AMBO UNIVERSITY WOLISO CAMPUS SCHOOL OF GOVERNANCE AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

COURSE OUTLINE	
Course Title & Code	**Ethiopian Foreign Policy and Diplomacy** [GaDS3112]
Instructor's Name	
ECTS/Chr.	5ECTS / 3 Credit hours
Academic Year	2019/20 G.C.
Semester	II

CONTENTS

Chapters	Reading Materials
Chapter One: Introduction 1.1. Conceptual Definitions of Foreign Policy, Diplomacy and National Interest 1.2. The Origin and Evolution of Diplomatic Communication and Foreign Policy Making 1.3. Foreign Policy and Diplomacy as a Field of Study 1.4 . Foreign Policy Making and National Interest 1.4.1. National Interest - Functions of National Interest - Determinants of National Interest - Instruments of Advancing National Interest - National Interest and Foreign Policy - Constraints on National Interest 1.4.2. Foreign Policy and Its Formulation - How Foreign Policy is made? - Objectives of Foreign Policy - Determinants of Foreign Policy: Domestic and External Factors 1.4.3. Instruments of Foreign Policy - Propaganda - Trade - Military and Economic Power - Diplomacy	Theory of International Politics, pp. 131-139; 139-149; International Politics, pp. 83-129 Wright, Stephen (ed.) (1999) African Foreign Policies, West view press: USA
Chapter Two: Diplomacy and Diplomatic Communication 2.1 . Objectives and Functions of Diplomacy and Diplomats 2.2 . Types and Characteristics of Diplomatic Practices - Traditional Diplomacy - Modern diplomacy 2.3. The Conduct of Diplomacy: Diplomatic Processes and Diplomatic Bargaining 2.4. The Environment for the Conduct of Diplomacy - The National Setting - The Diplomatic Setting - The International System 2.5. Rules of Effective Diplomatic Communication and bargaining	Theory of International Politics, pp. 131-139; 139-149; International Politics, pp. 83-129 Wright, Stephen (ed.) (1999) African Foreign Policies, West view press: USA

2.6.The Instruments of International bargaining 2.7.The Nature and Characteristics of Power as Base for Diplomacy Elements of power: - National geography - Population - Government National Infrastructure: Technology, Transportation and Information and Communication systems 2.8. 3.6 The Negotiating Process: Preliminaries, Inducing Agreement and Problem solving 2.9.Options for Conducting Diplomacy	
Chapter Three: Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in Ethiopia under Imperial System **3.1. Overview of Ethiopian External Relations in Pre-Haile Sellassie Period** 3.1.1. Tewodros`s Foreign policy and International Relations  3.1.2. Emperor Yohannes IV`s Foreign Policy and International Relations 3.1.3. Menelik`s Foreign policy and International Relations **3.2. Foreign Policy of Emperor Haile Selassie I** - Modernization and Emperor's Foreign Policy - Pre-Italian Invasion - Post- Liberation - Ethiopia and Europe - Ethio- US Relations - Ethiopia, the Middle East, Africa and the OAU	Bahiru Zewdie (2002). A History of Modern Ethiopia: 1855-1991
Chapter Four: Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in Ethiopia in post Imperial period **4.1. Ethiopian Foreign Policy and Diplomatic Relations during the Dergue Era** 4.1.1. Dergue's Foreign Policy Orientation and Priorities 4.1.2. Ethiopia, Its Neighbors and the Rest of Africa 4.1.3. Ethiopia and the Socialist Camp 4.1.4. Ethiopia and the Non-Aligned Movement Ethio-Arab Relations **4.2. Ethiopian foreign policy and diplomatic relation under the EPRDF** 4.2.1. Guiding Principles of Ethiopia's Foreign Policy 4.2.2. Economic Diplomacy as a New Paradigm 4.2.3. Ethiopia and the West (US and Multilateral Institutions) 4.2.4. Ethiopia and the Middle East 4.2.5. Ethiopia, Somalia, Eritrea, the Sudan, Egypt and Djibouti 4.2.6. Ethiopia, Africa and the OAU/AU **4.3. Changes and continuities in Ethiopia's Foreign policy Orientation**	FDRE Foreign Policy and National Security Strategy, pp1-150 Bahiru Zewdie (2002). A History of Modern Ethiopia: 1855-1991 FDRE Foreign Policy and National Security Strategy, pp1-150

Chapter One: Introduction

1.4.Conceptual Definitions of Foreign Policy, Diplomacy and National Interest:

Foreign policy is the content of foreign relations, comprising the aspirations and aims a country wants to achieve in its relations with other states and international governmental organizations. It is the expression of its national interest *vis-à-vis* other states. A well-rounded and comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience, to conduct foreign relations with the rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interest of the nation. It is a plan of what you do in your relation with others in the global political system. It is the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (Usually a state) in international relations. It is the set of priorities and plan of action or percepts established by national leaders to serve the guideline for choosing various courses of action. The processes of identifying the elements which a state considers constitute its vital national interest.

The term "diplomacy" is of Greek origin, and its meaning is twofold. On the one hand, as a verb—*diploo*, it comes back to a double folding, and on the other hand, as a noun—*diploma*, throughout the Middle Ages, it designated official documents folded in a particular way which conferred on their bearer certain rights and privileges. During the Renaissance, *diplomas* were associated with papal acts. In particular, a *diploma* is a letter of papal nomination. These letters were written by a cleric who was called a *diplomatarius*. From the end of the seventeenth century, the methods necessary to verify the authenticity of these documents are brought under the term *diplomatica*. Moreover, it is in this sense that the word appeared for the first time in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* in 1762. During the same period, concomitantly, we witness an extension of the term *diploma*. Not only does it continue to refer to documents attributing privileges to certain individuals, but, through a series of associations cumbersome to disentangle, the term *diploma* also progressively comes to designate the collection of official documents and treaties concluded between various sovereigns. Thus, because this falls within the context of treaties between sovereign entities, the adjective derived from *diploma*, diplomatic, becomes associated with the activities of envoys of one sovereign in another sovereign's court. This explains the link between diplomatic activity, on the one hand, and peace, war, and alliances, on the other hand. An evolution, technically similar to that of the term *diploma*, occurred around the notion of the diplomatic corps. While in the seventeenth century the diplomatic corps was analogous to the

people's body of law, from the middle of the eighteenth century it began to designate all of the ministers accredited in another court.

 Finally, the term "diplomacy" made its way into the 1798 edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* and signified the "Science of the relationships, of interests between powers." In *Webster's Dictionary* of 1817, diplomacy is perceived in a broader sense since, henceforth, it covers "the customs and rule of public ministries, the forms of negotiation; and the corps of ambassadors and envoys." By and large, this is the definition of diplomacy as it has come down to us. Overall, besides the conceptual variations characterized by the upheavals in etymology, we can stress that diplomacy falls into a distinct field of practice: that of war, peace, and alliances. In other words, this is the political domain. In that respect, everything that one could term new forms of "diplomacy" (humanitarian, cultural, or others) above all serves these original goals of diplomacy. Yet what of its relationship to foreign policy? Certain institutional ambiguities offer little relief to those who would like to differentiate them. In the International Studies Association (ISA), there is, indeed, a specific section dedicated to the analysis of foreign policy, which is linked to the journal *Foreign Policy Analysis*. In addition, there is a section on diplomatic studies. This decoupling is surprising when we know how difficult it is to get an autonomous section recognized in the ISA. In reality, in our view, diplomacy and foreign policy evolve at distinct but complementary levels. Foreign policy is situated at a meta-level. It formulates objectives which diplomacy pursues. Certainly, diplomacy is based on means and instruments. Yet it is also about the form that interactions take. A poor ambassador can derail years of serene relations. Thus, diplomacy concerns instruments and practices through which not only states, but also actors support, coordinate, and achieve their identities, interests, and values.

Diplomacy generally refers to a government's process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and current policies. By this accord, nation-states partake in the most pluralistic organizing institution in the international system. One state can confidently enter into diplomatic relations with another under a shared understanding. With sovereignty mutually recognized, nation-states can use diplomacy as the means to achieving political ends.

National Interests can as defined as the claims, objectives, goals, demands and interests which a nation always tries to preserve, protect, defend and secure in relations with other

nations. National interest is the most crucial concept in international relations. It is the key concept in foreign policy as it provides the material on the basis of which foreign policy is made. While formulating foreign policy all statesmen are guided by their respective national interests. It is the purpose of foreign policy to conduct foreign relation in a way so as to achieve national interest to the maximum extent. But it is not easy to determine exactly what a nation's national interest is.

1.5. The Origin and Evolution of Diplomatic Communication and Foreign Policy Making

Diplomatic Communication: The means whereby a state communicates with another. In this matter there are established usages, the breach of which is likely to be inefficient and also lead to ruffled feathers. Where one state's foreign ministry wishes to communicate with its counterpart in another state, the message (whether oral or written) is ordinarily passed to the state's diplomatic mission in the capital concerned for onward personal transmission by a *diplomatic agent to the relevant official in the other state's ministry. In this way the message can be delivered at the appropriate level and with exactly the emphasis and tone that is calculated to be most likely to achieve the desired result. An alternative but usually much less satisfactory channel is to give the message to the recipient state's diplomatic mission which is resident in the capital of the state sending the message. The disadvantage of this channel is the lack of personal delivery to the official responsible for the issue on which the message-sending state seeks a satisfactory response.

However, when one state wishes to protest strongly to another, the preferred channel is to use the resident mission of the state to which the protest is addressed. The *head of mission can be summoned to meet a senior figure – a *minister or a very high official – who can register the state's displeasure in no uncertain terms, and with greater weight than would be available to the protesting state's head of mission in the foreign state's capital. In the event of the message sending state having no diplomatic representation in the capital of the recipient state, the appropriate channel for the more normal type of message is also through the recipient state's diplomatic mission in the capital of the message-sending state. If there is no such mission (but assuming that the two states are in *diplomatic relations), the message-sending state will select a place where both states have diplomatic representation and send the message to its mission there for passage to the recipient state's mission with the request that it be transmitted to that state's foreign ministry. A further possibility where neither state has a diplomatic mission in the other's capital but where at least one of them has a *consular post, is for that post to be used. However, in a high diplomatic matter, it might be thought

inappropriate to involve a *consular officer. And for the message-sending state to use its consular post in the *receiving state for diplomatic purposes, the consent of the receiving state would need to be secured. What all this reflects is that in the normal way the foreign ministry is far and away the leading agency responsible for the conduct of a state's *international relations; and that its diplomatic agents are the medium through which it makes external representations. Thus *diplomats act as the voice box of the state *vis-à-vis* other states.

Accordingly, when a government department other than the foreign ministry wishes to communicate with a foreign state, the proper channel of communication is for it to use its own foreign ministry. Unless special circumstances obtain (as, for example, in the case of the states of the *European Union), such a department is not entitled to communicate directly with its foreign counterpart, nor with its diplomats resident in the capital of the state concerned, nor with the diplomats of that state resident in its own capital. However, an exception to this rule may be permitted by a foreign ministry in respect of technical or routine matters, where there may well be obvious advantage in the relevant government department – for example, that responsible for transport or for civil aviation – contacting its counterpart directly. Such 'exceptions' are now by no means as exceptional as they used to be. However, a foreign ministry will always be sensitive about the possibility of such dealings going beyond the permitted ambit, and keen to emphasize its prime responsibility for communications which have the least bearing on principle or policy, or which entail representations to foreign authorities.

1.6. Foreign Policy and Diplomacy as a Field of Study

After the treaty of Westphalia and the end of the First and Second World War, the international system has witnessed an increasing growth in the development of nation states. The end product of this development is thus, the creation of an interaction between these nation states. In addition, the establishment of United Nations and the process of decolonization that has liberated many states into sovereign entities have further provided the impetus to interrelationships among states. Such has resulted into the formation of 'foreign policies' within the aim of determining and identifying the decisions, strategies, and ends of interaction of a state with another. Furthermore, the modern world of "globalization"; the "widening, deepening and speeding up of global interconnectedness" has increased this interrelationships or interactions among states. Hence, there is unanimity among scholars on

the necessity of a "foreign policy" for each state, since no state will like to function in complete isolation. This made scholars like Feliks Gross, to say that even a decision to have no relations with a particular state is also a foreign policy. A state without a foreign policy has been compared to a ship in the deep sea without any knowledge of directions.

Thus, foreign policy leads a state in fulfilling its national interests and acquiring rightful place among comity of nations. Like small states studies, the first problem that one faces in the study of foreign policy, is the problem of definition or clear meaning of the term. When used, it is either out of context or entails a different meaning. Such has led to scholars like Charles Hermann, to call foreign policy a "neglected concept" adding that this neglect has been one of the most serious obstacles to providing more adequate and comprehensive explanations of foreign policy. He believed that part of the reasons for this neglect is that "most people dealing with the subject have felt confident that they knew what foreign policy was." The term foreign policy has been defined in various ways by scholars; however, they are certain that it is concerned with behaviour of a state towards other states. Hermann for instance, defined foreign policy as "the discrete purposeful action that results from the political level decision of an individual or group of individuals. It is the observable artifact of a political level decision. It is not the decision, but a product of the decision." By this, it can be seen that Hermann defines foreign policy as the behaviour of states. George Modelski, defines it as "the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment. Foreign policy must throw light on the ways states attempt to change, and succeed in changing the behaviour of other states." Modelski, noted only those aspects of policy that aim at the change in the existing behaviour of states, as the primary objectives of foreign policy.

However, foreign policy is not only to change, but also continuation of the behaviour at different times. It is concern both with the change and the status quo as far as they serve the national interest5. For example, Gambia's decision to cut diplomatic ties with Taiwan (a country it maintained ties with for almost two decades) in 2013, was a change in the foreign policy of the Gambia. In addition, no reasons were given for the decision, nor further details provided in the official the Gambia. In the same vain, Gambia's decision to resume diplomatic relations with China, is a shift in her foreign policy towards a continuation of relationship with an old ally. According to Joseph Frankel, "foreign policy consists of decisions and actions, which involves to some appreciable extent relations between one state

and others". By this, foreign policy involves set of actions that are made within state's borders, intended towards forces existing outside the country's borders. It comprises the formulation and implementation of a set of ideas that govern the behaviour of states while interacting with other states to defend and enhance their national interests. In the words of Padelford and Lincoln, "A State's Foreign Policy is totality of its dealings with the external environment.

Foreign Policy is the overall result of the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into specific courses of action in order to achieve its objectives and preserve its interests". Two functions of foreign policy can be extracted from Padelford and Lincoln's definition; first, foreign policy is to attain its conceived goals and second, to pressurize its national interests. In Huge Gibson's insight, "foreign policy is a well-rounded comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience for conducting the business of government with rest of the world. It is aim at promoting and protecting the interests of the nations. This calls for a clear understanding of what those interests are and how far we hope to go with the means at our disposal. Anything less than this, falls short of being a foreign policy". An interesting addition to that of Padelford and Lincoln's definition in Huge's insight is that of how far states are willing to go with the means at their disposal to achieve their interests. Such a claim leads us to ask the question; will states be willing to use force when diplomacy fails in achieving their interests? The answer to this is YES. An example of which is the Bush administration's invasion of Iraq in 2003; where the American government turned to military capabilities at her disposal to achieve their national interest.

Finally, in Deborah Gerner's dictum, foreign policy is "the intentions, statements, and actions of an actor-often, but not always, a state-directed towards the external world and the response of other actors to these intentions, statements and actions." Laura Neack, has criticized Deborah's definition being emphasized on states. She argued that other actors such as international cause groups, businesses, religions, and the like-in the international system formulate guidelines and goals that direct their actions towards other international actors. She used a broad definition of foreign policy that involves both statements and behaviours or actions. She asserts that foreign policy "needs to consider more than what states declare to be their goals and how they attempt to achieve them. The study of foreign policy needs to consider how certain goals arise and why certain behaviours result." Thus, in view of such a variety of definitions as to what is meant by 'foreign policy', I will conclude by defining a foreign policy as consisting of three parts: the 'end', the 'ways' and the 'means'. The end

consists a vision of a desired outcome or set of interests in interacting with another state/actor; the ways, consists of the strategies and ideas (e.g. diplomatic tactics, coercion), to pursue these desired interests; and the means, consists of the available resources at a state's disposal (e.g. economic, military). Thus, a foreign policy is a vision of a desired outcome or set of interests in interacting with another state/actor, the strategies and ideas used in achieving these goals, and the available resources at a state's disposable, in guiding her interaction with other states.

1.5 . Foreign Policy Making and National Interest

1.4.1. National Interest

- Functions of National Interest

One cannot be more specific in explaining the meaning and content of national interest as both its value roots and the process of its synthesis are peculiar to the history, traditions and institutional make-up of a country. One can, however, be quite clear about its function. Lerche and Said explain: As the overriding purpose governing the state's relation with the outside world, it serves two purposes: it gives policy a general orientation towards the external environment, and more, importantly, it serves as the controlling criterion of choice in immediate situations. The dominant view of, national interest, in other words, dictates the nature of a state's long term effort in foreign policy and governs what it does in a short term context. National interest also adds an element of consistency in a nation's foreign policy. A country carefully sticking to its national interest in a swiftly changing situation is more likely to maintain its balance and continue to advance towards its goals than it would be if it altered its interest in adapting to each new situation.

- Determinants of National Interest

Several factors of variables both internal as well as external play their role in the formulation of national interest. These determinants are: the qualities, personality, and ideals of decision makers the interests of the most influential groups within the nations the types of philosophies of governmental structures and processes, the customs and cultural styles of different societies ideologies of the states, the geopolitical location and the capabilities of various countries, the types of challenges and pressures that each country faces from neighbouring countries, great powers and international organizations and finally the general nature of international society prevailing at a given time.

Criteria of Determining National Interest:

Coulombs and Wolfe have given the following criteria of determining national interest.

