

政治发展与治理研究系列丛书

马荣久 著

外交政策分析

Foreign Policy Analysis

山东大学出版社

外交政策分析

Foreign Policy Analysis

马荣久 著

山东大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

外交政策分析/马荣久著. — 济南: 山东大学出版社, 2015. 2

ISBN 978-7-5607-5233-4

I. ①外… II. ①马… III. ①对外政策—政策分析 IV. ①D801

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2015)第 035283 号

责任策划: 徐 翔

责任编辑: 王 潇 郑琳琳

封面设计: 牛 钧

出版发行: 山东大学出版社

社 址 山东省济南市山大南路 20 号

邮 编 250100

电 话 市场部(0531)88364466

经 销: 山东省新华书店

印 刷: 山东和平商务有限公司

规 格: 720 毫米×1000 毫米 1/16

13 印张 213 千字

版 次: 2015 年 2 月第 1 版

印 次: 2015 年 2 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 32.00 元

版权所有, 盗印必究

凡购本书, 如有缺页、倒页、脱页, 由本社营销部负责调换

《政治发展与治理研究系列丛书》

编委会

主 编 葛 荃

编 委 (按姓氏笔画排序)

王学玉 王建民 王韶兴

方 雷 孔令栋 刘玉安

曹现强 崔桂田 葛 荃

总 序

2011年是山东大学建校110周年。作为中国近代第二所官办大学——“山东大学堂”，山东大学的积累之悠久，底蕴之深厚，堪可感慨系之。

晚清光绪二十七年(1901年)，山东巡抚袁世凯奏呈朝廷并由光绪帝御批的《山东大学堂章程》中，就山东大学堂的办学宗旨作了这样的阐述：

公家设立学堂，是为天下储人才，非为诸生谋进取；
诸生来堂肄业，是为国家图富强，非为一己利身家。

在20世纪初叶，在东渐之西学纷至沓来的近代中国，袁氏奏呈的“办学章程”有着某种意义上的传承性与超越性。愚以为，袁氏立意“天下”、“国家”，绝非其偶然心念一动，在这一理念的背后，当是数千年孔孟儒学传统文化精粹的蕴聚与支撑。为了“天下”、“国家”，而非“一己”之“进取”的办学理念，在那个中华羸弱、列强环伺的年代，越发彰显着山东大学的历史使命与民族责任，成为山东大学立足与发展的价值基石。正是基于这样的理念，山东大学在伴随着时代动荡、社会变迁的百余年行进途中，尚能安然把握着方向与节奏，使之得以在不同的历史阶段，均能汇聚时代的学术精英，渐次积淀了丰厚的学术内涵和大学文化底蕴。迄今，亦能风雨无阻，依然跻身于全国高校第一方阵的前排。

政治学与公共管理学院是山东大学百余年行程过半的时候才得以

组建的,如今业已年过而立。作为全国政治学与公共管理学在山东区域的一方重镇,其或发展或进步或逡巡或蹒跚,总会令人瞩目,引人关注。作为山东大学不可割舍的肌体,政管学院之举手投足、一笑一颦,往往事关全校的布局与发展,甚或波及百年山大之盛誉。于是兹事体大,吾侪不敏,遂以《论语·泰伯》之教训为警醒:“士不可以不弘毅,任重而道远!”为此,于2009年即谋划聚合全院教师,协同努力,做一学术振兴。列为其重要举措之一,即出版学术著作若干,自成体系,冠名曰“政治发展与治理研究系列丛书”,为的是既能涵盖学院诸多学科,又能与主体方向不离不弃——推动山东大学政治学学科建设与发展而积累学术内涵;同时,在这样的操练过程中,不断推出青年才俊,实现个体与整体的同步迈进。

我们肩负着学界前辈的成就与希冀,我们延续着百年山大的底蕴和盛誉。在当下学术与世俗混而难分、盛名与实学真伪莫辨的“转型时代”,我们当以山大人的真诚与辛劳,为学界奉上这组系列文字。目的是弘扬学术,以文会友,抑或移风易俗,振兴我山东大学之政治学学科。

是为序。

葛荃

山东大学政治学与公共管理学院教授兼院长

2012年12月17日 重识于巢舍

Preface

In the mind of the reading public, foreign policy does exist, but it is generally remote and inaccessible; foreign policy consists in what one state does to, or with, other states, and it is mainly a subject written about by journalists, retired diplomats, and ministers looking for a place in history. However, there is another literature altogether dealing with foreign policy in the academic world. It is nested in the general subject area of international relations, the bridge between international and comparative politics, itself a close relative of political science. It has grown up over the last nearly sixty years under the name of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA).

