especially another state in the international system, so the development of understanding the behaviour of foreign policy is an important activity. However, trying to analyse this behaviour, however, represents various intellectual challenges that range from defining basic terms to more fundamental methodological problems. Attempts to solve these problems led to analysts to accept some simplification of conventional prerequisites on this behaviour. Together, these assumptions have created what could be called a traditional approach to an analysis that was very influence. Since the 1950s, these traditional prerequisites have been undermined by

the application of a decision-making approach, which makes various prerequisites on the behaviour of foreign policy. Although this approach has brought several problems, it has shown what few foreign policy analysts would now question, namely that the understanding of the way the politics is carried out is central to understand the essence of foreign policy.

One approach to studying foreign policy has been so ubiquitous over the years that it can be referred to as a traditional approach. One of the attractions of this approach is that it is based on conventional and direct assumptions about foreign policy. It is barely necessary to think very hard about any specific example of foreign policy in action to realize that we tend to assume that states have cohesive foreign policies that are an example of specific measures; The fact that governments have goals or goals on which their policies are focused on and governments calculate not only specific steps but also the consequences of this action. Foreign policy is a product of national behaviour. Joseph Nye summarized these conventional prerequisites that support traditional analysis somewhat formally under the brand "state central realism". The state rather than any other international actor is considered a unit for foreign policy creation. More importantly, a state or government acting on behalf of the state is considered a monolithic actor; In other words, it is a government activity whose behaviour is generally analogous to a targeted individual. These two prerequisites, Nye suggest, are usually used for realistic analysis, which explains the state behaviour in terms of interstate power struggle. Since the realist characterizes the international environment as hostile and dangerous, it follows from the fact that the behaviour of the state is analysed from the point of view of this environment, the external forces into the state are considered to be the main determinant of foreign policy. Thus, the ability of states to survive and prosper in such an environment provides a focus for analysis. It can be seen that survival depends on a skilful means to an end, strength to purposes.

The state is the highest unit of social organization that supports social communication or interactions of any kind across the borders of the state borders only for themselves. However, such communication or interaction is only required if there is a real need for some political objectives that cannot be achieved by any other average or state activity within its borders. Interestingly, the intensity of the state interaction differs from the period and in every period, from the state to the state. The past shows 'inclination to self-sufficiency, reduction of international intercourse. The whole organization of foreign policy of the state exists for the purpose of adopting and implementing decisions on the protection of the interests of the state.

The state is the highest unit of social organization that supports social communication or interactions of any kind across the borders of the state borders only for themselves. However, such communication or interaction is only required if there is a real need for some political objectives that cannot be achieved by any other average or state activity within its borders. Interestingly, the intensity of the state interaction differs from the period and in every period, from the state to the state. The past shows 'inclination to self-sufficiency, reduction of international intercourse. The whole organization of foreign policy of the state exists for the purpose of adopting and implementing decisions on the protection of the interests of the state. The basic components of the decision-making process are common in all countries of the world, regardless of their position. Because "foreign policy is not carried out by electronic computers, it is formed by men who lack mathematical decisions, but also have courts." It is a well-known idea that decision-making processes are common in all countries of the world, regardless of their status and decision-making must be based on understanding what it is about. No policy can be selected without recognizing the problem to which the decision to compensate. "An important element of any problem is the timely selection of the goal to achieve that the nation's efforts will be committed." Since all operational decisions are taken in terms of postulated objectives, identification and evaluation of strategic objectives is the main step in the process of identifying the problem.

The theory of decision-making is basically a conceptual framework. It provides a comprehensive and useful control list of factors that should take into account in any attempt to analyse politicians, either as a general process or as a process in a specific case. Theory is used to identify several relevant variables. This does not consider interesting possible relationships between these variables or necessarily contains a hypothesis that would lead to predictive abilities concerning the type of substantial policy that the creator of the decision can choose in the situation. Snyder, Bruch and Spain tried to focus on specific creators of decisions who speak and act in the name of the state. According to them, it does not matter the so-called real and objective world. They compared a team of high-level officials who advise the CEO to a massive filter that processes countless variables, including the faith and roles of the creator of decisions, bureaucratic requirements, political and social interests, and restrictions on their policies that arise in the rest of the world.