Operational-Philosophy Criteria:

Keeping in view the time, location and the actions of predecessors, one may adopt any of two major styles of operation. First, one may function in a bold and sweeping style. On assuming office, introduce major new practices, policies and institutions and stop previous ones. This style is known as symptomatic in the decision making literature. Instances of decisions made from a synoptic fashion would be declaring war, capitulating to a foreign ultimatum, instituting a social security system, joining or leaving a regional defense organization like NATO or WTO, nationalizing private property and resources and redistributing land holdings. The second way of operation is to act in a cautious, probing and experimental fashion, following the trial and error method.

This style is called incremental as it prefers to make a series of marginal decisions, constantly watching for the effect that each decision has upon the environment and constantly taking corrective action in order to maintain some type of social equilibrium. Thus, the incrementalist often endeavours to improve existing legislation, policies, institutions and practices. Examples of incremental decision makings are gradual escalating or deescalating an ongoing conflict, marginally increasing or decreasing social security benefits, increasing or decreasing the rate of collectivization of agriculture in a socialist country, and, finally, increasing or decreasing programmes of economic and military aid to foreign countries.

Ideological:

Most governments follow different kinds of formal or informal ideologies. The day-to-day decisions of policy makers are to be somewhat consistent with these doctrines. For instance, if one country's ideology is Marxist Leninist, its foreign policies should be so designed that it appears to be friendly to communist governments and leftist revolutionary movements in capitalist countries. If ideology is liberal democratic, the country should appear to encourage free enterprise, support democratic governments and movements, and oppose totalitarian and authoritarian ones. Finally, if ideology is traditional authoritarian, the country should side with those other countries that support its regime or at least do not oppose it, and oppose those countries that are unfriendly to it.

Moral and Legal:

Acting morally is regarded as acting honestly and making ones public decisions accordingly. Thus, moral behavior particularly in international relations, involves , keeping your promises and treaties, being true to ones friends, living and letting others live, avoiding exploiting others, and generally standing up for the principles to which one is morally committed and

that are widely accepted in ones culture. Acting legally implies abiding by the rules of international law to the extent that such rules are identified and accepted. However, it must be pointed out here that although theoretically it seems easy to urge decision makers to do good and avoid evil, it is quite complicated in reality to decide what the moral or legal action in a specific situation is.

Pragmatic Pragmatist's orientation is low-key:

As a matter of fact, it seems unemotional and professional. He looks at life in a dispassionate fashion and is not bothered about good and evil, ideological compatibility, operational philosophy, or other general principles of action. Pragmatic approach emphasizes to solve each problem, much as an engineer solves problems such as the building of bridges, hospitals and weapon factories. Its motto is, If it works, it's good. Pragmatist defends himself when he is attacked, takes advantage of an Opportunity if he has the resources to do so, and makes short term and even long term friendship if they are useful. Utility rather than sentimentality is the watch word of pragmatic criteria. As a pragmatist, one values human life because it is useful to do so and one obeys laws and moral precepts if doing so helps him to improve his external image and to sell his politics. On occasion, one may have to lie and even cheat in order to protect country's interest and to solve the problems confronting the governmental organization to which one belongs.

Professional-Advancement:

One's actions must frequently be manipulated and adjusted in considerations of one's professional survival and growth in sum, this is success. Usually, in large bureaucracies the trick to success is to play the game and not to rock the boat. This attitude has been referred to cynically as the go along to get along effect. Bureaucratic behavior is frequently equated with conformist behavior. Even presidents and prime ministers have to conform, either to public opinion or to powerful elites whose support they consider indispensable for their political survival. Partisan here one equates the survival and the success of his political party or faction with the survival and success of his country. The issue is will you support certain policies that you consider beneficial for your country if doing so might cause you and your party to lose an election or to be removed from a position of power.

Bureaucratic-Interest:

Here one equates the interest of one's organization (the army, the navy, foreign office, an intelligence service, a cabinet, and so forth with the national interest. Owing to limited budgetary resources, battles among security, welfare, education, and economic interests for scarce funds are fiercely waged within all governments. The normal outcome of this

bureaucratic infighting is that each agency attempts to exaggerate its specific funding requests and to argue in the name of the national interest rather than the bureaucratic interest.

Ethnic and Racial:

If one is recruited from an ethnic or racial minority group, he may tend to exaggerate the significance of projects that might benefit that group. Similarly, if one has come from the majority ethnic or racial group, he may try to overestimate the needs of that group and be indifferent to the needs of the minorities. Class States If one is recruited from the upper or middle class of his country, he would like to support policies that benefit the class with which he identifies himself. If one has come from the lower (worker and farmer) classes into a Western bureaucracy, he may find himself steadily becoming torn between his loyalty to the class of his origin and his opportunity to become an important upper-middle-class bureaucrat.

Foreign Dependency Criteria:

These criteria often apply to small or medium sized countries whose governments are highly dependent on foreign protectors in order to remain in office. The three countries that span the world's ideological spectrum and that come under this category are Afghanistan, El Salvador and Chad. There are so many others also, If one is a decision maker in one of these governments, he may find that the needs, guidelines and dictates of the foreign protectors interfere with his assessments of what is in his country national interest. By doing so he may invite the wrath of his protectors and suddenly may be ousted from office. After the above discussion one may not be able to support the objectivity of national interest in too. It is evident now that decisions about the national interest are not purely scientific or mathematical formulations that result in clear gains for a nation state. On the contrary, national interest decisions seem to be the outcome of opposing wills, ambitions, motivations, needs, demands and factors.

- Instruments of Advancing National Interest

Instruments and methods for the promotion of national interest are well explained by Palmer and Perkins. It will pertinent to rely on their views while dealing with these instruments and methods. These can be briefly explained as follows:

1. Diplomacy:

It consists of the techniques and procedures for conducting relations among states. Diplomacy functions through a network of foreign offices, embassies, legations, consulates and special missions all over the world. It can be bilateral as well as multilateral in nature. It includes a multitude of interests, from the simplest matter of detail in the relations between two states to vital issues of war and peace. When it fails the war or at least a major crisis is

inevitable. Diplomacy is practiced through diplomat. He is the eyes and ears of his government in other countries. His major functions are to implement the policies of his government in other countries. His major functions are to implement the policies of his own country, to protect its interests and its nationals and to keep his government informed of major developments in the rest of the world. He is also required to further the best interests of his own country. This may appear to be very selfish but it is the ultimate guiding principle of diplomacy. This is his responsibility to look after the interests of his country as interpreted by the policy makers back home and in accordance with treaties, other international agreements and principles of international law.

Diplomatic negotiations are employed to reconcile the different interests of the states through the process of mutual give and take. But it must be pointed out here that diplomatic negotiations prove fruitful only if the interests of concerned states are complementary or compatible. On the other hand, in case of conflicting or opposing interests negotiations may not be of much success.

2. Alliances:

These are usually concluded by two or more states for the promotion and protection of their common interests. After the conclusion of the alliance the protection of these common interests becomes a legal obligation which the member states are duty bound to discharge. These alliances may be concluded for achieving different kinds of national interests and their nature depends on the type of the interest sought to be fulfilled. Thus the character and the tenure of the alliance will depend on the relative strength of those interests, Robinson observes: the advantage of pursuing the national interests through alliances, of course, lies in the translation of inchoate, common or complementary interests into common policy and in bringing the nation's power directly to bear on questions of national interests.

3. Propaganda:

In the twentieth century propaganda has become a major instrument for the promotion of national interest. States have set up permanent agencies for the systematic exploitation of the possibilities of propaganda as an instrument of national policy. At present no state can easily overlook these possibilities. In the most general terms any attempt to persuade persons to accept a certain point of view or to take a certain action is propaganda. Its meaning becomes clear when one sees its relationship to education. Lasswell says, Propaganda is the manipulation of symbols to control controversial attitudes education is the manipulation of symbols (and of other means) to transmit accepted attitudes (and skills). From the point of

view of international relations propaganda is condensed to mean merely organized efforts by governments to induce either domestic groups or foreign states to accept policies favorable or at least not unfavorable to their own. In the post Second

World War period it became a major component of the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States, both in direct relations and in competitive policies toward the emerging nations of the Third World. It has been a chief characteristic of Sim Soviet rivalry. This instrument has been utilized in hot as well as cold war such as in Korea, in Vietnam, in Arab Israel, in Gulf, in Indo Pak etc.

4. Psychological and Political Warfare:

Eisenhower associated psychological warfare with the struggle for minds of men. Linebarger defined psychological warfare in the broad sense as the application of parts of the science of psychology to further the efforts of political, economic, or military action and in the narrow sense as the use of propaganda against an enemy, together with such other operational measures of a military, economic, or political nature as maybe required to supplement propaganda. Political warfare includes the means short of war which a state takes to weaken a particular enemy or enemies. The persuasion of friendly diplomacy is not political warfare neither is propaganda which does not seek to impair or limit another state's freedom of action. On the other hand, diplomacy or propaganda which has the intent to coerce must be regarded as political warfare. Economic measures must be so characterized when they are aimed at a particular state. Thus a given act may or may not be political warfare. The distinction lies in its purpose. An embargo conceived solely to conserve domestic resources of a commodity is quite different from an embargo imposed to deprive an unfriendly state of essential imports, regardless of the fact that both may apply to exports to all states.

5. Economic Methods:

States deliberately follow certain policies in pursuit of their national interests. A state may pursue economic policies to enhance its domestic welfare without harming another state. But a state may also pursue economic policies clearly aiming at harming another state. Since every state is in some way dependent on other states, it is to some extent amenable to pressures from other states, likewise it may also be able to pressurize other states. Whenever, economic policies are designed to achieve national interests whether or not they intended to harm other state they are economic instruments of national policy. Economic methods are regularly employed to fulfil national interests both in peace and war. In peace times all countries have objectives which must be accomplished whenever possible, such as raising the standard of living, encouraging foreign sales, expanding employment, conserving natural

resources, advancing technology and improving health and hygiene. Economic means may also be utilized by a state during war. It may want to conserve certain goods and to stock pile others or it may try to set at naught the war preparations of the threatening state. Finally, war itself may convert a situation short of war into a fight that requires the mobilization of all state resources to build more economic and military power. The state may then adept the most drastic economic controls in order to harness its own resources and to upset the war making efforts of the enemy.

6. Imperialism and Colonialism:

These have long been used as instruments for the promotion of national policy. From sixteenth century till the middle of twentieth century European nations used imperialism and colonialism as a tool to further their national interests. After the Second World War most of the Western world and part of the Eastern were threatened by Communist imperialism, the Communists were also inveighing against Western imperialism, and vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America are charging most of their difficulties and problems to the colonialism of the congregate colonial powers. It will be wrong to presume that imperialism and colonialism are dead. As a matter of fact their entry through the back door in the form of Neo colonialism has made appearance in many parts of the world.

7. Coercive Methods and War:

The state can take certain coercive measures on its own territory to advance its national interests which ultimately work against the enemy state. These include actions like seizure and confiscation of the property of the rival state or its subjects by way of compensation in value for the wrong, suspension of operation of treaties, embargo of ship belonging to the offending states lying within its parts, seizure of ships at sea etc. All these methods are *prima facie* act of war and the state against whom they are directed has to determine whether it wants to give the developments the shape of war or not. In the extreme form these methods can take the shape of bombardment, military operations and military occupation.

No matter how severely men may criticize war, it will survive as long as the rulers of mankind are unable to agree on an acceptable alternative to it. The reality is that, as Eagleton observed, war is a method of achieving purposes. Many people hate war and strongly suggest that war never pays. On the contrary many believe that war often pays and, moreover, that it has paid not only for bad men with wrong intention but often for good men with good purposes. For that matter it persists as an instrument for the promotion of national interest.

However, this instrument is mostly used as a last resort when all other methods prove ineffective.

- National Interest and Foreign Policy

At the heart of any national interest lays its security, in order states to survive they must protect their security, by any means available to them, the treats to national security can be both external and internal. External treats can include any treat that comes from competing nations and enemies of the state.

Internal treats can come from groups with political aims of overthrowing the government, "even though the aim of security in national interest doesn't always mean protecting the states territorial boundaries, nor the repulsion of foreign attack. In some cases nation may be required to sacrifice some of its territory, or renounce some of its claims, in order to preserve another, more intrinsic element of the state".

States create economic developments by promoting foreign investment, modernising their economy from low-income based economy to high-income based economy, such as building infrastructure, investing in technology, research and development. Without social development economic development can't be fulfilled. States invest in education, access to public health, gender equalities, and civil societies.

States don't further their national interest by becoming self centred , in this day and age where the world is a global village states can't afford to ignore the rest of the world, therefore states look far beyond their states and consider other factors that are important to their national interest, economically, socially and politically.

The above mentioned characteristics identifies national interest of a state and its components, the question is how do states promote their national interest?, states promote their national interest through foreign policy, thus foreign policy is the sum of an actor's goals and purposive actions in global politics." Foreign policy consists of those discrete official actions of the authoritative decision maker's of a nation's government, or their agents, which are intended by the decision makers to influence the behaviour of international actors external to their own polity." In practice, foreign decisions are not made by single leaders in isolation, but it is a cumulative process that involves, interest groups, domestic issues, bureaucracies, leadership, and so on. Therefore foreign policy is the means and national interest is the end.

Countries conduct their foreign policy through many channels that are available to them, namely diplomacy, force, track11 diplomacy, communication, and so on. Countries when shaping their foreign policy take into account many factors that are important, such as, geography, the size of the population, the level of economic development, political tradition, domestic environment, internal environment, military capability, and national character.

- Constraints on National Interest

International politics and the grand strategies of states reflect domestic constraints and imperatives as well as international ones, economic and political as well as military ones. Constraints do not act as determinants if they do not generate unique point solutions. When structural explanations act as constraints, foreign policy analysis crosses boundaries and turns to purpose and process to complete explanation.

1.4.4. Foreign Policy and Its Formulation

- How Foreign Policy is made?

Since the national interests are paramount, governments design their foreign policies through high-level decision-making processes. Goals may be accomplished by peaceful cooperation with other nations, or through exploitation. Usually, creating foreign policy is the job of the head of government and the foreign minister (or equivalent). Modern states employ hundreds, thousands, or more professional diplomats in their diplomatic service. Much of their work involves implementing and researching the effectiveness of directives toward stated foreign policy goals. They see to the task of harmonizing compatible foreign policy goals between partner states and NGO's while also reporting to their agencies on both success in, and obstacles to, their efforts.

In some countries, the legislature also has considerable effects on foreign as well as other areas of public policy, most often in liberal democracies. States with stronger unitary executive branches of government and which lack parliamentary sovereignty have weaker legislative involvement with foreign policy, except in cases of autocracy where one ruler handles major decisions on all national policy, where the autocrat *is* the legislature. Elections and other shifts in government makeup can change the course of foreign policies, even on areas with long periods of consistency, when new leadership comes in with new goals and different views on the national interests.

Foreign policies of countries have varying rates of change and scopes of intent, which can be affected by factors that change the perceived national interests or even affect the stability of

the country itself. The foreign policy of a country can have a profound and lasting impact on other countries and on the course of international relations as a whole, such as the Monroe Doctrine conflicting with the mercantilism policies of 19th-century European countries and the goals of independence of newly formed Central American and South American countries.

- Objectives of Foreign Policy

Diplomacy is an instrument of national interest. It is always guided by the objectives of securing the goals of national interest as defined by foreign policy. It is an element of both the foreign policy and the national power. It is an instrument of peace. Preservation of peace is a part of the general objectives of diplomacy. It is implied in its role as an instrument for the promotion of national interest by peaceful means. Broadly speaking, diplomacy seeks to secure two types of primary objectives for the nation it represents. These are:

(i) Political objectives

(ii) Non-political objectives.

For securing these primary objectives, diplomacy has to undertake, as Morgenthau puts it, four tasks which are in them the objectives of diplomacy.

(i) Relating power with objectives: Diplomacy must determine its objectives in the light of the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives. A nation that pursues goals, which are not backed by adequate and essential national power, can face the risk of war in international relations. By overindulgence, it can invite the risk of war. Hence, diplomacy must weigh the objectives against the available power, both actual and potential, before committing itself for securing these objectives.

(ii) Assessment of objectives with other countries: Diplomacy must determine as to what extent the different objectives are compatible with each other. A nation that seeks to pursue an intelligent and peaceful foreign policy cannot cease comparing its own objectives and the objectives of other nations in the light of their compatibility. In case the interests are incompatible, diplomacy has to act actively and effectively for securing the national interest.

(iii) Relating means with objectives: Diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives. Out of the three available means- persuasion, compromise and threat of force, it is the diplomacy which decides as to which means are to be used, at what time and in relation to which nation. ―The art of diplomacy writes Morgenthau, consists in putting the right embassies at any particular moment on each of these three means at its disposal.

The objectives of any state's foreign policy can be broadly classified in to;

1. Maintaining the integrity of the state
2. Providing for national security
3. Promoting economic interests
4. Protecting national prestige
5. Developing national power
6. Maintaining world order

- Determinants of Foreign Policy: Domestic and External Factors

In Hill's insight, "foreign policy is the hinge of domestic and international politics". There is also consensus among scholars that foreign policy serves as an intersection point of domestic and international politics. Thus, from here we can say that, the foreign policy of every state is influenced by mainly two determinants; international or external and domestic or internal. These are considered as factors which help in shaping and moulding foreign policy. However, the linkage between international and domestic determinants has long been a widely debated topic in the field of international relations and Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) in particular. While others argue that domestic politics and foreign policy are two 'independent' arenas of issue, others are of the view that foreign policy and domestic politics are 'interdependent' and could spill over into each other. While both school of scholars made convincing arguments, however, the level of influence between domestic and international determinants of foreign policies varies from state and the political environment in which these states exist. In some cases, international factors play a major role, whereas in other cases, domestic determinants are more important.