As a distinct and consciously theoretical enterprise within the field of international relations, FPA can date back to the late 1950s and early 1960s. Because the initial FPA-style works focused on the decision-making process of foreign policy, FPA is also known as Foreign Policy Decision Making (FPDM).

FPA has sought to develop middle range theories, i. e. , theories that are not general accounts of all foreign policy behavior but instead are accounts of either the foreign policy of some types of states or foreign policy in specific situations. This has dowered FPA with a

special position and characteristics of subject.

FPA is a bridging field linking international relations theory and comparative politics. To analyze a foreign policy or an important decision, we need to explore the roles played by a series of variables, both domestic and international. These variables not only involve the relationships of states and the international system's attributes—mainly power configuration, power distribution and its change, but they also refer to internal political system and structure, political culture and ideology, media and public opinions, as well as political leaders, including their cognitive, psychological and personality factors. In this sense, FPA could cut across the “artificial boundary” between domestic and international politics.

FPA is a bridging field linking the worlds of academia and policy-making. Foreign policy is the starting point and the foothold of international relations research, because, in a sense, FPA provides the basis for the development of theories, while the development of international politics theories is nothing more than to serve for the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. In this sense, compared with many other sub-fields in international politics, FPA is closer to practice. Indeed, FPA places greater emphasis on policy-relevant theoretical work. Theoretical perspectives from FPA remain essential for diagnosing events, explaining their causes, prescribing responses, and evaluating the impact of different policies and conducts.

The objective of this book is to introduce a useful framework of foreign policy analysis which can help us to make sense of the interaction between foreign policy and the context within which foreign policies are formulated and implemented; particularly, the influence factors arising from the context in the process of policy-making, the functional mechanism and paths through which the factors or variables at different levels play their roles. Seeking to answer the question of what accounts for the behavior of nations and how policymakers actually

make decisions, the book provides a survey of theoretical perspectives on the sources of foreign policy organized by means of levels of analysis, moving from individual level approaches to decision groups and from domestic level approaches to systemic theories. In addition to providing a survey of the relevant scholarly literature and theoretical perspectives, empirical examples are employed throughout. We will explore a series of policy-oriented case studies drawn from a wide range of countries and time periods, especially from the US foreign policy and China's foreign policy. Our objective is to integrate theory and policy, debating the merits of alternative theoretical approaches in the context of specific historical case studies of the policy-making process.

Contents

Chapter 1 Overview and Evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis	(1)
1.1 Policy and Foreign Policy	(1)
1.2 Foreign Policy Analysis	(4)
1.3 Paradigmatic Works of FPA	(6)
1.4 Further Development of FPA	(13)
Chapter 2 Leaders' Perception, Psychology and Personality in FPA	(15)
2.1 Do Leaders Matter?	(15)
2.2 Leaders' Perception and Misperception	(19)
2.3 Leaders' Emotion and Psychology	(23)
2.4 Leaders' Personality	(25)
Chapter 3 Group Dynamics, Groupthink and Foreign Policy	(28)
3.1 Small Group Dynamics	(28)
3.2 The Groupthink Syndrome	(31)