Among the tools for the implementation of policies that have been properly recognized in international affairs 'and diplomatic channels include business policy and foreign aid. This is the part and land of the state's economic ability. Since economic power is required to build the ability, the policy creator should not ignore the potential influence of economic instruments and carefully consider their possibilities. In international politics and the environment, it is not possible to draw a line in terms of economic possibilities, because almost every aspect of economic activity could be used as a weapon. For political objectives, politicians face various difficulties in terms of selection. Their choice has become limited for two simple reasons, especially if the economic capacity of the nation is too weak and this option is either closed or simply does not exist and sometimes the home environment in their use prevails, it thinks it would be useful in achieving a specific goal. Simply put, the possibilities of politics creator are determined by the environment in its own state. For almost any national efforts, whether to determine or raise living standards or create abilities and resources that can be used for domestic or foreign policy purposes, relying on others has become one of the primary conditions for modern international relations. Of course, economic needs and abilities are not distributed equally in the international system. The degree of dependence on trade as part of the overall economic activity varies significantly between states.

Foreign assistance is another important variable that has a deep impact on the country's economic growth. The international transfer of economic resources is the main board of foreign aid. The public aid flow consists of grants and loans, including the technical assistance of a donor government or an international organization to other governments or businesses in the recipient countries. Forms and purposes of financial and technical assistance are very diverse. The net economic function of this type of assistance is quite significant. There are a number of ways to be provided by the state's foreign assistance, but may not include explicit resource transfer. Sometimes preferential treatment is due to less developed countries in the form of decreased tariffs and special import quotas. In this way, these measures are useful in increasing the relative earnings of exports of less developed countries.

Another important aspect of foreign aid in the context of foreign policy is the preservation of external sovereignty in connection with severe dependence on foreign aid; It also needs diversification of source of foreign aid. It is the basic principle of science of international relations that the aid giving state Act provides a large extent in its own interests and providing assistance for other reasons is an exception rather than a rule. It is undoubtedly true that foreign aid was desirable, albeit a small redistribution effect on world health. It is less clear that foreign aid leads to direct political influence on the country of the recipient. This is especially true that the assistance provided by one country is the only source of further 'foreign aid, it still does not uniformly follow that the country of the recipient will follow the leadership of the donor country in foreign matters.

Political stability is accepted as one of the preliminary conditions for satisfactory economic growth and development. It can be any form of a system, democratic or correct, authoritarian without modicum stability, it is somewhat difficult to perform your investment programs effectively, to train your workforce, he made him be in his sanction, and to make himself be in a decisive sanction, and to try to get to be enough to be able to make it possible to make it available. It was possible in planning decision-making and so that it is necessary to believe. Economic and planning industry without renting other problems from the political arena. Economic development under the program of support of foreign policy is considered to be associated directly with the process of creating foreign policy. Politics creators are usually vigilant about the needs of their country's economy and accept all possible means to strengthen it.

The process of creating foreign policy is deeply rooted in the perception of various determinants, which are directly or indirectly responsible for the feasible foreign policy of the country. Unstable variables are more important compared to constant variables in the sense that the first needs to be better understood if someone really wants to see how they have their impact on the process of creating foreign policy. The contributions of different scientists in understanding different aspects of foreign policy at least definitely help analyze crisis situations that come to orbit the creators of foreign policies. One aspects of foreign policy that is not questionable is that it requires a lot of patience, understanding and skills to analyze or take over the decisive policy on any foreign policy issue. There are also human factors that determine one or the whole process, to a large extent quantitative in the case of population and qualitative in terms of national character, social structure, national morality, political institutions and experience and effective and healthy tradition of diplomacy. These determinants and instrumental points of the Policy Creation process include the essence of foreign policy and the main historical policy and essential interests of countries that are open to world public opinion and, of course, criticism.

Geopolitics is a science of the relationship between the universe and politics that attempts to provide geographical knowledge of the service to political leaders. It is more than a political geography that is descriptive. It looks from national aspirations, looking for facts and principles that can serve national goals. Geography is important in the creation of the international context of the state in areas concerning military logistics, business patterns, alliance formulas, membership between government organizations and various international forums, the UN of its specialized agencies and regional organizations such as EU, OPEC, ASEAN, SAARC, etc.