External Determinants of Foreign Policy

Undoubtedly, the international environment plays an important role in shaping the foreign policy of every state. Since foreign policy in general is about the interaction of a state with another, this interaction only takes place at the international level and as such, cannot be ignored in analyzing the foreign policy of any state. As scholars in this school acknowledge the importance of both international and domestic factors, however, they argue that international factors play a more important role in determining country's foreign policy. The main external factors that determine the foreign policy of a state are but not limited to: the international system or power structure, international law, international organizations, alliances, and military strength or arm race. Now we can analyse this factors in details.

The international system or power structure

The modern state system has been in existence since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. It includes big, middle and small powers. As mentioned above, the interaction between these states takes place at the international level and as such it plays a significant role in shaping and moulding the foreign policies of those interacting states. The establishment of friendly and cooperative relations between states is the aims of a sound foreign policy. Foreign policy is essentially shaped by one's relative power within the international system. The world is continuously changing, new events and personalities create fresh foreign policy problems for all concerned. To select events at random, the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the rise of Communist Power in China in 1949, the rise of De Gaulle to power in France and Hitler in Germany, and the emergence of new states in Asia and Africa; brought about significant changes in the power structure and that has impacted the foreign policy of many states.

A prevalent framework of world politics plays decisive role in deciding the foreign policy of a country. As such foreign policies of states thus changes with shifts in the international power structure. In the traditional multi-polar system, it was easier for states to switch sides and gain maximum interests from both sides. Italy has used this strategy skilfully and switched sides during the height of World War I to gain its share in the post war colonial arrangement. During the 1980s, the international system was characterized with a bi-polar system as witnessed during the Cold War, and now a unipolar with the US as the only hegemonic power. These events have restructured the power system and have a significant effect on the foreign policies of states. During the bipolar world system, it was not easy for states to switch sides easily as the ideological fault lines were clearly marked.

The demise of the Soviet Union and the advent of the unipolar world (US hegemony) have its own system dynamics, such as Bush's "either with us or against us". This declaration has made many states from the margins of the system to come forward and play effective roles, especially in the so-called Global War on Terror. At this point therefore, every type of power structure at the international level has its own particular dynamics and has an impact on the foreign policies of states.

International law

The international law is generally defined as a set of rules that regulate relations between states. Cali defined it as "a system of rules created deliberately and explicitly by states. It is

where states have expressly willed to be bound by the rules. The existence of international law and international norms limits the freedom to manoeuvre of states in the system. It is constituted by interstate agreements and treaties and thus, does not entirely favour every interest a state may have. It limits a state in one way or another. That been said, international law regulates the foreign policy of states, and has a binding function in foreign policy as it offers a legal framework through which states should interact. By foreign policy in this sense, is defined as the objectives that guide the activities and relationships of one state in its interaction with other states. It is believed that states actually obey and comply with international law because it constraints the making and enacting of their foreign policy.

However, there is much debate among International Relations theorists about the consequences of international law. Whether states really comply with or observed international law and norms or not and to what extent they do obey international rules; because it is clear that some international norms are obeyed while others are ignored. One side of the debate, proponents of Realism, argue that international law has little or no independent effect on foreign policy. Henkin, for instance argued that one of the major purposes of foreign ps to "maintain international order so that states can pursue national interests." Thus in a realist view, states have the tendency to give priority to their national interests and then sometimes violate legal norms when fundamental interests are at risk. Leaders are claimed to pursue their national interests (broadly defined to include military security and economic prosperity) without regard for international law.

The US invasion of Iraq in 2003, under the Bush administration provides a clear illustration of this. Hence from this it is said, the international law lacks force because the legislative, judicial and executive functions are fundamentally decentralized. First, each nation in world affairs is its own lawgiver. Second, a nation is its own judge and can interpret the law to serve its own purposes. Finally, each nation in world affairs is its own sheriff, who must enforce the law for itself or organize a sympathetic posse. On the other hand, against this skeptical view, liberal institutionalist argues that international law can be profoundly significant. They assert that when states sign a treaty or agreements, it allegedly becomes costlier to take actions the law forbids and less costly to pursue policies the law condones. That is, treaties in the other words "tie the hands of current and future leaders by increasing the cost of reneging."

According to the Positivist view, international law is a set of rules that regulates and constraints state behaviour. States are constrained to respect international norms if they do not want to face sanctions and avoid 'naming and shaming' by international activists (i.e., human rights activists). The Constructivist approach of international law in foreign policy can illustrate the fact that it regulates and gives a roadmap to state's behaviour, enable them to enter in relationship with each other (thereby limiting their actions); because they are legally bind by customary law and they decide to have legally binding obligations through treaties.

In sum, international law defines the status, the rights, the responsibilities, and obligations of the nations in foreign policy. Thus, it is the responsibility of every state to observe the norms and laws, failure to which there are consequences.

International organizations

Currently, there are over 68,000 International Organizations (both active and inactive) in the world. Many International Organizations (IOs) play an enormous role in the current international system. It is hard to imagine how world affairs would operate without international bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and its affiliates, international financial institutions, such as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). Such organizations are considered as active actors in the field of International Relations, as they facilitate the interaction between states at the global level. A state's foreign policies is thus, often affected by its membership of international, regional and sub-regional organizations, since they surrender partially their sovereignty to these organizations. As their operations will be guided by the constitution of the organization; the policies of member states will undoubtedly be affected by the nature of the particular institution.

Nevertheless, scholars of international relations still disagree about the role IOs play in the foreign policies of states. The realist approach in the international politics has generally had less confidence in the efficacy of international organizations. They argue, for example that the United Nations and 0most other international bodies have no way to implement their decisions and that nation states have all the real power in the international system. Mearsheimer for instance, argued that international institutions "are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in the world. They are based on the self interested calculations of the great powers, and they have no independent effect on state behaviour." IOs are considered as only a marginal factor in world politics. This is otherwise regarded as the 'bottom-up' perspective; i.e., how the foreign policies of states impact international organizations.

However, the Constructivist and liberal institutionalist account, took a different view; the 'top-down' perspective. How international organizations impact the foreign policies of states. In the constructivist account, international organizations to a larger extent serve as modifiers of state behaviour and as independent actor. They have profound impact on the determination of the foreign policy of the member states. The realization of mutual independence has given birth to a large number of international and regional organizations, arrangements, agreements, and trading blocks. The European Union, ASEAN, African Union, OPEC, ECOWAS and several others have been major players in the international system. Hence, it is obvious that the foreign policy of every state is now becoming conscious of these organizations, trading blocks, and economic and trade agreements. Thus, international organization constitutes a determinant factor in the foreign policies of states.

Alliances

Alliance formulation is considered to be one of the most curious aspects of international relations. It is regarded as the cornerstone of security policy; however, conventional wisdom holds that is commitments are notoriously unreliable. Alliance formation is considered as a strategy that states use in the formulation and implementation of their foreign policies. Clinton and Palmer, examined the consequences of alliance formation for other foreign policies of a state, including defense spending and the initiation of militarized disputes, using a theory of foreign policy that is based on several assumptions.

First, states pursue two goods-change and maintenance-through their foreign policy. Second, states select a portfolio of policies designed to produce the most preferred mix of the two goods. Third, all foreign policy behaviour including alliance requires resources. Fourth, states are rational in their allocation of resources. Together this implies that an observe alliance must have been the most efficient mechanism available for acquiring the most desired and achievable foreign policy portfolio and have implications for the observation of foreign policy substitutability. They added that alliance provide capability on which the state can draw, thereby providing greater opportunity to pursue both maintenance and change. Alliances in their dictum "are the results of agreements that both entail some commitment and allow for increased foreign policy activity." Finally, they see alliances as part of a state's foreign policy portfolio, in which the alliance may constrain the state in some areas while allowing it freedom to act in others.

Alliances like international law do shape the foreign policies of states, because the member parties to the alliances have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies and refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to the alliance partners. Like many scholars in international relations, Dinesh asserted that, alliances serve as instruments of foreign policies. "The extensive and intensive system of alliances that emerged in the post-1945 period had a big impact on the foreign policies of all the nations. During 1945-90, both the United States and USSR, recognized and used alliances as the means for consolidating their respective positions." Again, during the height of the Cold War, neither the members of the 'Warsaw Pact' nor those of 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization' (NATO) could pursue any independent foreign policy [23]. Even now, with the demise of the Warsaw Pact, the US still continues to consider NATO as the mainstay of its foreign policy in Europe.

Military strategy/Arm race

An arm race denotes the quantity or quality of instruments of military and naval power by rival states in peacetime. The first modern arm race took place when France and Russia challenge the naval superiority of Britain in the late 19th century. The build up of arms, was also a characteristic of the Cold War between the US and USSR. The hostility between the United States and the Soviet Union began near the end of World War I. The profound ideological differences between these two camps were problematic, which eventually had an effect on the international system. The creation of the first atomic bomb in 1945, by the USA had two objectives: a quick end of World War II and possession by US (and not USSR), would allow control of foreign policy in the global stage. However, the discovery and the detonation of an atomic bomb in 1949 by the Soviet Union, ends America's monopoly of atomic weaponry and launches the Cold War. As such in the 1950s, arm race became the focus of the Cold War.

Arm race are a competitive defense spending and military capability building between two states or bloc of states (like the cold war). Examples of such states locked in long-term rivalries with other states include India-Pakistan, China-India, North-South Korea, and Turkey- Greece. In the pursuit of foreign policy objectives, states adopt different strategies, and military strategy is one of those. Scholars assert that one of the main prerequisite of a credible state actor is to develop the military compatibilities and political will, to back its diplomacy by force when necessary. As the famous saying, 'when negotiations fail, confrontation is inevitable.' Thus, the use of military power is considered as the ultimate tool

of international relations following the conception of war as the continuation of politics by other means.

However, in either case whether used defensively or offensively, military power lends a measure of international freedom of action to the state involved. Thus, this is affirming the political theory of war which argues that "in a world system of competing states, the basis of diplomacy, and of all contractual obligations beyond the boundaries of the state rest on the capacity to use (diplomacy of) violence, both to protect the state, and to protect one's interest in the face of opposition from other states." This assertion is in concord with the notion that military strategy occupies a fundamental place in a countries foreign policy. Sunday Ebaye, argued that a state may pursue its interests by bringing immense resources such as large military forces, allies or embargoes on products crucial to others to the support of the issue it perceived to be at stake. However, "in situations where both states and parties to a conflict have the same preference, the structure of the conflict is then akin to the game theorist's concept of the prisoner's dilemma, where no party to the conflict wants to back down in respect to what it perceived to be the central issue."

In Bassey's dictum too, "….whether conceived in terms of it direct or indirect employment, military power has become in the modern era, the legally sanctioned instrument of which states use in their relations with each other…" Coercive diplomacy entails using what Schelling termed the 'diplomacy of violence' to influence the cost benefit calculations of the adversary; as "it is the threat of damage, or of more damage to come, that can make someone yield or comply." In view of this, a state possessing sufficient military strength has greater initiative and bargaining power in the international arena. By this, until the nation state system is radically transformed and superseded by a different international order, the military power and the capacity for armed coercion which it sustains, is likely to continue to play a significant role in international politics. The case of Israel and North Korea can be seen as an example. They continue their precarious existence despite the combined opposition of the allied nations; they have power to maintain an assertive foreign policy. The military strength is closely linked to their resourcefulness and the development of their industry.

Domestic Determinants of Foreign Policy
Like the external determinant factors, scholars agree that the internal environment of state also influence the nature and course of its foreign policy. Countries differ in size, socioeconomic development and political regime. They also differ in their political

institutionalization and societal structures, military and economic capabilities, and strategic cultures. In the same vain, public opinion, national role conceptions, decision making rules and personality traits of political leaders vary from one state to another. These differences according to Taner, "directly affect both foreign policy making process and foreign policy decisions." By this, the "stuff of foreign policy derives from issues of domestic politics as well as foreign relations." Laura Neack argued. According to Kissinger also, "…...the domestic structure is not irrelevant in any historical period. At a minimum, it determines the amount of social effect which can be devoted to foreign policy." Therefore, we shall now look into those domestic factors that may shape the foreign policy formulation and implementation of states.

Culture and history

Culture provides people with ways of thinking, seeing and interpreting the things around them. It shapes our ideas and serves an instrument for us in analyzing everything happening around us. Everything from our racial features, to the food we eat, the way we dress, the language we speak, the music we listen to, and where we live, all form a part of culture. In Frode Liland's dictum, "the cultural side of foreign policy is a vast and treacherous area." However, a heated debate exists among scholars on whether and how culture impacts and shapes a state's foreign and security policy in particular as well as international relations in general. Nevertheless, many scholars of international relations argued vividly that the way we think (i.e., our culture) has an effect on the policies we make. Vlahos argued that "pattern of thought and behaviour are shaped by culture; they are not the product of mere nationalism." Frode again asserted that cultural diplomacy has deep root and can easily be found in the archives of foreign ministers. A nation inherits a style and culture which in turn influence and decide the course of actions; the nation has to follow in relation to other sovereign states.

Again, the external affairs of a state are to a large extent the legacy of its history and cultural heritage. The approach of a nation to the foreign problems is determined by its traditional values and beliefs which have emerged on periods of years. Historical experiences, like culture and traditions of a state, exert influence on its foreign policy. In general, states with unified culture and common history find it easier to formulate effective and consistent foreign policy. In such a case, overwhelming majority of people, who share similar experiences and common perceptions of historical events, support the state's foreign policy.

However, countries with divergent cultures and various historical experiences in its different parts, find it difficult to formulate foreign policy in unison. The relationship between the Gambia and Senegal is a clear testimony of this fact. The two countries virtually share same cultural ties with the exception of official languages. The two sister countries have effective foreign policy due to shared cultural values. Colonization is another dimension of the historical experiences that influence the foreign policy of states. The foreign policy of many Asian and African states is shaped by their former colonial masters, notably Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal. This is more illustrated among French Speaking African countries, such as Senegal, Mali, Benin, Togo, Ivory Coast etc. France obviously becomes their best and strategic ally in world affairs. Same can be said about the former British colonies or members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, like Gambia, Ghana, Cameroon, Cyprus etc.

Geography, size and population

The size of a state's territory, its geography and population greatly influence its foreign policy implementation. It is generally believed that leaders and people of states with small territory and population do not expect their country to carry out heavy weight in international affairs. For example, Gambia, Benin, Brunei, Kyrgyzstan etc. On the other hand, leaders of large countries are ready and willing to assume special and larger responsibilities in global affairs. For instance, United States, Russia and China, are active players in world politics due to their gigantic size.

However, that is not to say that, all small states do not take active roles in international affairs. Some small states which have rich resources in terms of economics and power, are very active and leave a deep impact on world politics. For instance, Israel and North Korea are playing a very active role in international politics. Same is true for that of the oil-rich countries of the Middle East, though small in size are playing a significant role in international politics, especially in international political economy. In the meantime, large countries like Canada, Australia and Brazil have not been playing active and effective foreign policy. Thus, it can be argued that size is not an absolute factor but rather gets influenced by other factors like resources at a state's disposal. The geopolitical location of a state is one of the unrefuted factors that determine a country's foreign policy. In Amer Rizwan's dictum, "it matters where on the globe a country is located. It matters whether the country has natural frontiers: that is whether it is protected by oceans, high mountains, or desserts. It matters who one's neighbors are and whether a given country is territorially large, populous, affluent and well-governed."

The location of a state has a significant impact on its foreign policy. Example of such states includes Turkey, Israel, The Gambia, and Libya. Turkey, with its location as a transit point between Europe and Asia, undoubtedly has profound impact on her foreign policy implementation. Same is true for the Gambia, due to its geographical location on the Atlantic Coastline. Moreover, in the 19th century, the United States has adopted isolationist policy mainly on account of its geographical location. Although the significance of geographical location cannot be overemphasized, its importance has considerably declined due to technological and scientific developments. Nevertheless, geographical location of a country has a deep impact on the determination of its foreign policy. In Dr. Eayers words, "Pacts may be broken, treaties unilaterally denounced, but geography holds its victim fasts."

Economic development and natural resources

The level of economic development of a country also influences the foreign policy of that country. Many advance industrialist countries play dominant role in world politics, and formulate their foreign policies to maintain such superiority in the system. Such countries like United States, Russia, Germany and France have large resources at their disposal to build military capabilities on one hand, and disperse monetary benefits on other states in the form of aids and loan, with the sole aim of 'seeking allies' with these states.

It is in line with this that, the US has been able to pursue vigorous foreign policy and secure its national interest, which can be highly related to its degree of economic and technological development. It has made liberal use of 'foreign aid' as an instrument for the promotion of its foreign policy goals. A clear example of this can be seen in United Nation's condemnation of Donald Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The US ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley said that "…. we don't expect those we've helped to target us. … the US will be taking names." In addition, the president of the United States, Donald Trump threatened to cut off financial aid to countries that vote in favour of a draft UN resolution to reject the US's decision on Jerusalem as Israel's capital. In an interview, he said explicitly "They take hundreds of millions of dollars and even billions of dollars, and then they vote against us. Well, we're watching those votes. Let them vote against us. We'll save a lot. We don't care."

On the other hand, small states like The Gambia pursue a limited and calculated foreign policy due to their insufficient economic power. Therefore, it can be seen that developing and undeveloped countries remain dependent on these advance industrialist countries to a larger extent to get development loans, import of technologies, provision of health care, access to

higher education, and even food grains to meet their needs. Thus, accordingly it has to adjust its foreign policy in these economic terms. Moreover, in recent years, we have seen that Germany is playing leading role in Europe's politics despite not being permanent member of UNSC, and being a non-nuclear state. It can rightly be argued that Germany's increased leadership is entirely attributed to its economic development. Also, the emergence of China and India on world stage is based on their economic resurgence in recent years. On the contrary, in post-cold war period, Russia's influence decreased to a considerable extent as its economic power has diminished after the disintegration of USSR.