Chapter 4 Rational Choice, Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics in FPA	(37)
4.1 Introduction	(37)
4.2 Rational Actor Model	(38)
4.3 Organizational Process Model	(44)
4.4 Bureaucratic Politics Model	(48)
Chapter 5 Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy	(53)
5.1 Introduction	(53)
5.2 Political System and Its Foreign Policy Effect	(55)
5.3 Political Game and Its Foreign Policy Effect	(64)
5.4 Summary	(70)
Chapter 6 The Media, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy	(72)
6.1 Introduction	(72)
6.2 Media and Foreign Policy	(73)
6.3 Public Opinion and Foreign Policy	(81)
6.4 Summary	(85)
Chapter 7 National Attributes and Foreign Policy	(86)
7.1 Introduction	(86)
7.2 National Attribute and Its General Characters	(87)
7.3 National Attributes and Foreign Policy	(89)
7.4 Case Analysis	(95)
Chapter 8 Culture, Strategic Culture and Foreign Policy	(100)
8.1 Introduction	(100)
8.2 Defining Culture	(101)
8.3 Culture and Foreign Policy	(103)
8.4 Strategic Cultures and State Behavior	(109)
8.5 Summary	(112)

Chapter 9 International System and Foreign Policy	(114)
9.1 Foreign Policy under the Perspective of Realism	(114)
9.2 Foreign Policy under the Perspective of Liberalism	(119)
9.3 Foreign Policy under the Perspective of Constructivism	(122)
Chapter 10 National Role and Foreign Policy	(128)
10.1 Role and National Role	(128)
10.2 National Role and Foreign Policy	(130)
10.3 The Relevance of National Role in FPA	(134)
10.4 Case Analysis	(135)
Appendices	(141)
Appendix 1 Domestic Level Analysis of FP	(141)
Appendix 2 Regional Level Analysis of FP	(160)
Bibliography	(183)

Chapter 1

Overview and Evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis

1.1 Policy and Foreign Policy

People talked in terms of diplomatic relations, peace and war, economic sanctions and military deterrence, and the other forms of foreign policy. Most of us dealing with the subject have confidence that they knew what foreign policy was and that others presumably shared their conceptualizations, removing the need for explication. As a consequence, there has been a remarkable feature of the study of foreign policy, namely, the general concept of foreign policy has been given scant attention. Against this, it is imperative to define the basic conceptions as the starting point of our academic journey.

1.1.1 The Concept of Policy

Policy could be defined as a set of basic rules or principles and associated guidelines, which are formulated and enforced by the governing body of an organization so as to direct and limit its actions in pursuit of long-term goals. In this case, there are three essential factors that policy contains: objectives, actions, and rules or principles.

We shall define objective as essentially an “image” of a future “state

of affairs”—a “set of conditions” to be fulfilled or a “set of specifications”, which when met are to be regarded as the achievement of what was desired by the decision-makers. For example, “peaceful rise” is an objective of contemporary Chinese diplomacy. Meanwhile, “new type of major-power relationship” is one of the objectives in China’s foreign policy towards the US.

Action means “to accomplish an objective, the state or process of acting or doing, something done or accomplished”. Actions have a threefold aspect: which has occurred, is occurring, and which is projected. As we know, “summit meeting” is an action taken to propel the development of state-to-state relations. “Diplomatic negotiating” is a widespread action in the foreign affairs.

Another component of policy is rules or principles, that is, the guides to action.

Rules are specific prescriptions or proscriptions for action, that is, the occasion for a response or the conditions under which a particular response will be made. To oppose the invasion from others or to oppose terrorism points to the rules.

Principles are beliefs of fact, causation, and rectitude, that is, the substance of a response to some future situation; the interpretation of future events and circumstances.

The four cases below reflect the meaning of principles:

(1) Five principles of peaceful coexistence, i. e. , mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other’s internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

(2) China will never be the first to use nuclear weapons.

(3) Any move by the Soviet Union to reduce atomic stockpiles will be regarded by USA as an empty gesture in the Cold War.

(4) Offshore balance, that is, a great power uses favored regional power to check the rise of potential hostile powers.

Policy is constituted by a series of decisions; decision-making can be

regarded as the core of policy. They are tied up by each other; however, there exists discrepancy between the two conceptions.

Decision-making is defined as “a process which results in the selection from a socially defined, limited number of problematical, alternative projects of one project intended to bring about the particular future state of affairs envisaged by the decision-makers”^①.

Decision-making leads to a course of action based on project. The term project is employed here to include objectives and techniques. Adoption of the project signifies that the decision-makers were motivated by an intention to accomplish something. At the same time, it involves valuation and evaluation.