Important components of geography are location, size, topography, climate, and natural resources. Perhaps more important than the size is the location. This does a lot to repair a particular type of economy on the area and people. The location in terms of spatial relation to other land bodies and other countries also deeply affects state culture and economy and its military and power. The location tends to make the state of ground energy or sea energy with overall advantages and disadvantages. The location also appears in the diplomacy and strategy of war. This can help to determine whether the state will find its ground combat ground or a generally respected bumper area. The location of the state in relation to other countries is the geographical fact of a significant value that is or is not a neighbour, has significant strategic consequences and can greatly affect national security. It also tends to make the state of land with land or sea energy and, in terms of a special relationship with other land bodies and to other countries, also deeply affects state culture and economy and its economic and military power.

The priority areas are determined by states with regard to the location of a particular country. Littoral states in the same way are considerably in demand. There is a virtual race between the states, which controls these areas because of their military, political and economic interests in the Indian Ocean. The size is also another important variable that is closely related to the geopolitical situation of the Earth. Each state has borders in common for areas under the political control of other sovereign states or that extend along international waters and each state claims control of the airspace above its territory. The size gives the state army to retreat without surrender and has an advantage if the desire to fight for the next day. Its importance is that it also allows the location and liquidation of the critical population, economic, military and government facilities. Another advantage of a large size, if combined with a large population, is that the defeated large country would be very difficult. Topography had a significant impact on the definition of a modern state system. The islands and physical barriers of continents have defined natural areas for evaluating a number of sovereign independent states in the world from time to time. Barriers and surface communication routes, however, have their own importance in states of states, although rivers, mountains, jungles, and deserts are less important obstacles in the modern world than in the past. But even today, because of their traditional importance, international matters still affect.

The policy-maker is aware of the usefulness and importance of natural resources and raw materials for economic growth and development, international trade, national security, war power and a large number of other variables that have a close relationship with domestic and international consequences. Scientists have long received international policy scientists because they acknowledge that international power of the state depends on its war abilities, which in turn is determined by a safe approach to natural resources. Despite the massive destruction of military technology in the contemporary world, sources have "appeared as both subjects" and foreign policy levers in many countries. The principles of resource security that have against the distribution supply and demand imbalance reflect the growing international relations.

The environment and foreign policy

Problems with foreign and domestic policy are integrated products of the same political system and are designed to define and implement overall national purposes. Almost all decisions are taken in the whirlwind of internal pressures, and politicians often do not just have the freedom to continue and take all the decisions they consider to be the best. It is not possible to deny the fact that in all countries of the world, the "official" creator of politics is only one part of the process of creating policy. Many other parties are also involved, each attempting to influence the procedure based on their own interest. As a result, the "Policy Creation process is usually much more complicated. Many groups and individuals needed and are able to provide the necessary support automatically as a goal of a wide range of requests, promises, threats and requirements. Foreign and domestic policies are related to the products of the same political systems and are developing over all national objectives. They exist, in the national system at the moment.

Henry A. Kissinger, a former state secretary of the US, strongly feels that "foreign policy begins where domestic policy ends," while further elaborating his argument, he classified that this approach was only

applicable for a stable period, because it would be quite different than the role of different international components. If the domestic structure of the state is based on common ideas about what is fair or unfair, there is probably the possibility of consensus about the permissible goals and methods of foreign policy. If the domestic structure is large stable, then the attitude of the creators of politicians would be different. They would like to accept adventure foreign policy and ignore domestic cohesion. However, if the domestic structure is based on fundamentally different ideas of what is complicated by the behaviour of international affairs. Then it is difficult to even define the nature of disagreement, because what seems to be obvious to one side seems to be the most problematic for the other. Generally, political dilemma arises, because the advantages and disadvantages of the course seem evenly balanced. The definition of what is a problem and what criteria are relevant in the "solution" reflects to a large extent "domestic idea of what is fair, pressures induced by the decision-making process and experience that leads the leaders to their rise to eminence". It is assumed that if the domestic structure and the concept of legitimacy on which they are based-are quite different, there is still room for a state-owned meeting, but one should be obvious that "their ability to convince themselves because it no longer speaks the same language.