The available natural resources that a state has, influences the foreign policy of those states. These resources include minerals, gas, petroleum or crude oil, and water resources, which are abundant in Africa and Middle East. It can be seen that such countries in these regions are considered small; however with such abundant natural resources at their disposal, despite their size they play a crucial role in international politics. This, according to Rizwan has made Middle East to have leverage in world politics due to oil diplomacy of the region. Due to their oil power, small states in the Middle East such as Qatar, Bahrain and Kuwait, pursue foreign policy more confidently and assertively.

Military capabilities

The military strength of a country, also determines the foreign policy strategy of states. The capability of a state to defend its borders against armed aggression plays a profound role in both internal and external policies that states make. Militarily capable states exercise greater independence from external forces in the formulation of their foreign policy. In the same vein, increase in the military capabilities of a state might result in change in its foreign policy; from peaceful to an aggressive foreign policy. For instance, India has acquired new dimensions after 'nuclearisation', as it attempts to get the status equivalent to the P-5 countries. The same can be said about North Korea, with her possession of new weapons of mass destruction, it is directing her foreign policy towards an aggressive one. This is to say that, states with high military capabilities such as US, China and Russia, tend to be active and vigorous in pursuing their foreign policy objectives in the international system. On the other hand, states with weak or low military capabilities tend to be more salient in pursue of their policy goals and most often depend on ally seeking with greater powers and international organizations for their protection.

Political system

The political organization and institutions in a country, also greatly influences the foreign policy of that country. Generally, under authoritarian or totalitarian forms of government, easier and faster foreign decisions are possible because the decision-making power rests with an individual assisted by his clique. They are the sole decision makers and as their decisions are made without any constraints or consultations, their foreign policy decisions can be conflictual. It is also observed that decision making under such closed systems have often, if not always, lead to a country's isolation in international politics as happened with the regimes in North Korea and Myanmar.

On the other hand, in a state with democratic system, foreign policy implementation tends to be difficult and slow as compared to that of an authoritarian structure. Citizens in this system can freely express and voice their opinion on the domestic as well as foreign policies of their country, making an impact on the policies their government is pursuing. Democratic leaders tend to respond to these public demands and formulate a foreign policy within it. In the same vein, Kitol asserted that the different political structures in a democratic system itself have its impact on foreign policy. For instance, under a parliamentary system of government based on cooperation between the Legislature and the Executive body, the cordial relation between these two wings, have an impact on a country's foreign policy.

Moreover, under presidential system of government based on the principles of separation of powers, the relation between the two wings are non-cordial and likely to be strained, which affect the ambiguity or the continuity of foreign policy. Similarly, different foreign policy is likely to emerge under biparty and multi-party systems. Under bi-party system the government is likely to have a clear-cut majority and conduct itself in a more decisive manner regarding the conduct of foreign relations. In contrast, under multi-party systems, conflicting views and interests may occur. This may lead either to the avoidance or postponement of the decision.

Personality and character of the leader

Leadership in general, the personality of a leader in particular plays a profound role in foreign policy formulation. The role of personality in foreign policy encompasses cognitive processes, and assumes that decision making is the result of individual 'human agency'; that is, ultimately, it is 'individuals' who make decisions, not 'states'. Thus, personality can be important in adding to our understanding of foreign policy behavior. However, its relevance

some scholars argue, is dependent upon the constrains of the international system as well as domestic political structure. Rosenau said, "A leader's belief about the nature of international arena and the goals that ought to be pursued therein, his or her peculiar intellectual strengths and weakness for analyzing information and making decisions, his or her past background and the extent of its relevance to the requirements of the role, his or her emotional needs and most of other personality traits these are but a few of the idiosyncratic factors that can influence the planning and execution of foreign policy." Though, the government structure and societal realities are believed to constrain the character of a leader, during crisis time the leader shows the path to the government and society.

Leaders have been categorized into two: 'hawks'—those who advocate an aggressive foreign policy based on strong military power, and 'doves'—those who are termed as conciliatory and try to resolve international conflicts without the threat of force. According to Hermann, an aggressive leader can be characterized by certain attributes as tendency to manipulate others, high need for power, paranoia, high levels of nationalism, and a vigorous willingness to initiate on behalf of their state. Whereas conciliatory leaders, are the opposite of the above. They possess attributes such as a desire for affiliation and friendly relations with other, low level of nationalism, etc. From this, due to their aggressive foreign policy, leaders like Hitler, Mussolini, George W. Bush, Donald Trump, and King Jong-Un of North Korea, can be categorized as 'hawks', while leaders such as Abraham Lincoln, Barack Obama, Sir Dawda Jawara and Emmanuel Macron of France, can be classified as 'doves'. Again, while Winston Churchill's astute leadership had steered England to victory in the Second World War, the British participation in the 2003 Iraq War, has been characterized as "Tony Blair's War", with many believing that the personality and leadership style of the prime minister played a crucial part in determining British participation in the war.

Political parties and interest groups

Political parties are vital to modern political settings. They play an important role in shaping representative democracy in a country. They have a greater say in the foreign policies of their countries and usually voice their interest directly or through interest groups. Under multiparty system and coalition governments, political parties (i.e., the opposition party) always have conflicting views and interests, which may alter the formulation of foreign policy. Scholars from the neoliberal approach to international politics (e.g. Keohane), accentuate the decisive influence of organized interest groups on foreign policy. In this view, leaders or government officials with foreign policy authority bargain with domestic interest groups that use their

member's votes, campaign contributions, labor strikes or other tools to affect the electoral benefits and costs to elected officials of choosing alternative policies. For example, Keohane and Milner, traced targeted government subsidies and trade protections to the influence of well-organized and financed groups; while Snyder attributes defense policy to logrolling coalitions. Organized labor and business corporations possess critical resources for pressuring policy makers. Galenson asserts that, with mission as protecting the jobs and benefits of their members, "Labor leaders have spoken out often on foreign affairs."

Moreover, due to the increase in interconnectedness and the rapid growth of globalization, pressure groups have more interests in the foreign policies of states. They influence these policies when interacting with states at the international and domestic level. In Robert H. Thrice's insight, "Interest groups can be viewed as auxiliary actors that stand between the government and the mass public, tied to the government's decision-making system by channels of communication." These interest groups have mobilized a diverse area ranging from business, labor, ethnic, health, environmental, human rights, etc. Thus, it becomes impossible for governments to turn a blind eye on their existence.

Press and public opinion

Again, in Thrice's dictum, "the domestic sources of foreign policy are widely recognized and include interest groups, mass public opinion, and the printed and electronic media." Tomz et.al, distinguished two pathways through which the public could shape policy outcomes: selection and responsiveness. "First, the public could exert influence by selecting parties or candidates whose foreign policy positions best match their own. Second, after politicians take office, leaders may respond to public opinion out of concern that rebuffing the public could be politically costly." With strong experimental evidence, their study concluded that public opinion affects foreign policy in democracies, both by shaping who is elected and by influencing leaders once they take office. Leaders in countries with advance democracy, consider opinion poll before making any crucial policy decision.

The 2003 Iraq war for instance, was initially supported by the American public, which the United States used as an excuse for the invasion despite the international outcry of the unjust nature of the war. The Bush administration had to make a decision by going to war or face the exit door of the white house. At this point, it is worth knowing whether public opinion matter in non-democracies as much as in democracies. The short answer to this according to Neack, is 'Yes'. She argued that leaders of any type of regime need to pay attention to

opponents and whatever resources those opponents wield. The media is agreed by many scholars to play a significant role in influencing the policies and decisions leaders make. There exists a phenomenon called the "CNN effect", which Joseph Nye explains as: The free flow of broadcast information in open societies has always had an impact on public opinion and the formation of foreign policy.

By focusing on certain conflicts and human right problems, broadcast pressure politicians to respond to some foreign problems and not others. The so-called CNN effect makes it harder to keep some items off the top of the public agenda that might otherwise warrant a lower priority. In Neack's insight, those who believe in the reality of the CNN effect, propose that it makes use of public opinion. As the media broadcast images of mass starvation, ethnic conflict, violent human right abuses, and other sort of mass suffering; the images arouse strong emotions in the public. Then in turn the public, aroused by those images of suffering portrayed in the media, will demand from their elected officials to do 'something' strong and morally correct response.

Obviously, elected officials wanting to stay in the public's favor for all sorts of reasons will respond to these demands with some sort of humanitarian or military intervention, or whatever action is necessary in the immediate term. In addition, Rubenzer, in analyzing the role of 'social media' (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube etc.) in foreign policy implementation, argued that the social media as it becomes more accessible, becomes one means by which people, non-state actors and governments can share their foreign policy priorities in an effort to receive feedback, engage in diplomacy, educate people, and attempt to influence foreign policy outcomes. This denotes that the media plays a profound role in setting the public agenda and eventually influencing foreign policy decisions.

Science and technology

Just as media, technology has brought a tremendous amount of change in the areas of foreign policy and diplomacy. Hillary Clinton in her tenure as secretary of state, once said "Just as the internet has changed virtually every aspect of how people worldwide live, learn, consume and communicate, connection technologies are changing the strategic context for diplomacy in the 21st century." The recent advances in technology has transcend almost all areas of international affairs and indeed open up vast new areas of communication, cooperation and even conflicts among states in their pursuit of security, development and progress. Science and technology considerations are often central to the interaction of states with other

governments. It plays a large role in discussions of such critical topics as nuclear non-proliferation, use of outer space, population growth, adequate and safe food supply, climate change, energy resources, and competitiveness of industrial technologies. In the addressing of these issues, expert science and technology knowledge is significant to the anticipation and resolution of problems and to the achievement of foreign policy goals.

As such, the profound impact of science and technology on human society and national security has made states and foreign policy professionals to use it as a tool in successfully negotiating international affairs. Technology in this sense may be seen as a driver for both power and legitimacy in the areas of foreign affairs and diplomacy. Leaders especially in the advance industrialized countries, use this technology in raising awareness, promoting global culture, and spreading democracy throughout the world. The advance industrialized countries transfer this technological equipment and the technical know-how, to developing countries.

However, in the transfer of this technology, advance industrialized countries exert such leverages or interests to mould their foreign policy. This technological transfer especially in the military sphere has further increased developing world's dependency on advance countries. Rosenau rightly said, "technological changes can alter military and economic capabilities of a society and thus its status and role in the international system." Today, it can rightly be argued that U.S.A, Germany, China and Japan are in a position to play crucial roles in international politics due to their technological excellence. Also, the aggressiveness of present day North Korea in global affairs is due to their military capabilities which was enhanced by the advance in technology of the country. The recent conduct of its 6th nuclear test in 3rd September 2017, is a testament of this validity. In sum, the technological advancement of a country, changes her role and status in world politics.

1.4.5. Instruments of Foreign Policy

- **Secret Intelligence**

Foreign policy decision making requires information that has to be collected, analyzed and utilized. Information based foreign policy decision increases the accuracy and efficiency of the foreign policy formulated. Intelligence evidences are usually considered as rich source of evidence and important dimension of information gathering to formulate foreign policy. *Importance:* To obtain, by covert means, and then to analyze information which cannot be analyzed by conventional methods. Importance for accuracy and speedy delivery of information on friends and enemies. Gathering secret information on friends is easier because

of greater intimacy. Deception: feeding other governments with disinformation to confuse the opponent about ones plan, purpose and military policy. This function is mainly important in wars or situations which threaten war. Political warfare (covert action): involves the secret participation in the domestic politics or civil wars of other states to defend a friendly government or to overthrow a hostile one.

- **Force**

The art of using force in service of foreign policy is called as strategy. It might involve the direct attack on military forces of the enemy state, surprise or immediate attacks. The strategy of protracted war involving using insurgency forces within the people of the enemy state, using irregular or guerilla forces and physical exhaustion and demoralization of the enemy. Coercion or use of force could also be implemented to encourage an opponent to have second thought before waging full scale war. Threat which is made with the purpose of preventing a possible forthcoming aggression is called as **Deterrence.** Deterrence is designed to forestall attack by convincing a potential aggressor that the cost of action will substantially outweigh any possible gains. Use of **coercive diplomacy** is also another means of using force to succeed ones foreign policy. **Coercive diplomacy** involves the threat of pain or causing pain in an attempt to persuade an enemy to conform to one's will, to surrender a position or change some policy.

- **Economic statecraft**

Trade policies and foreign aid are known as economical instruments. The economic techniques that are used to influence the relationship between states can generally be classified in to two:

1. **Persuasive** economic techniques use the method of offering economic reward or advantage in return for a satisfactory modification of another state's behavior.

2. **Coercion** is a method through which a state threatens the other with deprivation or impoverishment unless it submits.

Foreign aid and economic sanctions are some of the most commonly used mechanisms of influencing foreign states using economic resources. **Foreign aid can** be used in the service of foreign policy using it for reward or punishment, by holding out donation, its continuation or suspension. Economic sanction is used to compel another state to behave in a certain manner or to change the way it is behaving. Suspending trade interaction, interrupting the mobility of goods and services between two state economies, blocking financial transactions

and other sorts of economic relations could be components of economic sanction in the service of a foreign policy.

- **Propaganda**

Propaganda and culture- Propaganda is systematic attempt to affect the minds, emotions, and actions of a given group for public purposes.

It is an organized effort by governments to convince foreign states to accept policies favorable to them.

The great bulk of the propaganda messages put out by state aims at creating a favorable view of a state by other states.

Effective propaganda may help increase the acceptability of diplomatic, economic or military moves.

It involves manipulation of public opinion by symbols and words through mass media with the aim of "political advertising" and "Psychological warfare.

Propaganda has been used for many purposes by countries as an instrument of foreign policy, among others these includes;

Encouragement of internal opposition to unfriendly regimes.

Undermining the morale of the other side which are armed forces.

To indirectly influence the target government to take a friendly and positive attitude towards one's own purpose.

-Using the standard techniques of public relations such as exchanging cultural experiences, states have undertaken active international promotion of their culture beyond their borders.

- **Diplomacy**

Diplomacy is not foreign policy.

Foreign policy is the attitude struck by one state towards another, diplomacy is one of a number of instruments employed in order to make that attitude persuasive.

It is the process of conducting communication among states through officially recognized representatives.

Diplomacy is a major dimension of a state's foreign policy with foreign ministers and their diplomats living abroad carrying out state business.

However, recently it is also practiced by non-state actors like Inter Governmental Organizations, Human Rights Groups, Multi-National Corporations and others.

- **Collective Security**

    ❖ It is a device of maintaining peace and preventing aggression.

    ❖ It is machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established order.

    ❖ The underlying principle in collective security is that an attack on any one state is an attack on all.

    ❖ It is a permanent arrangement that aims against any aggression anywhere

- **International Law**

It primarily serves as a system regulating the rights and duties of states. It is a body of law by which a growing area of inter-state relations will be regulated and controlled.

Chapter Two: Diplomacy and Diplomatic Communication

2.3 . Objectives and Functions of Diplomacy and Diplomats

Objectives of Diplomacy:

Broadly speaking, Diplomacy seeks to secure two types of primary objectives for the nation it represents. These are:

(i) Political Objectives, and

(ii) Non-political Objectives.

(1) Political Objectives of Diplomacy:

Diplomacy always works to secure the goals of national interest as defined by the foreign policy. It always works for increasing the influence of the state over other states. It uses persuasion, promises of rewards and other such means for this purpose. Through rational negotiations, it seeks to justify the objectives of the foreign policy of the nation. It seeks to promote friendship and cooperation with other nations.

(2) Non-political Objectives of Diplomacy:

The interdependence among nations is the most important and valuable fact of international living. Each nation depends upon others for economic and industrial links and trade. Diplomacy always seeks to promote the economic, commercial and cultural links of the nation with other nations. Diplomacy depends upon peaceful means, persuasive methods for promoting the interests of the nation and this is indeed an important non-political objective of Diplomacy.

Functions and Role of Diplomacy:

In performing its tasks and securing its national objectives, Diplomacy has to undertake a number of functions.

Major Functions:

(1) Ceremonial/Symbolic Functions:

The diplomats of a nation are the symbolic representatives of the state and they represent their state and government in all official ceremonies and functions as well as in non-official, social and cultural functions held in the place of their postings.

(2) Representation:

A diplomat formally represents his country in a foreign state. He is the normal agent of communication between his home office and that of the state to which he is accredited. His representation is legal and political. He can vote in the name of his government. Of course, in

doing so he is totally bound by the directions of his home office and the foreign Policy of the nation.

(3) Negotiations:

To conduct negotiations with other states is a substantive function of diplomacy. Diplomats, observe Palmer and Perkins, are by definition negotiators. They are the channels of communication which handle the transmission of messages between the foreign ministries of the parent state and the host state. Along with the nature of the message, the manner and style of delivering the message greatly influences the course of negotiations. It is mainly through negotiations that a diplomat seeks to secure agreements and compromises over various conflictual issues and problems among states. The role of diplomacy in conducting negotiations has, however, declined in our times because of the emergence of multilateral diplomacy, personal diplomacy political diplomacy, summit diplomacy and the direct communication links among the world leaders and top statesmen. The diplomats today do not play as great a role in international negotiations as used to be previously played by them. Nevertheless, they continue to be the legal and formal channels of negotiations in international relations.

(4) Reporting: Reporting involves the observation of the political, economic, military and social conditions of the host country and the accurate transmission of the findings of the diplomat to his home country. The political reporting involves a report about the assessment of the roles of various political parties in the politics of the host country. It seeks to assess the friendliness or hostility of the various political groupings towards the home state, and the power potential of each party or organisation. Economic reporting involves sending of reports to the home office containing general information about the economic health and trade potential of the host country. Military reporting involves an assessment of the military might, intentions and capabilities, and the strategic importance of the host country. The level of social and cultural conflicts among the people of the host country and the level of social harmony and cohesion are assessed for determining the level of stability of the host country. Thus reporting is an important and valuable function of diplomacy.