1.1.2 The Concept of Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is defined as the totality of a country's *policies* toward and *interactions* with the environment *beyond its border*.

We can define “policy” as the combination of objective, action and rules or principles. The notion of “foreign” applies to anything beyond the legal boundaries of a state, to areas where it has no legal authority over territory or people. Foreign policy is directed to other countries or has an impact on other countries.

To some extent, foreign policy can be understood as *the sum of official external relations*. Foreign policy is what the states do in the field of external relations; it is the actual foreign policy behavior directed across the borders of states, the activity actually performed by the official representatives of states, in order to secure and advance the national interests, and to enhance the power and prestige of one country in world affairs.

We draw upon the above views and adopt a comprehensive definition of foreign policy which comprises:

- (1) The goals pursued by a state and the principles followed in its

① R. C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck and B. Sapin, *Foreign Policy Decision-Making* (Revisited), New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, p. 78.

interaction with other states;

(2) The decisions taken to realize these goals and objectives;

(3) The behavior engaged in to implement these decisions.

Foreign policy behavior refers to the observable artifacts of foreign policy; specific actions and words used to influence others in the realm of foreign policy. Foreign policy behavior may include behavior that was accidental or unintended by the government, and decisions to do nothing may not leave any behavior artifacts. Thus, there exist some differences between foreign policy behavior and diplomacy.

Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations or intercession between representatives of groups or states. It usually refers to the conduct of professional diplomats with regard to issues of peace-making, trade, war, economics, culture, environment and human rights, etc.

1.2 Foreign Policy Analysis

Analysis is the process of breaking a complex topic or substance into smaller parts to gain a better understanding of it. Foreign Policy Analysis means the necessary breaking down of foreign policy into its constituent's parts, concepts and processes, and the examination of the impact of its various environments. At the heart of the study or analysis of foreign policy is the desire to explore the decision making, processes and conditions of the decisions, to understand countries' actions and behaviors towards other countries and the international environment generally.

As a scholar points out, FPA can be understood in a sense akin to psychoanalysis^①, whereby an attempt is made to draw out deeper meanings, regular pattern or law than appear on the surface and to understand action in terms of the way actors constantly redefine themselves through interaction with others, the interplay between the

^① Christopher Hill, *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, "Preface", xix.

interior and exterior worlds.

Overall, Foreign Policy Analysis, on the one hand, enquires into the motives and other sources of the behavior of international actors, particularly states; it does this by giving a good deal of attention to the decision-making process, the interplay between the domestic and the external sources of behavior. On the other hand, FPA aims at improving foreign policy making to enable states to achieve better outcomes and, in some instances, even to enhance the possibility of peaceful relations between states.

The objectives of FPA necessitate the engagement with a host of social science fields, such as psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, anthropology, economics, and a number of subfields, including comparative politics and public policy, as well as international relations(IR). Thus, FPA is interdisciplinary in its effort to explain foreign policy. Furthermore, FPA is multi-level and multi-factorial.^① It examines explanatory variables from all levels of analysis, from the most micro to the most macro; it views the explanation of foreign policy decision making as multi-factorial. Meanwhile, FPA tries to integrate a variety of information across levels of analysis and spanning numerous disciplines of human knowledge.

As a field of study, Foreign Policy Analysis is characterized by its actor-specific (instead of actor-general) focus. In the simplest terms, it is the study of the process, effects, causes, or outputs of foreign policy decision-making in either a comparative or case-specific manner. The underlying and often implicit argument theorizes that human beings, acting as a group or within a group, compose and cause change in international politics.^②

① Valerie M. Hudson, "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1(1), 2005, pp. 2-3.

② Scholar holds that the end of the Cold War revealed anew that it is not possible to explain or predict system change at the level of system-level variables alone. This event involves variables more in harmony with FPA: the personalities of Gorbachev, Havel, Walesa; the activities of actors such as the Lutheran Church and the Green Movement; the struggles between various domestic players, such as the military, the Communist Party, the bureaucrats, and so forth. See Valerie M. Hudson, "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations", pp. 13-14.