Because foreign affairs are considered one of the principles of concerns of all states. In a small state, the problem may include more than the basic problem of survival, larger states usually add a number of positive goals that everyone hopes to achieve in their own name. The task of each state on the international scene is typical of themselves, but everyone considers foreign policy a matter of high priorities and main imports. This is the main reason for all governments to be organized for foreign affairs with maximum care. However, the inefficient or careless domestic policy can be carried out or performed, no country can afford to function internationally for a long time, except for maximum efficiency. Implementation tools for foreign policy in any state reflect the best of which society is capable of. In all governments, facilities for foreign policy are somewhat identical.

The government manager must play an active role in basic significance and relevance of international matters. He is directed, led and helped by any narrow counselling and administrative apparatus that the government can boast, whether the "Cabinet" of the British "Revolutionary Council" of the Military Regime, the "Presidium", as was the case in the former Soviet Union or a less institutionalized agreement on the executive office. The main specialist in foreign affairs in the government is the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is to take care of the administrative department related to the creation of foreign policy and is widely accepted as the main official advisor to the head of the government. In all countries, the other departments directly participate in foreign policy decisions, financial military experts are almost always doing, and financial ministers (about trade or development issues) have practically become critical. Legislative bodies play roles dependent on their constitutional place, but foreign policy is primarily an executive privilege, which sometimes inhabits by legislative intervention. The actual part is assigned to diplomatic representatives located abroad. They are ubiquitous in the contemporary world, the number and strength of economic, cultural, military and scientific, etc. Representatives have grown. The department of foreign affairs of each state is actually strongly dependent on them. Information that transfers to their home government apparently affects politics, and they themselves do a lot of negotiations.

However, the nature of the government is existence in the state, it has its own importance in terms of the process of creating foreign policy. In order for the executive number of government programs that are associated with various and complex problems of modern societies, governments are forced to create a large network of organizations dealing with specific features and interests. In order to achieve certain objectives and objectives that deal with countless questions and claiming from the political system, liability must be decentralized according to functional lines and actions dealing with recurrent problems and requirements are launched. In the hope that the task of national leaders will be manageable, all except most important questions and decisions are usually transferred to the functional departments and agencies of the government. In the absence of a specific threat or opportunity to promote their foreign interests, the elites of the nation would like to turn their heads to domestic fears and entrust operational organizations for responsibility for dealing with routine activities including other nations. The normal functioning of diplomats, foreign trade experts and military planners tend to deal with a relatively update of the matter in normal times, national leaders whose main problems and priorities are always domestic-like economic problems or social unrest at all costs devotes their time and energy in matters that are less important.

Decentralisation is ideal to deal with the complexities of modern governments and capacity of the political leadership to state policy goals explicitly and unambiguously. As in most of the political systems, subordinate officials and agencies are supposed to apply only the stated criteria to specific situations to

determine the component decisions and actions to achieve the national interest. The officials would need clear instructions from the officials and the national leaders only when an issue involved conflict between stated goals or activities for which no policy guidance had been established. But the picture is altogether different. In fact, the policy statements issued by the national leadership in most cases do not provide explicit criteria that can be applied to most issues that emerge within the functional agencies of the government. Some of the reasons for this are the inability to foresee what specific policy issues and problems are likely to arise,

Decentralization is ideal for solving the complexity of modern governments and the capacity of political leadership with state goals explicitly and unambiguously. As in most political systems, subordinate officials and agencies should only apply the criteria for specific situations to determine the decisions and actions to achieve the national interest. Officials would only need clear instructions of officials and national leaders only when it is a problem between set goals or activities for which no political instructions have been established. But the picture is completely different. In fact, a statement of politics issued by the national leadership in most cases does not provide explicit criteria that can be used for most of the questions that appear within the functional agencies of the government. Some of the reasons for this as inability to Foresee What specific Policy Issues and Problems Are Likes to Arise of Conflicting Policy Objectives Both Foreign and Domestic, and the Practical Tendency to Avoid Commitment to Specific Police and Course of Action Before Adequate Information Can Be Gathered and analysed to access the relevant benefits and costs.