(5) Protection of Interests:

Diplomacy is always at work for protecting and promoting the interests of the nation and its people living abroad. Protection of interests is the "bedrock of the practice of diplomacy." It works to secure compatibility out of incompatibility through accommodation, reconciliation and goodwill. A diplomat always attempts to prevent or change practices which he feels are discriminatory to the interests of his country. It is his responsibility to protect the persons,

property and interests of such citizens of his country as are living in the territory of the state to which he stands posted. Through all these functions, diplomacy plays an important role in international relations.

2.4 . Types and Characteristics of Diplomatic Practices

In contemporary times the nature of Diplomacy has undergone a big change. From its traditional dress (Old Diplomacy) it has come to acquire several new features. This change has earned for it the name Modern/ New Diplomacy.

- **Traditional Diplomacy**

Diplomacy in its traditional form is known as Old Diplomacy and its main features have been:

(i) European Diplomacy: Old Diplomacy was primarily confined to Europe. Being an imperial continent which controlled and ruled the continents of Asia and Africa, Europe was the centre of all international activities. Old Diplomacy had its origin in Europe and continued, till 1914, to handle the relations among the European states.

(ii) Aristocratic: In Old Diplomacy, the conduct of foreign relations was considered to be the prerogatives of the kings or rulers and their trusted ambassadors. The diplomats used to be selected by the monarchs and were responsible to their 'lords'. Diplomacy was conducted by a class of professional diplomats and was characterised by an air of aristocracy, nobility and class consciousness. It was both formal and elitist in nature and approach.

(iii) Special Emphasis upon Virtues: The Old Diplomacy was aristocratic and hence regarded several well defined and accepted principles as cardinal principles or virtues of diplomats. Honesty, integrity, truthfulness, politeness, fairness, strict conformity to protocol, secrecy and total commitment to national interests were considered to be the essential qualities of diplomats. However in actual operation, the Old Diplomacy was characterised by 'honest lies,' integrity in appearance, qualified truthfulness, outward politeness, self satisfying fairness and strict observance of protocol and secrecy.

(iv) Secrecy: Secrecy was considered to be the hallmark of Old Diplomacy. Complete secrecy in respect of the negotiations as well as about the outcome of these negotiations was considered to be a vitally important condition of old diplomacy. Diplomats communicated only with their counterparts in other countries. Secret negotiations leading to secret undertakings, agreements or treaties or alliances were considered to be the ideal ways of conducting relations for the preservation of peace and problem solving.

(v) Freedom of Action for the Ambassadors: Within the broad limits of agreed policy, the diplomats handling diplomatic negotiations used to enjoy freedom of action. During the era

of Old Diplomacy, the ambassadors enjoyed considerable freedom in matters of negotiations. Lack of speedy and continuous means of communications made it essential for the state to give wide powers to its diplomats. The inability to maintain continuous speedy communications with the ambassadors made it essential for the ruler of the state to give freedom of action and full power to his ambassadors. Ambassadors always used their authority freely without much fear of the 'home office.' Old Diplomacy continued to remain in operation till the middle of the 20th century. Thereafter, it had to change due to several big changes in the international system as well as because of the development of fast and comprehensive means of transport and communications. It now came to be a New Diplomacy.

- **Modern diplomacy**

Modern/New Diplomacy has the following salient features which have been totally different from the features of Old Diplomacy.

(i) New Diplomacy is Global, Old Diplomacy was mainly European:

The New Diplomacy is truly global in nature and scope. The rise of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the emergence of a large number of sovereign independent states changed the character of post-war international relations. From mostly European relations these came to be truly international relations involving all the sovereign states. Consequently, diplomacy had to abandon its European character and to become truly global in nature and approach.

(ii) New Diplomacy is mostly Multilateral, whereas Old Diplomacy was mostly Bilateral:

Multilateral negotiations in international conferences, institutionalized diplomacy at the United Nations and the emergence of direct personal contacts among the statesmen and leaders of various states, have all combined to give a new look and content to New Diplomacy. Old Diplomacy was mostly bilateral and limited; the New Diplomacy is mostly multilateral and global.

(iii) New Diplomacy is less formal than Old Diplomacy:

New Diplomacy is not as much formal and rigid in respect of rules or procedures as was the case with the Old Diplomacy. Presently, there exist quite informal and direct contacts among the leaders and diplomats of various states.

(iv) New Diplomacy is mostly open and Old Diplomacy was mostly secret:

In New Diplomacy the negotiations are open and the results are, invariably always, made public soon after the reaching of agreements or treaties or alliances or settlements.

Diplomatic negotiations are given full coverage over the Radio, Press, Television and other means of mass-media. Old Diplomacy favoured secrecy as its governing principle.

(v) Democratic Nature of New Diplomacy versus Aristocratic nature of Old

Diplomacy: The New Diplomacy is democratic, whereas Old Diplomacy was aristocratic in nature. In the era of the latter, a special elitist class of diplomats, who were professionals to the core, used to conduct diplomatic negotiations and relations. However, at present the increased influence of public opinion, political parties, pressure groups, world public opinion, the rise of a more democratic and less aristocratic class of civil servants, have all given a new dimension and look to diplomacy. Modern ambassadors and consoler's are democratic in their outlook towards diplomacy. A degree of informality has come to characterize their functioning in international relations.

(vi) New Diplomacy depends more on Propaganda than Old Diplomacy: The use of propaganda/publicity as an important instrument of political warfare in international relations is accepted and used by New Diplomacy as a means for securing the goals of national interest that it represents. Old Diplomacy was mostly secret and hence avoided propaganda. It concentrated upon legal and formal communications as the means for conveying its wishes, desires and objectives.

(vii) Under New Diplomacy, the role of a Diplomat has suffered a Decline: In the era of New Diplomacy, the role of diplomat has suffered a decline. Due to the development of speedy means of transport and communications, it has become possible for the political leaders of the states to develop and maintain direct, continuous and active contacts with one another. This development has reduced the role of an ambassador as a link between his home state and the host state. In Old Diplomacy, diplomats were regarded as the most important vital links among the states and were full representatives of their nations in international relations.

They enjoyed a lot of discretion and freedom of action. New Diplomacy has reduced the role of diplomats to glorified representatives who really act as highly dignified messengers and actors with the responsibility of faithfully carrying out the instructions of the foreign office and political leadership of their states. The control of the foreign office over the diplomats has considerably increased in this real of New Diplomacy. Thus, the features of New Diplomacy are almost entirely different from the features of Old Diplomacy.

2.3. The Conduct of Diplomacy: Diplomatic Processes & Diplomatic Bargaining/Negotiation

Diplomatic Processes: Whenever a state desires to open diplomatic relations with another, the first step it has to take is to approach that state for agreement to establish its mission. Such

occasions may arise in the case of two existing states which had not until then opened diplomatic relations but find it necessary or possible to do so either due to the increase in the interests that require to be protected, or availability of personnel or funds the lack of which had stood in the way of establishment of such relations earlier. Occasions for establishment of diplomatic relations arise more frequently perhaps when a new state is admitted into the community of nations as a fully sovereign state. A revolutionary change in the government of an existing state may also in certain circumstances necessitate the establishment of fresh diplomatic relations. In all such cases the government of the country which desires the establishment of diplomatic relations must make the first approach. In the case of newly independent states, the request should normally be made direct on a government to government level; in other cases the approach may be direct or it may be preceded by informal soundings through the intermediary of the diplomatic representative of another state.

When an approach for establishment of diplomatic relations is made, the request is generally examined in the Foreign Office. In considering such a request the first question which the Foreign Office will naturally examine is whether it would itself be in a position to establish its own mission in the country which has sought establishment of diplomatic relations, since the reciprocal establishment of missions by each other is the most effective method of conducting relations between nations. It may, however, be mentioned that there is nothing to prevent two states from agreeing on other methods of conducting their diplomatic relations, namely through their missions in a third state. The next important factor that is normally taken into account is the extent of its interest that requires to be looked after in the other state. Formerly the quantum of such interest was determined by the number of nationals resident in each other's territory, the investments made by such nationals, or considerations of development of trade and commerce.

Today, in addition to these factors one important matter which governs a country's decision is the question of votes in the United Nations or the Specialised Agencies. The countries which were hitherto considered to be unimportant from the point of view of a country's interest have assumed a much more important role having regard to the fact that in the United Nations each member country has one vote, and in that august assembly, which is the nerve centre of the world politics, no country is too insignificant to be ignored. In addition, the question of propaganda or publicity, and the fact that a country may be considered to be a good listening post often enter the verdict on the question of establishment of permanent missions. States naturally find the expenditure on maintenance of such missions worthwhile for these

considerations. The Great Powers as well as those states which desire to take an active role in world politics are consequently anxious to have missions in as many capitals of the world as possible.

Diplomatic Bargaining/Negotiation:

1. Diplomacy is the art of negotiation. It was through the negotiating process States have agreed on the conditions of their coexistence and have tried to prevent the break-out of war over a set of crucial issues. In fact, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations established negotiation as one of the fundamental functions of the diplomatic mission.

2. Diplomatic negotiation is regarded as a key technique for promoting national interests and the most effective means for achieving the objectives of the foreign policy of States. It has become an essential procedure for the exercise of diplomacy and it allows representatives of States to provide outstanding services to their nations.

3. Negotiation usually aims to conclude international commitments, to develop rules of this nature, to increase political, economic, legal, social understanding between governments, to consolidate their friendly relations and, above all, to prevent or resolve conflict situations or controversies between States.

4. The diplomatic negotiator, in addition to possessing the required skill, talent and unwavering commitment to the fundamental interests of the State he represents, must naturally have a profound knowledge of national and international reality.

5. He should also be aware of and be able to master the increasing specialisation in certain areas essential to his professional practice. Similarly, he should have frequent updates surrounding the rigorous, theoretical thinking of professional analysts in the area of negotiation and also learn from the practical experience of practitioners in the field of negotiation.

6. As a representative of a State, the diplomatic negotiator should be aware of all possible interpretations of his and his counterparts' behaviour. Realising, of course, that his counterparts will have a similar attitude towards him, he must at all times be very vigilant while conducting his task with extreme dignity.

7. The diplomatic negotiator must develop the ability, not only to analyse the views of the other side, but also the changing perspectives and positions it may adopt, in order to visualize intermediate lines that offer advantageous options.

8. He must keep in mind that to achieve his ultimate goal he must be prepared to present his State's case properly so as to persuade and convince the other side to accept his position. At the same time, he must be alert not only of the tactics of the adversary, but also of the complicated operations carried out by third countries which are not in the negotiation but which may have special interests in the outcome and thus may seek to influence the result.

9. In the universe of international law, negotiation is the oldest and most frequently used methods of peaceful settlement. In fact article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations establishes as one of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, first bargaining (direct settlement), followed by the good offices, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, all of which are, indeed, rules of negotiation.

10. In treaty law, negotiation is the critical phase of the conclusion of treaties. It consists of a set of actions leading to the drafting of these agreements.

11. Negotiation can be formal or informal. In the formal form, the diplomat commits himself and his Head of State to particular actions, while the latter is carried out without compromising the Head of State or any representative of the particular State. Similarly, a confidential or secret negotiation may formally or informally commit the parties to remain quiet about their purpose and decided action. But usually, an informal negotiation is usually carried out privately outside of any formal relationship and may serve to prepare for upcoming formal negotiations.

2.4. The Environment for the Conduct of Diplomacy

There can be different settings/environment that influence the Conduct of Diplomacy
- The International System:
1. The profound changes in international relations, evident in its orientation, design and implementation, are often the result of the speed and intensity of changes from the globalization process and the increasing inclusion and participation of Heads of State, and also of the multiplicity of simultaneous and different forums of negotiation in the international arena.

2. The impact of the changing global economy is also felt in the evolving international relations. Further, the limitations that the international environment "imposes" on the traditional sovereignty of States now force these States to deal with new approaches.

3. The ongoing tension between continuity and change illustrates the inherent characteristic of the international system, and it has now reached a level of complexity hardly comparable with previous historical periods. In many cases the so-called new processes do not stop dealing with the old issues which are now presented with fresh arguments and new concepts, since new situations cannot be handled with outdated techniques and methods unsuitable for the present.

4. The contemporary diplomat, in addition to his core responsibilities, should know how to properly address the implications of globalization, and deftly handle issues relating to foreign investment and the increasing influence of international standards set by international organisations with competence in that area.

5. These are some of the essential aspects to be taken into account when organising the multidisciplinary training required for diplomats which will result in the proper selection of diplomatic representatives. There is no room for inconsistency, since mistakes or improvisations during negotiations often produce damage and unpredictable consequences for the respective State.

6. One of the newer developments in international relations is the acceptance of steps and processes taken by regional or provincial (or sub-national) governments within a unified State to establish, among other links, contacts for cooperation with foreign governments or with counterpart sub-national governments in other unified States. These steps and processes often deal with foreign trade, investment, research, environmental protection, tourism and cultural and sports exchanges. However, these relations do not move into the area of foreign policy which historically is the preserve of the central government.

7. The danger of this developing form of diplomacy or "proto-diplomacy" conducted by regional or provincial governments within a unified State is that it promotes separatism since a particular regional or provincial government may use such international activity as preparatory work for a future secession and international recognition.

8. There is also the concept of "post-diplomacy" which refers to international action taken by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) within a particular State to promote their positions through their contacts with foreign governments. Their views may conflict with those of the State which also has diplomatic relations with the governments contacted by the NGOs.

9. Another mutation in international relations, though not widespread, is the is the idea of "anti-diplomacy." This term refers to the sinister and unsettling action of international terrorism, drug traffickers and the transnational organised crime, and political and economic espionage.

2.5. Rules of Effective Diplomatic Communication and bargaining

Some basic rules of effective diplomacy are:

1. Be realistic: It is important to have goals that match your ability to achieve them.

2. Be careful about what you say: The experienced diplomat plans out and weighs words carefully.

3. Seek common ground: Disputes begin but negotiations find common ground to end them successfully. Almost any negotiation will involve some concessions, so it is important to maintain a degree of flexibility.

4. Understand the other side: There are several aspects to understanding the other side

5. **Be patient**: Being overly anxious can lead to concessions that are unwise and may convey weakness to an opponent.

2.6. The Instruments of International bargaining

Instruments of Diplomacy briefly:

- A state can attain its diplomatic aims through a variety of ways namely; reconciliation or negotiation, giving gift or concession, creating dissension, threat or actual use of force.
- The diplomatic objectives, a state takes resort to three basic modes of diplomatic behavior; **co-operation, accommodation and opposition**
- Co-operation and accommodation can be achieved through fruitful negotiation. When negotiation fails to achieve these aims through peaceful means, opposition in various from including the use of force is adopted.

In detail:

Political Instruments: The main political instruments of Foreign Policy are mainly diplomacy and international alliances and organizations. International Governmental Organizations are treated elsewhere, so they will not be dealt with here.

Diplomacy: Diplomacy is considered to be the main element of Foreign Policy. It is defined as the art or practice of conducting international relations. It is important not to equate Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, as the first is merely one of the instruments for the advancement of the latter.

The use of diplomacy includes arbitration, either informal (where a group of diplomats is gathered to hear all sides of an issue, and come to a decision based on international law), or formal (where the International Court of Justice at The Hague takes this role);international conferences (where solutions are found on the basis of political discussion, without much resort to international law), negotiations (without the formalities of a conference), informal diplomacy (such as the use of non-officials or non-mandated officials).

Diplomatic relations and rules are set out by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Declaration was signed in 1961 and is considered as a key document in the history of international relations. The Convention forms the rule-book of diplomacy and has been ratified by nearly every country in the world.

The Vienna Convention defines the rules of diplomatic relations to be observed between States. It also specifies the rights and immunities for diplomats and rules to be followed in case of rectifications of international agreements.

Alliances: Alliances are agreements between two or more actors of Foreign Policy to cooperate on issues of common interest. Alliances can be open (when publicly known) and covert (when maintained secret), formal (when creating bodies to support and manage them) and informal (when no structures are created) and refer to security or other matters.

Economic Instruments: The main economic instruments are foreign aid, foreign economic policy and economic sanctions. All of them will be analysed below.

Foreign Aid: As regards Foreign Aid, it refers to the voluntary and intentioned transfer of resources, typically, although not always, from one State (donor) to another (recipient). Foreign Aid is in itself divided into different categories depending on the objective pursued

by the use of the transferred resources and which include Humanitarian Aid (to relieve human suffering during and after man-made or natural disasters, without tackling the original causes of the vulnerability), Development Aid (to contribute to the economic and social development of the recipient in the long term without necessarily alleviating immediate suffering) and Military Aid (dedicated to the strengthening of the military capabilities of the recipient).

Although Foreign Aid is sometimes considered as a non-coercive instrument of Foreign Policy, mostly dedicated to human, economic and social development, the instrument may be used, and is often used, in a coercive manner, by the establishment of a link between the reception of aid and certain policy objectives of the donor to which the recipient should contribute and by the threat of discontinuing the supply of aid if such contribution does not take place.

Foreign aid has been often used to support ideologically closed regimes that have then used that aid to repress their population or enter into aggressive militarist policies towards other States. Additionally, there has been widespread criticism as to the efficiency of aid to achieve its pursued objectives.

Foreign Economic and Trade Policy: Trade is defined as the exchange of goods and services between Foreign Policy actors, and is considered to be one of the most relevant instruments of Foreign Policy in current times. As with all other Foreign Policy instruments, trade may be used in a cooperative way, where all parties get some benefit, or a coercive way where the benefits or, rather, their absence due to a possible discontinuation of a certain trade policy, may be used to coerce a Foreign Policy actor to operate in a certain manner. While trade policy was in the past a typically bilateral instrument, it has become increasingly multilateral in the recent years, with the creation of trade blocks such as the European Economic Community (now European Union), MERCOSUR/MERCOSUL and, especially, the WTO, which is briefly analysed below.

Economic Sanctions: Economic sanctions are a typically coercive measure intended by an actor of Foreign Policy (imposer, the sanctioning actor) to cause economic damage to another actor of Foreign Policy (target, the sanctioned actor) and thus force it to pursue a certain course of action. They may include tools such as embargoes, boycotts, freezing of

funds and assets and other trade or economic restrictions and may be bilateral or multilateral.

The use of sanctions has been refined with the use of the so-called 'smart' sanctions, targeted at specific sectors of the economy or specific persons. The objective of these smart sanctions is to force compliance on the target without unnecessarily damaging the society as a whole, including those parts which may have nothing to do with the policies that the sanctions aim to prevent.

The European Union follows sanctioning regimes imposed by the UN and complements them with further sanctions. It also imposes its own sanctioning regimes. The European Union has imposed sanctions, among others, on Iran, Syria, Ivory Coast, Congo, Egypt, Tunis, Libya, etc.

Military Instruments: There are two types of military instruments, depending on whether or not force is actually used. When this is the case, we talk about warfare, whereas if force is not used we talk about military pressure or threat.

Military pressure: Military pressure is defined as the threat of use of military force by a Foreign Policy actor against another Foreign Policy actor in order to achieve certain Foreign Policy objectives and without having to use actual military force.

The use of military pressure has proved quite efficient in reaching Foreign Policy objectives, avoiding more damaging conflict and maintaining peace at large. It nevertheless entails high risks, such as that of escalating a conflict and ending up in a situation of actual warfare. Additionally, the use of military threat as a Foreign Policy instrument must infer indeed the possibility of actual warfare in order to be efficient.

Warfare: Whereas war has been classically considered as one of the main instruments of Foreign Policy, such position has gone under pressure in recent times. The use of war as an instrument of Foreign Policy intends to achieve Foreign Policy objectives by the coercion of other Foreign Policy actors, achieved by the use of military force upon them.

It is important to bear in mind that, unlike other Foreign Policy instruments, the use of war as a Foreign Policy instrument entails an enormous amount of risk and cost. Risks include the possibility of a military defeat which would render impossible the achievement of the

pursued Foreign Policy objectives, compromise other Foreign Policy interests and objectives and even put at stake vital interests. Another possible risk is the lack of public support for the war effort, ultimately leading to the demise of a government. It is important to bear in mind that, under international law, war is a legitimate course of action, even if it is confined to self-defence (Article 51 of the UN Charter). International law has aimed at the reduction of the human and economic costs of war.

War may be divided into conventional (open warfare with the use of conventional weapons), unconventional (covert warfare or with the use of non-conventional weapons, such as nuclear, biological or chemical) and asymmetric (where the parties in conflict differ greatly in their military capabilities).

2.7. The Nature and Characteristics of Power as Base for Diplomacy

Elements of National power:

A. Geography: The territorial expanse of the Soviet Union, whose land mass extends over one-seventh of the land area of the earth, or the vast reaches of the Chinese empire both make military conquest and control problematical even with absolute weapons.

The policies that the United Nations was able to pursue in Korea were circumscribed by the magnitude of the military effort of fighting a successful war on the seemingly endless terrain of the mainland of China.

- ❖ Maintaining communication networks, Japan, china, Russia, & American.
- ❖ It is best to note that Ethiopia's location in the horn of Africa and the complicated political situation in this geographic region.
- ❖ Ethiopia would have been in different international context if it had been located in some other part of the world say Latin America.
- ❖ Topography (its mountains, rivers, and plains), size and climate are also important.
- ❖ The immense expanse of Russia, for example, has repeatedly saved it from invasion.
- ❖ Ethiopian context, the rugged terrain and mountainous feature of the central highland saved the empire from being easily attacked by other internal and external forces.

B. Natural Resources:
- ▪ The crisis in the Middle East provides a reminder that natural resources continue to be a vital element in foreign policy.
- ▪ Hence control of oil becomes a cordial stake in world politics, and "oil diplomacy" has emerged as a term of art among policy makers.

- Other natural resources influence foreign policy; the most basic has tended to be food production.
- Food and energy are the lifeblood of a nation; its leaders must find ways, whether domestically or internationally, to satisfy these needs.

C. Industrial Establishment: 19th and 20th centuries, the industrial establishment of a country has been the most basic index of world power.

- ❖ Attained independence seeks economic growth as the indispensable prerequisite of status in the international society.

D. The National Infrastructure

- ❖ The infrastructure of a state might roughly be equated with the skeleton of a human body.
- ❖ For example these factors strongly affect any country's capacity in the other elements of power.

(I) Technology

- ❖ Air conditioning modifies the impact of weather, computers revolutionize education, robotics speed industry, synthetic fertilizers expand agriculture, new drilling techniques allow for undersea oil exploration, microwaves speed information, and lasers bring the military to the edge of the Luke Skywalker era.

(II) Transportation Systems

- ❖ The ability to move people, raw materials, finished products, and sometimes the military throughout its territory is another part of a country's power equation.

(III) Information and Communications Systems

- ❖ The advent of satellites and computers has accelerated the revolution begun with radio and television.
- ❖ Photocopying machines, then fax machines, and now the Internet have dramatically changed communications.
- ❖ Enhanced communications technology increases the ability of a society to communicate within itself and remain cohesive.

E. Military Establishment

- Today a show of strength involves air forces, fleets, and satellites
- Effective foreign policy must be supported by a military program that can safeguard national security.

Quantitative Population

- ❖ Constitute the human forces both quantitative and qualitative.

- ❖ Population is a quantitative factor that obviously must be considered in every calculation of the capacity of states.
- ❖ Population is an element of foreign policy that is not absolutely predictable and that depends on other related elements.
- ❖ Tangible demographic subcategories include number of people, age distribution, and such quantitative factors as health and education. There are also intangible population factors such as morale.
- ❖ Population as is true for geographic size, the size of a country's population can be a positive or a negative factor. Because a large population supplies military personnel and industrial workers, sheer numbers of people are a positive power factor.

Age Distribution

- ❖ It is an advantage for a country to have a large number and percentage of its population in the productive years (15-65 by international reporting standards.
- ❖ Booming populations have a heavy percentage of children who must be supported.
- ❖ Limited life expectancy, many people die before they complete their productive years.
- ❖ Some countries are aging, with a geriatric population segment that consumes more resources than it produces.

ii) Health and Education

- ❖ There are health and education variations among all countries, but LDCs are especially disadvantaged compared to EDCs.

iii) Morale: A final factor that affects the population element of national power is the morale of a country's citizens. World War II demonstrated the power of strong civilian morale.

- ❖ Great Britain and the Soviet Union reeled under tremendous assaults by the Nazi forces.

Qualitative-Policy Makers and Leaders

- ❖ The capacity for rational and responsible foreign policy varies greatly from state to state.
- ❖ Population is an element of foreign policy that is not absolutely predictable and that depends on other related element of foreign policy.

G. Government

- ❖ The quality of a country's government is a third power element associated with the national core.
- ❖ The issue is not what form of government, such as a democracy or an authoritarian system, a country has.

- ❖ Instead the issue is administrative competence; whether a state has a well- organized and effective administrative structure to utilize its power potential fully.

- ❖ The collapse of the Soviet Union stemmed in part from its massive and inefficient bureaucratic structure.
- ❖ The management of the state is failing fast
- ❖ One top Soviet official complained in 1990
- ❖ We have brought the motherland to an awful state, turning it from an empire admired throughout the world to a state with an inglorious present and an indefinite future

H. Leadership skill
- ❖ Leadership is one of the most intangible elements of national power.
- ❖ Prime Minister Winston Churchill's sturdy image and his inspiring rhetoric well served the British people during World War II.
- ❖ The official empowered with making the relevant decisions in foreign policy.
- ❖ From a formal point of view, a policy maker is the official empowered with making the relevant decisions in foreign policy.
- ❖ In societies where the officials are not the true wielders of power, the search for the centers of power may lead us to the political party, the military, the trade unions, the tribal chiefs, or the intellectuals.

2.8. The Negotiating Process: Preliminaries, Inducing Agreement and Problem solving
Negotiation is a method by which people settle differences. It is a process by which compromise or agreement is reached while avoiding argument and dispute.

In any disagreement, individuals understandably aim to achieve the best possible outcome for their position (or perhaps an organisation they represent). However, the principles of fairness, seeking mutual benefit and maintaining a relationship are the keys to a successful outcome.

Specific forms of negotiation are used in many situations: international affairs, the legal system, government, industrial disputes or domestic relationships as examples. However, general negotiation skills can be learned and applied in a wide range of activities. Negotiation skills can be of great benefit in resolving any differences that arise between you and others.

Stages of Negotiation

In order to achieve a desirable outcome, it may be useful to follow a structured approach to negotiation. For example, in a work situation a meeting may need to be arranged in which all parties involved can come together.

The process of negotiation includes the following stages:

1. Preparation
2. Discussion
3. Clarification of goals
4. Negotiate towards a Win-Win outcome
5. Agreement
6. Implementation of a course of action

1. Preparation

Before any negotiation takes place, a decision needs to be taken as to when and where a meeting will take place to discuss the problem and who will attend. Setting a limited time-scale can also be helpful to prevent the disagreement continuing.

This stage involves ensuring all the pertinent facts of the situation are known in order to clarify your own position. In the work example above, this would include knowing the 'rules' of your organisation, to whom help is given, when help is not felt appropriate and the grounds for such refusals. Your organisation may well have policies to which you can refer in preparation for the negotiation.

Undertaking preparation before discussing the disagreement will help to avoid further conflict and unnecessarily wasting time during the meeting.

2. Discussion

During this stage, individuals or members of each side put forward the case as they see it, i.e. their understanding of the situation.

Key skills during this stage include questioning, listening and clarifying.

Sometimes it is helpful to take notes during the discussion stage to record all points put forward in case there is need for further clarification. It is extremely important to listen, as when disagreement takes place it is easy to make the mistake of saying too much and listening too little. Each side should have an equal opportunity to present their case.

3. Clarifying Goals

From the discussion, the goals, interests and viewpoints of both sides of the disagreement need to be clarified.

It is helpful to list these factors in order of priority. Through this clarification it is often possible to identify or establish some common ground. Clarification is an essential part of the negotiation process, without it misunderstandings are likely to occur which may cause problems and barriers to reaching a beneficial outcome.

4. Negotiate Towards a Win-Win Outcome

This stage focuses on what is termed a 'win-win' outcome where both sides feel they have gained something positive through the process of negotiation and both sides feel their point of view has been taken into consideration.

A win-win outcome is usually the best result. Although this may not always be possible, through negotiation, it should be the ultimate goal.

Suggestions of alternative strategies and compromises need to be considered at this point. Compromises are often positive alternatives which can often achieve greater benefit for all concerned compared to holding to the original positions.

5. Agreement

Agreement can be achieved once understanding of both sides' viewpoints and interests have been considered.

It is essential to for everybody involved to keep an open mind in order to achieve an acceptable solution. Any agreement needs to be made perfectly clear so that both sides know what has been decided.

6. Implementing a Course of Action

From the agreement, a course of action has to be implemented to carry through the decision.

Failure to Agree: If the process of negotiation breaks down and agreement cannot be reached, then re-scheduling a further meeting is called for. This avoids all parties becoming embroiled in heated discussion or argument, which not only wastes time but can also damage future relationships. At the subsequent meeting, the stages of negotiation should be repeated. Any new ideas or interests should be taken into account and the situation looked at afresh. At this stage it may also be helpful to look at other alternative solutions and/or bring in another person to mediate.

2.9. Options for Conducting Diplomacy

Options: the primary function of quiet, third-party diplomacy is to create space for dialogue and to establish and maintain confidence. Both objectives are enhanced by establishing relations at an early stage, thus creating a sort of "capital" of confidence, trust and local knowledge – including personal contacts – all of which may be drawn upon, especially should events take a negative turn. This "capital", primarily and most effectively enabled by pro-activeness, complements and enhances problem-solving efforts by maximizing the impact of the abovementioned notions of "persuasion", "suasion" and "influence". Through early, long-term relation-building, the third-party actor is better able to identify and then draw attention to the "enlightened self-interest" of parties to a conflict, devising genuine and workable solutions to real problems, advancing argument, and using experience and prestige

to influence. This requires credibility on the part of the third-party, born of recognized status, experience and skill for which commensurate resources are needed. It also requires the capacity to deliver expert assistance and otherwise be useful.

Although the challenge of multi-party versus two-party engagements will be addressed in the section on Techniques, it bears mentioning here that the basic options and techniques remain the same. Their choice and application may be different, as in the case of proximity talks whereby the third party might have to "survey" or perform multiple "shuttling" and try to triangulate positions with a view to finding "common ground", leading positions, and perhaps "compensating" some. None of this is necessarily unique to multiparty engagement, but a greater degree of complexity is inescapable. A seminal book on the subject aptly describes the process as "herding cats".

The following, though not intended as an exhaustive list, provides a brief overview of the primary options for quiet diplomatic engagement for the prevention of violent conflict: "good offices", "special envoys", "facilitation", "mediation", "conciliation", "adjudication" and "arbitration". "Good Offices" Perhaps the most prominent example of third-party engagement has been the "good offices" function of the Heads of intergovernmental organizations. Though enshrined in the charters or dispute resolution mechanisms of a number of regional organizations, the precise meaning and practice of the term are rarely elaborated. The ambiguity of the good offices function – in one definition described as "action taken to bring about or initiate negotiations, but without active participation in the discussion of the substance of the dispute" – has permitted considerable freedom of action for those who have chosen to provide it. When: most prominently at the outset of a conflict management effort. How: gaining entry at the good office provider's own initiative, with consent or by invitation of parties; guaranteeing a safe environment; access to information, expertise, and power to reward and coerce. Functions: enquiries; fact-finding; determination of legal rights and specific duties; intermediary, i.e. to transmit messages between parties; may then encourage exchange of information; may attempt to explain and interpret messages to receiving party; formulating objectives.

Characteristics: dispassionate outsider or interested insider; credibility, local knowledge and sustainability over long-term (mix of actors may be required to accomplish all three). Special Envoys Special envoys are respected, experienced and impartial individuals (typically senior or retired diplomats or politicians) dispatched by the authority of a third party – often by

invitation of governments involved in conflicts – to help reduce tensions and resolve disputes. They collect information, promote dialogue, make recommendations on issues of concern, and suggest preventive activities. As envoys generally have limited power to move parties to comply, their involvement is most effective before stakes in a conflict have risen. Furthermore, the fact that actions of the envoy at an early stage are more likely conciliatory and non-threatening may help maintain the permission – implicit or explicit – of sponsoring organizations and their member States to engage with all parties in other ways. When: before tensions have escalated (pre-crisis, early); usually short-term. How: (1) contact: one-off; direct, in person; visiting, extra-territorial; focused mainly on particular disputants/immediate tensions; (2) communication: oral, public, confidential, on-the-record, off-the-record, reporting (back to intergovernmental organization) • Functions: from fact-finder/observer to active engagement with parties in communications and negotiations; earning trust; provision of advice, counsel, recommendations; conduit to other instruments; intermediary; negotiator; mediator; process and goal definition; catalyst for initiating institution-building or other means of addressing sources of conflicts; providing early warning for outside community; may express grievances of parties where appropriate before international community. Characteristics: stature, experience and considerable independence; dispassionate outsider or interested insider; credibility; impartial broker; avoids cumbersome political processes and time other tools/procedures might require; cannot ensure that underlying causes of tension are redressed and must therefore be supplemented by long-term tools. Facilitation describes third-party engagement which provides a forum, space and environment conducive to dispute settlement. Other facilities and services may be provided as appropriate, notably communications. Such provision may be minimal or substantial depending on the situation and (most importantly) the will of the parties. "Facilitated mediation" describes a more substantive third-party engagement which actively seeks to solve the matters in dispute by bridging positions and advancing alternatives. These engagements work best at the earliest possible stage, when the sources of conflict are identified and addressed before tensions or violence emerge. Such a mechanism may maintain its independence and impartiality by basing its actions and recommendations on international norms already recognized by the parties concerned. Historically, it appears most effectively accomplished "quietly", as elaborated and exemplified by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM), which is capable of quick, independent and impartial action, promotes a law-based approach, and can rely upon participating States for support and further credibility.