The creators of the decision face a number of problems if the situation is not clear and ambiguous. In fact, decision-making is difficult when the final intentions are not clear. The adoption of the right decisions is above all difficult when the sworn enemy mobilizes and concentrates its units on the border. The decision to respond to or not to fight or not, must be immediate. Obviously, the decision not to act can be disastrous as a stroke decision. There is no scientific answer to this problem. For example, all governments require a certain degree of acceptance by their population to end, and therefore politicians are engaged in what people think. This can be less true in authoritarian systems than in democracy, but it is still a factor in some importance. However, both authoritarian government and democracy are composed of congeries of people and interests that compete and cooperate in the process of policy creation, and this can lead to inefficiency, confusion, incorrectly directed politicians and delay in both systems. For states where the political process is more authoritarian or closed, it will be more useful to look at the features of governments and its structures rather than to explain foreign policy to the attributes of its society. Being closed political parties, public opinion and political interests will be less effective. These types of relations between the government and society are supported in studies of whether the conflict in states results in external or international conflict behaviour states.

Governments can sometimes use a foreign conflict as an excuse to gather their own people under the government. In times of domestic confusion or conflict, they can choose a quarrel with a foreign enemy in an effort to unify their people and avert them from their home conflict. Alternatively, involvement in foreign wars can sometimes create domestic protest and disagreement. Democracy, where governments may be reluctant or unable to effectively suppress disagreement, are particularly susceptible to foreign conflicts leading to domestic conflict, rather than vice versa. For centralist states, however, the external conflict rarely leads to an apparent domestic conflict and disagreement is easier to control. The domestic structure has a very fundamental impact, the way in which the actions and reactions of other states are interpreted. To some extent, every society finds itself in an environment that is not its own work and has some of the main lines of its units based on foreign policy. Indeed, environmental pressure can grow so strongly that it allows only one interpretation of its meaning.

"National Interest" is usually part of foreign policy, but although under certain circumstances it also applies to domestic policy, for example, if the national leaders are warned that it is in the national interest that industry becomes more productive. When referring to the domestic sphere, we usually refer to alternative conditions such as "public" or "general interests", "public" or "social good", etc., because the international and domestic areas are interrelated and can be thought about government activities as one complex of inputs and outputs, some of them and/or directed to domestic and other related. We could agree to the use of a national interest in a wider complex significance, including domestic policy. However, it should be more advantageous to limit it to foreign policy and leave the relatives of the "public" or "general" interest to be covered in order to distinguish between domestic and foreign policy. In the domestic field, all sources to control individuals and subgroups, which impose a certain idea of the general good. In the international sphere, the government comes against the conflict will of other countries that often have an inflexible

necessity, there is a much harder master. Second, we find the difference between the basic approach or the objectives of foreign and domestic policy. The main objectives of foreign policy planners focus on survival and defence. Many of its elements are closely linked to elements of domestic policy, such as foreign aid, business and defense expenses have an apparent impact on prosperity and standard of living, but are considered quite different angles. Thirdly, in domestic politics it is possible to question the very existence of a common good. On the other hand, despite all the difficulties of definitions, foreign policy is generally seen as based on the concept of a national interest that is considered to represent the whole society and is not a compromise between partial interests. Another analysis can lead us to a different conclusion, but so far even the western critics who refer to the national interest as a myth have not deny the essential importance of its image. For the fourth, with monopoly of diplomacy and defence, the central concern for foreign policy, the governments play a much more exclusive role in their work than in domestic politics. Individuals and subgroups are generally unconscious and helpless and less disturbed than in the domestic context.

Foreign policy is not only focused on the international environment, it is also from what increases the level analysis, part of the international environment. This is the case that one foreign policy is obviously a feature of the environment of other foreign policies, but it is also in the sense that all foreign policies are part of the texture of the international system as a whole. Current international political systems that include historically proven ideas and formulas have associated with modern technology. Several revolutions of the current era in transport, communication, energy, production, weapons and space had a direct or indirect impact on the interaction of states. Many tensions of international policy in the nuclear era have resulted from the inevitable frustrating efforts to fit into traditional political categories into the current environment. Today, the political system is so compact and closed, in which the current state system works, that there are no international policy borders. Each explosion of political, economic or social forces in this closed system inevitable has an impact on a set of other countries. It does not believe that no part of the country has been classified as politically undesirable or strategically important. Each state of the contemporary world is important for each other state, one valuable manifestation of a new dimension of international policy is a great change in the number and nature of the participants of this process. It is no wonder with such different members of the international political system that this process has been significantly modified.