Indeed, since commencing activities in 1993, the HCNM has – with modest resources including a small travel budget and few staff – successfully identified and assisted in the early resolution of tensions between parties in some fifteen countries that could endanger peace, stability or friendly relations among participating States of the OSCE. In addition to facilitating dialogue and promoting confidence and cooperation, the HCNM has made recommendations to States regarding, inter alia, changes in legislation, institutions or policies affecting political and economic participation, education, language and culture of national minorities. Though often covered by local media, engagement of the HCNM has been discreet but not secret, thus respecting confidences and enabling open dialogue between all parties. • When: before conflict dynamics emerge, and until or after early operational conflict phase • How: with consent (usually pre-established by the mandate of the intervening mechanism) and cooperation of State concerned; monitors potential problem areas, determines if involvement is needed and degree of positive impact; addresses root and proximate causes • Functions: creating conditions for parties to initiate and maintain their own dialogue process; communicating and interpreting international norms; making precise recommendations of politically feasible solutions in line with those norms; explaining advantages of adherence and mobilizing support for conformity • Characteristics: independence; cooperation (non-coercive); impartiality; confidentiality; trust and credibility; capable of gathering and analyzing information; inside contacts; persistence; uses media tactfully and tactically; 'megaphone' when options exhausted. Mediation, a voluntary and ad hoc tool of peaceful conflict prevention and resolution, is "related to but distinct from the parties' own negotiations, (and) can be a non-coercive, nonviolent [and often non-binding] form of intervention of a third-party to affect, change, resolve, modify or influence a conflict." In mediation, parties seek the assistance of, or accept an offer of help from, an outside actor to change their perceptions or behaviour without resorting to the use of force or the authority of law. It may involve the commitment of the parties to respect the determinations and decisions of the independent and impartial third-party mediator. A mediator may act as a "catalyst, educator, translator, resource-expander, bearer of bad news, agent of reality, and scapegoat." The objectives of a mediator are "to change the physical environment of conflict management, to influence the perception of what is at stake, and to stimulate the parties' motivation to reach a peaceful outcome by using subtle pressure." Mediators should seek to problem-solve and prioritize improving relationships between the parties concerned. • When: too early may make the intermediary unpopular with one or more parties; too late may mean the situation has deteriorated to the point where mediation is not

possible • How: Communication – contact with parties; trust and confidence-building; arranging for interactions; identifying underlying issues and interests; supplying missing information; transmitting messages between parties; allowing interests of all parties to be discussed; parties agree to involvement of outside mediator to facilitate process. Formulation – chooses meeting site; controls pace of meetings and physical environment; establishes protocol; ensures privacy; highlights common interests; controls timing; helps devise acceptable outcome; helps parties save face; suggests compromises Manipulation – keeps parties at the table; changes expectations; takes responsibility for compromises; makes parties aware of the costs of non-agreement; supplies and filters information; rewards concessions; adds incentives and threatens punishments. Functions: issue definition; determining process, methods/procedures; identifies and explains (but does not exactly wield) carrots and sticks • Characteristics: mediator is "acceptable, impartial, neutral third party who assists parties in reaching their own settlement" ; encompasses good offices and conciliation; tends to be more appropriate than adjudication (binding third-party settlement) for politically sensitive disputes such as those involving national honor, "vital" national interests, or the use of force. Conciliation The term conciliation refers broadly to proceedings in which a person or a panel of persons assists the parties to a dispute in resolving their differences. An essential feature of the practice is that it is based on a request addressed by the parties to the third party. Conciliation differs from mediation in that its aim is to conciliate – or reconcile – the objectives of each party, often by seeking concessions, and that the parties seldom, if ever, face each other across the table in the presence of the conciliator. Separate meetings are held with the parties – a practice known as "caucusing" – and communication between them is accomplished through "shuttle diplomacy". Substantively, a conciliator assists sides to develop independently a list of their objectives, and then encourages them to "give" on the objectives one at a time, from least to most important, with a view to achieving easy "successes" and thereby building trust. Conciliators often take a more active role than mediators in making suggestions or advising on the best way to resolve the dispute. In contrast to arbitration, parties retain full control over the process – which is non-adjudicatory – and the outcome. As the process has no legal standing, the conciliator typically has no authority to seek evidence or call witnesses, usually writes no decision, and makes no award. When: before violent escalation; in response to the invitation of parties to a dispute • How: parties agree and extend invitation to the conciliator; process determined by parties • Functions: facilitating dialogue between parties through independent caucusing and information transmission; assisting identification/prioritizing of objectives; building trust •

Characteristics: parties control process and outcomes – no procedural guarantees; entirely consensual; often proposes but does not impose solution; adapts to circumstances and accommodates wishes and interests of. Adjudication and Arbitration International adjudication refers to a method of international dispute settlement that "involves the referral of the dispute to an impartial third-party tribunal – normally either an arbitral tribunal or an international court – for binding decision, usually on the basis of international law. In contrast with so-called political means of settlement, international adjudication usually involves a legal obligation on the part of the parties to the dispute to accept the third party's decision as settling the dispute." Arbitration is a form of adjudication that involves the referral of a dispute to an ad hoc tribunal, rather than to a permanently established court, for binding decision based on terms agreed by the parties. It may also be simply by agreement between the parties, including agreed terms, as is often the case for international commercial exchanges. • When: before violent escalation • How: parties form an agreement to establish tribunal/arbitral panel to decide their dispute • Functions: issue definition; determining methods and procedures; tribunal/panel addresses only the particular issue(s) entrusted to it by the agreement • Characteristics: offers parties control over selection of intervener(s), scope of issues, and procedures; produces legally binding decision (less appropriate for politically sensitive disputes).

Chapter Three: Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in Ethiopia under Imperial System

3.3.   Overview of Ethiopian External Relations in Pre-Haile Sellassie Period

3.1.1. Foreign Policy during Tewodros II (1855-1868)

The modern Ethiopian imperial state did begin to emerge in the middle of 19th century. At the time when Ras Kassa claimed to emerge as one of the kings defeating all minor kings fighting for the control of the throne, during the presumed Era of Princes, the King was predominantly concerned with establishing control over the fragmented parts of the Empire. He claimed to create a united Ethiopia, but only partially succeeded. Yet he introduced the idea of modernity and modern army at the time. Throughout his reign Tewodros tried to develop a dynamic foreign policy that reached out beyond the Horn Region. He sought the Western Christian world to recognize his country and help him to modernize his country. Moreover, as Keller has put it "he appealed specifically to Britain, France and Russia as Christian nations to assist him in whatever ways possible in his fight against the Turks, Egyptians and Islam".

The emperor attempted to establish his diplomatic relations to fight his immediate enemies claiming Christianity as instrument of foreign policy. However, the emperor's demand for modern technology and skilled man power from Britain was not concluded to his satisfaction as the latter sent religious missionaries. Despite his claim to be recognized as the emperor of Ethiopia the British Queen was not in reciprocal. Consequently Tewodros took desperate measures by taking hostage of several British missionaries including the consul which was responded with the British Millitary Expedition (Keller). Tewodros's Troops were easily defeated and the King found dead with controversial cause.

3.1.2. Foreign Policy during Yohannes IV (1872-1889)

Yohannes IV succeeded Tewodros II. Like his predecessor, Yohannes considered Islam as a threat to the territorial integrity of the polity. Indeed Egypt tried to put a serious security threat in its continued attempt to invade the country under many pretexts, yet its motive was to control the source of Blue Nile. These, however, were not successful as Egypt faced subsequent defeat both in 1875 and 1876 at the Battle of Gundet and Gura respectively (Keller). In addition to Muslim threat, the emperor saw European expansionism as greater threat to the survival of the country. In fact his calculation of threat has turned out to be real as Italy got a foot hold at the port of Massawa in 1885.This colonial ambition of Italy was

reflected by the Foreign Minister speech "The Red Sea is the key to the Mediterranean" implicating the strategic importance of Ethiopia (Novati). However, the emperor died fighting with the "Mahadists". The Sudanese resistance groups against British rule happened to invade Western Ethiopia because of their presumption that Yohannes IV was collaborating with the British.

3.1.3. Foreign Policy during Menelik II (1889-93)

Following the death of Yohannes, Menlik II assumed the throne. Menelik was the King of Shoa region before his coronation as the Kings of Kings of Ethiopia. He had expanded his sphere of influence towards the far South and East incorporating new areas and communities peacefully or otherwise. According to many Ethiopian historians, the southward expansionism policy of the King was mainly targeted to have access to Sea Port, Zeila. Minelik was aware of the strategic importance of outlet to the sea for the country as he felt that the country's access to the sea in the North had fallen under Italy's influence since the mid 1890s. Before the death of Yohannes Italy had good diplomatic relation with Menelik with the objective of weakening its immediate enemy in the North, Yohannes. Menilik comfortably exploited the opportunity to consolidate his power, perhaps to deter Yohannes and bolster its expansionist policy to the south. Menelik's relation with Italy had disappointed Yohannes as witnessed by the absence of Menelik from participation in the war against Mahadists.

Following the death of Yohannes, however, Italy continued to be the main challenge in the North. Moreover the King saw the other colonial powers surrounding all four corners of the country as the scramble of Africa was heightened. Italy expanded towards the hinterland of Ethiopia from its first hold of Bogess, later named Eritrea, and Massawa port crossing Tekeze river. Menelik was cautiously following such colonial expansionism of Italy. The emperor followed double track diplomacy to contain or reverse Italy's expansion and maintain the territorial integrity of his country. On the one hand, he entered many treaties and agreements to solve the challenge amicably. One of the remarkable treaties was the '*Wuchalle*' friendship and peace treaty where the parties agreed to avoid war and solve the problem peacefully. On the other hand the emperor was preparing himself by accumulating military ammunitions to defend the aggression from any side of colonial powers, British, French and of course Italy.

However, the emperor's diplomatic endeavor with Italy failed to result in peace due to Italy's misinterpretation of the controversial article 17 of the *'Wuchalle'* treaty. The treaty did contain different meanings and interpretations in the respective languages of the parties. According to the Italian version, Ethiopia failed under the protectorate of the former which then led to the abrogation of the *'Wuchale'* treaty by Ethiopia in 1893. As a result, Italy prepared for war and started its systematic penetration of the country from the north. Menelik was prepared to reverse this aggression raising his traditional Army till only 1896.

In 1896, the emperor declared nation-wide war against Italy in defense of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the century old nation. After a severe battle, Menelik and his people managed to defeat the colonial power. This happened at the bloody Battle of Adwa where Ethiopian forces made a record of history by defeating a powerful European colonial power. The significance of the Adowa victory is loud and clear as many European powers recognized Ethiopia as an independent African state on similar footing with the Europeans. Indeed Britain, France, Russia and the vanquished Italy came to Menelik's Palace to arrange formal exchange of Ambassadors. Moreover, these powers signed formal boundary treaties with the emperor. In fact the present boundary of Ethiopia vis -a-vis its neighbors had been defined at least on paper. With the exception of Sudan and of course present day Eritrea (being ex-colony of Italy) the boundary of the country with French Somaliland-Djibouti, Kenya (former British colony), and present Somali (Italian Somaliland and British Somaliland) had been defined on paper, yet were not demarcated.

As the boundary issue was not settled, there have been disputes and counter claims with the neighboring countries especially with Sudan, Somalia and Eritrea. Of course Somalia claims huge portion of the territory inside Ethiopia. What so ever the case may be, Ethiopia's foreign policy of the forth coming rulers has significantly been informed by the notion of territorial integrity of the country. And the issue of outlet to the sea remained the burning question determining its policy and role in the region.

3.2. Foreign Policy during Emperor Haile Selassie I (1916-1974)

Menelik died in 1913 and it was not until 1930 that the next strong emperor Haile Selassie I, assumed the throne. He was dedicated to the creation of a stronger, centralized and bureaucratic empire with unquestioned respect by the international community. This was clear as early as 1923, when as Regent to the Crown, Teferi Mekonen, and facilitated

Ethiopia's entry to the League of Nations. Ethiopia's membership in the League of Nations was clearly instigated by the ever present danger of invasion by Italians. When the Italian Fascists finally invade Ethiopia between 1936 and 1941, the Emperor fled to London and established a government in exile.

From there he journeyed to Geneva, Switzerland, to make a plea before the League of Nations for aid in defense to the country. Although the League of Nations' charter stipulated that all members were committed to protect the sovereignty of member states, through what was known as the collective security system, the League ultimately failed to take any substantive measure against Italy and the plea of the King was ignored. Apparently viewing the League of Nations' in action, the King continued to believe in the ultimate value of effective diplomacy. He also recognized Ethiopia's need for a powerful external patron until he could restore the independence of his country. His diplomatic skills and Britain's own strategic necessities in the area enabled him to elicit the aid of the British in securing the liberation of Ethiopia.

In the immediate post-war period, Ethiopia was extremely dependent on British military, economic and technical aid. At the same time, the Emperor feared that Britain might either declare Ethiopia a protectorate or use the claim that the whole of Italian East Africa; Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia, as an occupied enemy territory and thus could be partitioned for the administrative convenience. Haile Sellasie's fear moved him to seek alternative relationships that would allow him to loosen Ethiopia's tie with Britain. This was a period when all the Allied powers were jockeying for leverage in the reordered international political system. France wanted to return to the pre war status quo; Russia wanted to block Britain from claiming too much of the African spoils; the British wanted to solidify its presence in the Horn; and the United States wanted to establish a new presence in the region. As an emerging power, U.S was willing to heed emperors plead to strengthen diplomatic relations.

Through diplomacy, Haile Selassie was able to regain complete administrative control over the territory he claimed and more by 1954. In 1952 a U.N. resolution had made possible a federation between Ethiopia and the former Italian colony of Eritrea. Eritrea was to have regional autonomy within the federation, but Haile Selassie was not content with only administrative control. He was not satisfied until he secured the endorsement of both the Eritrean and Ethiopian Assemblies in 1962, which allowed him to incorporate Eritrea fully in to the Empire, making it a province of Ethiopia instead of a trustee-ship.

These manoeuvres took place against the backdrop of the emperor's loosening ties with Britain and establishing new patronage links with United States. British Military Aid was withdrawn in 1952, and the King moved quickly to firm up relations with the United States. Since the early 1940s, the United States had coveted a base in Eritrea where it could set up a radio tracking station. Haile Selasie viewed the use of such an installation by the United States as having more benefits than costs; that is, he would reap the benefit of being closely allied with the most powerful military power in the world, while being paid rent in the form of military aid that could be used to strengthen the state's military capacity. Two agreements were concluded in 1953 to formulize this new relationship. As a result, the United States guaranteed Ethiopia's security, which added greatly to the confidence with which the emperor could approach the task of political consolidation.

In addition to the military aid Ethiopia received from the United States over the next 23 years, its armed forces also benefited from the presence of a Military Assistance Advisory Group, which was established in 1954. This group provided training for the Ethiopian forces. By 1975, the total U.S. military assistance to Ethiopia amounted to almost $ 280 million. In addition, between 1953 and 1976, 3978 Ethiopian soldiers were trained in the United States. The military aid was decisive for the Emperor to ensure his survival at home and maintain the territorial integrity of the country. He effectively used military action against those riots and rebellions both in rural and urban places. Even though preferred not to become involved in the domestic politics, on occasions it provided the emperor with the means to put down internal upheavals and riots. On more consistent basis, the United States contributed to the expansion of Ethiopian military as a hedge a against the Somalia threats. It also provided counterinsurgency training and on the ground advisors to help to suppress Eritrean Nationalism.

Ethiopia also played significant role in Africa in fighting for African independence and to end colonialism and apartheid. In the United Nations, Ethiopia played its part in raising agendas and pressing for resolutions against colonialism in collaboration with some countries that supported the cause. India was strong partner in that regard. In this manner, the emperor can be considered as one of the founding fathers of African Unification. The establishment of the organization of African Unity in the capital of Ethiopia witnessed the prominent role of the emperor in African affairs as well. There was a time when the emperor resolved the perennial conflict in Sudan through His Good Offices. Ethiopia also played a significant role in

maintaining international peace and security by commit ting its troops for peacekeeping operations in Korea in 1951 and the Congo in 1961.

Of course the emperor's strategic alliance with outside powers helped him to stay on power for decades. In this regard British military aid and assistance helped him to restore and consolidate his power again by eliminating his potential rivals at home. Directly or indirectly he distanced potential rivals first with help from the British and later on with the help of USA military and technical assistance. There had been so many peasant revolts which the emperor had to deal with his modern military forces trained and assisted by US aid. Over all he managed to consolidate his power at home and stayed on power over four decades. The emperor secured the territorial integrity of the country and also secured port through Eritrea, yet the abrogation of the UN imposed federation arrangement of Eritrea remained one of a foreign policy challenge to the military regime who came to power through coup de'tat. So was the question of Ogaden.

Chapter Four: Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in Ethiopia in post Imperial period

4.1. Foreign Policy during the Military Government (1974—1991)

The military regime that took control of state power in 1974 adopted a foreign policy largely oriented to socialist ideology. The primary objectives of the foreign policy were survival of the regime and maintaining the territorial integrity of the country. Apart from these, restructuring the society along socialist lines was also considered as the foundation for the foreign policy motives at home. The major strategy to achieve the stated objectives heavily focused on building the military capability of the country. And force had been employed as the best strategy to silence dissent at home and deter the perceived external enemies of the country.

Since socialism was the guiding philosophy of the country, friendship and alliance with socialist countries of the world was considered as a viable strategy for realizing socialism at home and perhaps in the world. However, since the regime did not have the necessary economic and military capabilities to achieve its objectives, the country was very much dependent on economic and military aid on the others. In this regard, the country was heavily dependent on military aid on the Soviet Union which prevented it from securing any kind of military and technical assistance from the US and other European countries. The regime was condemned by the west for its human rights record, especially its treatment of former government officials. This resulted in declining Ethio-US relations marking its lowest point with the closure of the US military base and operation of military assistance within 72 hours (Keller). Following such problems, internal and external enemies began to take action to hasten the demise of the regime.

Internally Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) launched military attack on the Ethiopian Army. Many external actors were involved in sponsoring the rebel group, including; Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Sudan, Somalia and later USA itself. Moreover, Somalia's invasion of the Ethiopian region of Ogaden was one of the serious external challenges of the Ethiopian Government at the time. The government did not have enough capacity to calm the Eritrean Rebels and the Somali irredentist invasion. However, the regime managed to reverse the Somali aggression with the help of the new powerful patron, USSR. The involvement of USSR in the region only heightened the superpower rivalry between the USA and USSR during the cold war era (Schwab).

The corner stone of Ethiopia's foreign policy at the time was maintaining continuing friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Apart from the Dergue's near total dependence on the leaders in Moscow and their Warsaw Pact allies for military and logistical support during the war with Somalia and in the Eritrean conflict, several others factors have facilitated the consolidation of this new special relationship. These include: the immediate and unhesitant recognition of Mengistu's government by the Soviet Union; the quick and generous support they offered when the military regime needed assistance and guidance to address problems inherited from the past and related to the new socio-economic and political order.

Indicative of the magnitude of its foreign relations, the Dergue has signed numerous economic, social, political, trade, cultural, educational, consular, and administrative agreements and protocols with almost all socialist countries. The Soviet Union and its allies were thus able to exert immense influence in both domestic and foreign affairs of Ethiopia. Experts from the German Democratic Republic assisted the military regime in its struggle against domestic guerilla movements and external opponents, and in training cadres for the completely reorganized security services, later consolidated in to a full-fledged ministry with the biggest budget in the country. The Dergue had sent hundreds of Ethiopians for training to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Cuba while employing many of their administrators and technicians.