Since the establishment of the UN, however, there will be some major changes on the world political scene, such as "Bipolarity of a large and vital area of international policy, gradually shading into a certain polycentric pattern, development of highly sophisticated and absolutely destructive nuclear projects, growth, which is dishonest but gentle and serious but fine. However, it is non-removable, it is inconsistent and non-uniform, and is disappearing. We can obtain effective understanding of the nature and extent of the international environment by remembering the following variables that determine the common relationship between the process of foreign creation and the international environment, what are the government's functions? Employed or creators of politicians, what is the role of international law? Finally, if the policy creator assumes that most relationships are in nature or are other types of relationships.

However, states that are the primary unit of international action are very different in terms of size, population, social conditions, etc., but despite their differences, they show certain common attributes, and they give them "statehood". These attributes are: (1) territoriality; (2) the right of internal control; (3) external autonomy and equality; and (4) permanent populations and economic system. Prominent among non-state actors is the UN with universal membership and organization of a permanent general purpose. He is entitled to solve any international problem anywhere in the world. Its permanent institutionalization has a deep and lasting impact on the international scene. The procedures are different from its existence, problems that could be sufficient attention, now gain publicity of glare and have invented new methods to deal with a crisis situation. Small states receive proper hearing of their problems. Sometimes it controls the impact of their economic and military power. It has the ability to solve a wide range of problems and functional activities are carried out under a large scale. "The style and tone of international relations, as well as content, have changed permanently. Because of these facts, the creators of the creators must consider the role of the UN in a wide range of situations." However, we should not ignore this fact that the UN is primarily an interstate organization, in some sense a permanent multilateral diplomatic conference which is of immense importance. It consists of states, and it will be effective or not to the extent and the way the states themselves desire.

Conclusion

The international environment has become so complicated that it is very difficult for the state to monitor and achieve its goals foreign policy. Several factors have been identified. First, they are different levels of personal meetings of national leaders to routine performing action programs-they interact with action programs. Secondly, the inability of nation states to control the activities of other states and the third, uncertainty that arises from these conditions and from the inability of one nation to predict changes in the international environment in the same point of view as other nations. The complex environment of international policy has transformed the creation and implementation of foreign policy rather uncertain art rather than accurate science. Politicians of politicians are usually calculated the risk of formulating their goals and action programs, while trying to maintain flexibility to the real circumstances as they take place. The success of the country's foreign policy depends on the exact assessment of the interests, intentions and abilities of their own and other nations. Such arrangements must often be made by an informal judgment based on political wisdom and experience, because they can rarely be developed in a precisely mathematical way. Rosenau correctly pointed out that "at the level of foreign policy, the forces of the past and the forces of the present, co-exist or sympathize. Elections and activities of foreign policy creators can be led by cultural standards and historical precedents or elections and activities can be conducted by changing requirements based on international systems or decision-making companies."

References

1. Joseph Frankel, *International Politics: Conflict and Harmony* (London,1973), p. 31.
2. Brain White," *Analysing Foreign Policy: Problems and Approaches*: in Michel Clarke and Brain White, (eds.) *Understanding Foreign Policy: The Foreign Policy System Approach* (Vermont,1989), p.1.
3. *Ibid.* pp. 10-11.
4. Joseph Frankel, n.1, p. 11.
5. James N. Rosenau, "The Premises and Promises of Decisions Making Analysis," In
6. James C. Charles Worth (ed.) *Contemporary Political Analysis* (New York, 1967),
7. pp. 208-209.
8. James N Rosenau, *The Premises and Promises of Decision-Making Analysis*, in James C. Charles Worth (ed.) *Contemporary Political Analysis* (Newyork,1967). pp-208-209
9. Joseph Frankel, *The Making of Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Decision Making* (New York, 1963), p. 174.
10. Robert L. Wendzel, *International Relations*, (London ,1977), pp. 137-138.
11. K.J. Holsti, *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, (Delhi,1988) pp. 242-243.
12. *Ibid.* pp. 247-250.
13. Walter Krause, *International Economist* (Boston, 1965), p. 6.
14. Normal D. Palmer and Howard C. Parkins, *International Relations: The World Community in Transition* {Calcutta,1970}, p. 137.
15. *Ibid.* pp. 138-139.
16. Jagdish Bhagwat and Richard S. Eckhaus, *Foreign Aid*, (Baltimore, 1970), p.7.
17. Edward S Mason, *Foreign Aid and Foreign Policy* (New York, 1966), p. 47.
18. Richard Rosecrans, *International Relations, Peace or War* (New York, 1972), p. 258.
19. Robert K. Carr, et al. *American Democracy in Theory and Practice* (New York, 1986), p. 482.
20. Robert K. Carr, et al. *American Democracy in Theory and Practice* (New York, 1986), p. 482.
21. Eric D Newsom, "Uniting the Tools of Force and Diplomacy to Enhance Security," *Electronic Journals Public Affair Office, US Embassy, New Delhi, May 2000*, p.9
22. Robert L. Wendzel, n. 27, p. 175.
23. Kenneth W. Thomson and Roy C. Macarids, "The Comparative study of Foreign Policy" in Roy C. Macarids (ed.), *Foreign Policy in World Politics*, (New Jersy, 1967), p.4.
24. Norman D. Palmer and Howard C. Parkins, *International Relations: The World Community in Transition* (Calcutta, 1969), p. 35.
25. William H. Hessler, "A Geography for Americans", *US Naval Institute Proceedings*, Vol. XX, March 1944, p. 246.

26. Quoted in Frank M. Russel, *Theories of International Relations* (New York, 1936), p. 45.
27. Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout, *Towards a Politics of the Planet Earth* (New York, 1973), p. 268.
28. Hans. J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (Calcutta, 1976), p. 110.
29. Norman D. Palmer & Howard C. Parkins, n.31, p. 38.
30. Robert L. Wendzel, n.27, p. 89.
31. Frederick H. Hartman, *The Relations of Nations* (New York, 1967), pp. 47-48.
32. Robert L. Wendzel, n. 27, p. 91. Also see, A.F.K. Organski, *World Politics*, (New York, 1968).
33. Norman D. Palmer and Howard C. Parkins, n.31, p. 38.
34. Robert L. Wendzel, n.27, p. 93.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 280.
36. Norman D. Palmer and Howard C. Parkins, n31, pp. 39-40.
37. Norman J. Padelford, George A. Lincon and Lee D. Olvey, n. 17, pp. 88-92.
38. Robert L. Wendzel, n.27, p. 24.
39. Norman J. Padelford, *The Dynamics of International Politics*, (Newyork,1967), p. 213.
40. Henry A. Kissinger, "Domestic Structure and Foreign Policy" in James N. Rosenau (ed.), *International Politics and Foreign Policy: A Reader in Research and Theory* (New York, 1969), pp. 261-62.
41. *Ibid.* p. 262.
42. Edmund Burke, (London, 1826), Vol. VIII, pp. 214-15
43. James N. Rosenau, n. 31, pp. 268-73.
44. Charles O. Larche and Abdul A. Said, *Concepts of International Politics* (New Jersey, 1970), pp. 40-41.
45. Norman J. Padelford, n.67, pp. 214-15.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 215-16.
48. Shimon Peres and David's Sling, *The Arming of Israel* (London, 1970), pp. 165-66
49. Robert C. Wendzel, n.27, p. 124.
50. Quincy Wright, *A Study of War* (Chicago, 1965), p. 841.
51. Bruce Russett and Harvey Starr, *World Politics* (New York, 1985), P. 299
52. Michael Sohi, "The Nexus of Civil and International Conflict in Red Gurr (ed.), *Handbook of Political Conflict* (New York, 19).
53. Henry A. Kissinger, n. 31, p. 262.
54. Joseph Frankel, *National Interest* (London, 1970), p. 38.
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.
56. Roy E. Jones, *Analysing Foreign Policy* (London, 1970), p. 112.
57. Charles O. Larche Jr. and Abdul A. Said, n.28, pp. 121-22.
58. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-23.
59. J. Bandyopadhyaya, *The Making of India's Foreign Policy* (New Delhi,1984), p. 99.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.
61. Robert L. Wendzel, n.27, pp. 1-2.
62. *Ibid.*, pp 2-5
63. *Ibid.*, pp 5-6
64. Norman J. Padelford. al., n.67, pp. 220-21.
65. *Ibid.*, pp 223.
66. *Ibid.*, pp 225.