Apart from socialism, Ethiopia's strategic locations and other questions, such as; Eritrea, Somalia, and the issue of the Nile, had also shaped the foreign policy orientation and behavior of military government. Ethiopia being located in the Horn of Africa is at the cross roads to the oil rich middle East region and Indian Ocean. As a result of this the U.S.S.R was keen to have stronghold over the area, replacing the United States. U.S.S.R came at the right time when the Dergue called for military aid to reverse the aggression from Somalia in the East and quell the Eritrean nationalists in the north part of the country. It should be noted that U.S.S.R was used to be a friend of Somalia, yet all of a sudden, it made a swift change of policy when it came to Ethiopian side; while the U.S.A piped in to Somalia. That was a time of cold war whereby the two super powers, U.S.S.R and U.S.A were pitting each other to have a sphere of influence in the region.

Ethiopia shares the Nile and its longest border with Sudan, yet the relation between the two had been strained for decades. Sudan was one of the host countries for Ethiopian opposition

forces. In turn Ethiopia had been supporting the dissent groups in southern Sudan, including the Sudan's People's Liberation Army/SPLA (Amare Tekle). Amare argues that Ethiopia's foreign policy towards Sudan was based in part on the mistrust of the Arab Northerners as well. Similarly Amare contends that, "Ethiopia's relation with any third state in the Nile Valley have been shaped as much by Egypt's attitude and action as regards to Somalia, Eritrea and the Sudan and by its close association with Arab and Muslim States".

With regard to Africa's broader issues of decolonization and anti-Apartheid struggle, Ethiopia played significant role. The regime had extended its military and technical support to Freedom fighters in Angola and Rhodesia. The regime had also showed its solidarity to Palestine's cause by condemning Israel and sought political allegiance with the Arab world, however the negative perception that most Arab countries have towards Ethiopia remained unchanged. Finally, the regime collapsed following the end of cold war unable to survive in the absence of military aid from the socialist blocs, USSR, Cuba.

In general the adoption of socialism and its subsequent impact on the foreign policy of the country could be considered as a departure from its predecessors; however the policy objective of the country remained unchanged. The country's policy towards its neighbours, the region, and the Arab world remained unchanged. Such continuity of in the era of dynamic world teaches us the determining role of geography in the making and implementation of foreign policy of Ethiopia. The issue of Nile River, boundary issues, the strategic location of the country, unique culture (Christianity) amid the Islam religion and Arab culture had cumulative effect in shaping the foreign policy the country.

Determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under military regime

Like under its predecessors, Ethiopian foreign policy under Derg regime was influenced by both internal determinants like the historical legacy, the level of economic development and external development such as political dynamism in the horn Africa and the norms of the international system. Therefore, the following section will present both the internal and external determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under military regime respectively.

Internal determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under military regime (1974-1991)

The Ethiopian foreign policy was determined by economic development, historical legacy, military capability, political development and stability, the nature of society-state relationship and personality of the leader and image of the leadership during the military regime.

The nature of political development and instability

The nature of the political system under the Derg regime was characterized by the absence of unity and cohesiveness due to the advent of historical attempt to impose a single set of values on a multi-ethnic, multi confessional, polyglot population which in fact leads to political instability. Despite the prevalence of initial promise of the military regime to ensure popular participation, equality of all people and respect of people's fundamental rights but the reality on the ground is different because of the nature of political system which was dictatorial and believe in the slogan of Ethiopia first and historical legacy of Haile Selassie's political system. Therefore, this domestic reality and internal political contradiction determine the country's foreign policy and it urged the regime to highly and solely depend on on the Soviet Union to continue the unity of the state and ensure the perpetual survival of the regime.

Economic development

It is no doubt that Ethiopia is one the world poorest and economically backward countries during military regime due to imbalanced economy and inadequate socioeconomic environment, though the military regime nationalize the means of production and distribution and conduct different reform program like associating the peasant (collectivization), resettlement and state farming. Thus, this backward nature of Ethiopian economy under the military regime was the major internal determinant of Ethiopian foreign policy under the regime because the main objective of the military regime was to continually remain in power by solving the economic problem of the large community and maintaining the unity.

Military capabilities

Maintaining territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Ethiopia was the primary of objective of Ethiopian foreign policy since the formation of modern Ethiopian empire and again during the reign of the military regime which is fact realized based on the national or military capacity of the country. To this end, the military regime allocates the (60%) sixty percent of the annual budget for the military sector in addition to aid which received from the Soviet Union. Ethiopia ranked first in terms of allocating a large amount of money from the annual budget for armed force and again in terms quantity of armed force which resulted from the absence of durable peace in Horn of Africa and Ethiopia. Despite this, the armed force of Ethiopia under military regime was not well-trained and this resulted in the defeat of the armed forces by ethnic based internal movements like Eritrean People Liberation Front, Tigray People Liberation Front, Oromo Liberation Front and other insurgent movements.

Generally, the military capability was the major determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy during the military regime because it leads to the sustenance of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and perpetual existence of regime and the military regime calculate its own military merits in conducting foreign policy and foreign relations of the country.

Historical Legacy

The historical worry has also dominated the perception and attitudes of all Ethiopian regimes: suspicion of their neighbors' rooted in the memory of past confrontations. The Christian ruling classes of Ethiopia have long been convinced that 'Arabs' and 'Muslims' can never be reconciled with their nation's interests (national interest of Ethiopia). This historical tragedy made the military regime to develop foreign policy strategy which intended to against the interest of neighboring Arab states. The foreign policy strategy developed by military regime include wedging divisions between Arab states, to pit Africans against Arabs, making arrangements with those in a position to influence Arabs and to search for a Powerful patron. Therefore, the historical legacy is clearly expressed by Ras Kasa (emperor Tewodross II) letter to Queen Victoria of England which state that is Ethiopia is the only Christian state in the Horn of Africa and Red sea which surrounded by Muslim states which are the enemy of

Ethiopia since they intended to create one Muslim state in the Horn of Africa. So, it was these historical legacies which pushed the military regime to develop anti-Arabian state foreign policy and strongly rely on USSR, India, Yugoslavia, Italy and other western European state and again attempted to forge against Arab states in Organization of Africa Union. In a nutshell, the siege mentality approach and the factors of historical legacies are the internal determinant factors of Ethiopian foreign policy under the military regime.

Leadership and image of the regime

Under the military regime, all political power was concentrated under the strong hand of Mengistu who the Secretary-General of the Worker Party of Ethiopia and the President of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Force. He has controlled the all political activities of the regime, the foreign policy of the country was approved by him, the President's idiosyncrasies determine the country's foreign policy and major decisions in foreign policy and relations have taken place without sufficient thought about its consequence and implications. Thus, this monopoly of authority adversely affects the predictability and clarity of foreign policy and makes its systematic formulation and execution difficult during the military regime.

To sum up, Ethiopian foreign policy during military regime was internally determined by the aforementioned and discussed factors such as economic development, military capabilities, historical legacies, the personality of the leader, the nature of political development and instability. Beside these, all determinants of external determinants which affected Ethiopian foreign policy under the military regime and the following section brought the brief discussion of external determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under the military regime.

External determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under the Military regime

In addition to internal factors that determined the making and execution of Ethiopian foreign policy during the military regime, there were also external factors that shaped Ethiopian foreign policy such as political situation found in Horn Africa countries, in the continent (Africa) and international political system. The two external determinants affected the Ethiopian foreign policy under military regime namely global factors and regional factors.

Regional and sub-regional factors

Ethiopia found at the nucleus of Horn of Africa. The political condition and political atmosphere found in the Horn of African countries affect the foreign policy making and execution of Ethiopia since the reign of emperor Tewodros II to even today due to the spill over effect of what happened other Horn Africa states. Ethiopian foreign policy always affected by the political situation found in the Horn African states. Therefore, these are also the factors that determined Ethiopian foreign policy under military regime because during the then time officials of the regime and president Mengistu himself believe that Ethiopia is surrounded by several unfriendly states, who's in- habitants share more differences than similarities, and whose relationships have largely been characterized by mutual suspicion and violent hostility. This made the regime to understand that, the major security threat of Ethiopia is an external threat since the foreign policy approach and orientation of the regime was an outside-in approach.

Beside this, Ethiopia was an independent state in the Horn of Africa and this resulted in the conduct of boundary demarcation between Ethiopian and European powers (Britain, France, and Italy) and it was this boundary demarcation which incorporated Ogaden and surrounding area as part of the Ethiopian empire especially during the reign of emperor Menelik II and again Eretria which was Italy colony was also federated with Ethiopia in 1952 as a result of UN resolution of 390 (v). These two provinces were major security threats of Ethiopia during the military regime and affected Ethiopian foreign policy and relations and they were the

catalyst for relationship with neighboring states because of the independent Somalia and Eritrea was not interested in the demarcated territory by colonial powers and that was what amounted to the 1977 Ethio-Somali war and the raise Eritrean People Liberation Front and other movements to against the regime. Generally, Ethiopia is the only non-Arab and officially non-Muslim state in the Red Sea region, and because of its proximity to the Middle East, the oil-rich Persian Gulf, and the militarily important Indian Ocean, it continues to attract the attention not only of the two superpowers, but also Israel and various Arab governments, as well as Western Europe. Thus, due to the geostrategic importance of the country and its epicentre to all Horn African states the Ethiopian foreign policy was affected by the political system in the Horn of Africa.

Global factors

The reign of the military regime (1974-1991) was in the era of cold war and bipolar system which determined the foreign policy of nation states across the world. Therefore, the same logic applies on the foreign policy of Ethiopia under the military regime because the milestone of Ethiopian foreign policy during the then time was making Soviet Union and another socialist state the natural ally of the country. The military regimes near total dependence on the leaders in Moscow and their Warsaw Pact allies for military and logistical support during the war with Somalia and in the Eritrean conflict; several other factors have facilitated the consolidation of this new special relationship. The Soviet Union and its allies were thus exerted immense influence on both the domestic and foreign policy of Ethiopia and this made Ethiopia play central role Ethiopia in the informal network of Africa's Marxist regimes created during the late 1970s and early1980s including Angola and Mozambique. Therefore, international political situations including the cold war or global bipolar system were determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under the military regime due to the mere dependence of derg on USSR and other socialist countries for military and other supports.

4.2. The Foreign Policy of Ethiopia in the Post 1991

With EPRDF's ascent to power the country adopted a new foreign policy orientation and objectives. In the post 1991 period, Ethiopia's foreign policy is driven primarily by the quest to ensure national interest and security. As such, one of the goals of the foreign policy is to ensure the survival of the multi- national state. National interest of the country is understood in terms of realizing the real interest of the people mainly democracy and development. It refers to the primary interest of the people to live freely from poverty, disease and ignorance.

In this regard, foreign policy has been considered as an instrument to solve the domestic problems of the country, including; lack of good governance, instability and lack of economic development. If the equality and democratic rights of nations, nationalities, peoples and individuals are not realized, then conflicts can happen leading to instability and eventual disintegration. These are also considered as factors that damage national image and pride. These domestic problems were identified as the main challenges to ensuring the survival and national interest of the people. The foreign policy of Ethiopia has been designed to create favourable external environment to achieve rapid economic development and build up democratic system. So democracy and development are the foreign policy visions of the country.

The primary strategy in realization of these goals is to put the focus on domestic issues first. Addressing domestic political and economic problems requires forging national consensus about the problems and exit strategies from the problem. Especially in the age of globalization emphasizing on external issues such as; seeking financial aid, loans or technical issues would subject the country to dependency and vulnerability. That will limit not only the diplomatic leverage of the country but also will neglect the crux of the matter at home, viz., the issue of democratization and good governance and issues of development would not be addressed. This strategy is called an "inside-out" approach. If we solve our domestic problems the country would not be vulnerable and its peace and survival can be ensured. Even its outside enemies can be effectively deterred only after the country builds up strong economic capability and build up a democratic system which would in turn minimize the risk of disintegration at home as well. The inside out approach would then help to reduce the countries vulnerability to threat. It is often true that countries may tempt to pose a threat thinking that Ethiopia could easily succumb to them due to its internal problems. Our internal problems then would invite the outside enemies to come in and exploit that opportunities

At diplomatic level, economic diplomacy is adopted to strengthen the domestic efforts in fighting poverty and backwardness and address the issues of development. Economic diplomacy involves attracting foreign investments, seeking markets for Ethiopian exportable commodities, seeking aid and confessional loans too. Economic diplomacy has also been considered as viable strategy under the age of globalization. It helps to exploit the opportunities that globalization offers, such as free trade, investment and technological transfers. Ethiopia would be beneficiary out of the free trade regimes and practices if sound

economic policy is put in place at home. Economic diplomacy can help the country to cope up with the challenges of globalization, but only if we create self reliant and sustainable development. Aid and technical assistance can help us building up our capacity at home temporarily, though these are not long lasting. The Security and Foreign Policy of the country also indicated that Ethiopia would adopt a kind of East-look policy. Ethiopia appreciates the East Asian countries economic successes and development paths. The country would like to learn from such successful countries such as Singapore, Malaysian and Indonesia.

The other foreign policy strategy is building up the military capability of the country. Peaceful dialogues and negotiations will be employed to peacefully coexist with others. Diplomatic solutions can always be taken prior attention when dealing even disputes. But above all building up military capability would have a deterrence effect. Countries may no venture to pose a threat on the country if the military capability of the country is scale up and modernized.

Looking at the patterns of the country's foreign policies over the years, there have been changes and continuities in the foreign policy goals and tactics adopted by different governments of Ethiopia. Though strategies may sometimes differ the primary foreign policy objective of all the three regimes remained the maintenance of the territorial integrity and independence of the country. To this end the three regimes used a combination of both military force and diplomacy to address both internal and external challenges depending on the circumstances. In this manner, while the imperial and the military regime's foreign policy strategy is largely an approach the current regime followed "in-side out" approach.

Determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under incumbent Government
Even though there are shift and dynamism in foreign policy approach and orientation under the EPRDF regime, both domestic factors, regional and global factors remain the remain the determinant factors that influence and shape the nature, style, and objectives of the foreign policy of Ethiopia under the EPRDF regime.

Internal determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under the EPRDF regime
Despite the change of one regime to the other either via peacefully and round table negotiation or forcefully (Coup d'état), domestic realities or factors remain the determinant of the foreign policy of a given state. The EPRDF government redefined foreign policy objectives, national interest, and foreign policy orientation and approach the country

especially through adopting the Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy and Strategy in 1996 and revising it in 2002 which clearly identify the internal determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under incumbent government. Accordingly, economic backwardness, and nature of the political system (absence of democracy and good governance are twin internal determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy.

Economic backwardness and poverty

Since 1991, Ethiopia's national interests have been completely redefined to focus on the country's internal vulnerabilities and problems like poverty and economic backwardness. As clearly pointed out in Ethiopian Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy and Strategy document of 2002 poverty and economic backwardness are two major threats to Ethiopia and its very survival. The document elucidated that the attainment of speedy economic development is fundamental to the survival of our country which finds itself in a state of abject poverty and backwardness. Therefore, this implies that poverty and economic backwardness is the major threat to statehood survival of the country and without the rapid economic development the viability of the country as statehood is doubt and this shift of foreign policy approach from the outside-in approach to an inside-out approach lead to the change in foreign policy objective from hard power (military diplomacy) to soft power (economic diplomacy). Thus, it was to this end why the EPRDF government emphasis economic diplomacy as a panacea to solve the poverty and economic backwardness by attracting foreign direct investors and enhancing export led industrialization. Ethiopian People Revolutionary Democratic Front government also believe that transforming and expanding Ethiopia's economy through agricultural sector, energy, and other sectors can realize rapid economic growth which can benefit all nations, nationalities, and peoples of Ethiopia and realize the very survival of the country-based Westphalia treaty-based statehood.

Moreover, the incumbent government also strongly believes that the national interest and security will be guaranteed if only rapid economic development is attained and this rapid economic development is critical for the protection of the national interests and security of the country. Therefore, poverty and economic backwardness is the major that shaped the style, approach and orientation of Ethiopian foreign policy under the incumbent government because it is major threat to national interest of the country and it is a threat to perpetual survival of the country in addition to external influence and this was due refinement national

interest of the county to democratization and economic development after the dethrone of military regime in 1991.

Nature of domestic political system

Infant stage democracy and lack of good governance is the source of inability to work together in a spirit of tolerance and cooperation in the country. Ethiopia completely redefined its national interest in post 1991 and gave a due emphasis for internal vulnerabilities which include the domestic political problems such as absence of democracy and good governance which is in fact the prominent factor in determining state-society relationship and rapid attainment of democratization is key for viable survival of the state because absence of democracy and good governance is the major threat to Ethiopia's national interest and its very survival.

Moreover, the FANSPS document pointed out that establishing a democratic order in Ethiopia is the way to respect people and individual rights, affirm good governance, and assure stable working and living conditions. Democracy is an important instrument to mobilize around common goals and to involve the people in nation building and guarantees that the members of the various nations, nationalities, and religions in Ethiopia live in an atmosphere of tolerance. In the absence of a democratic order, national and religious divisions will invariably intensify, the abuse of human rights would result in strife, and poverty would spread further a recipe for disintegration and destruction.

Thus, the realization of democracy will therefore not only help to attain development and good governance but also ensure national security and survival. Without a doubt, democratization is fundamental to safeguard the individual interests of every Ethiopian as well as to ensure the country's continued existence. In a nutshell, the nature of domestic political system (which include absence of democracy and good governance) is the major internal determinant Ethiopian foreign policy under the EPRDF government which can really determine the style, approach and orientation of the foreign policy of the country because realization of democratic principles and good governance are the bases for the very survival of the country.

External determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF Government

Though much emphasis was given for internal problems and vulnerabilities as the major threat of Ethiopian national interest and national security by incumbent government, external factors (political condition in horn Africa, Africa, and global political system) are also the

major determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under the current regime. So, despite the cease of siege mentality approach which considers the neighbouring countries as enemies of Ethiopia, under the current regime, external situations (political situation and economic situation) remain the main external determinants factors of Ethiopian foreign policy under incumbent government.

Regional and sub-regional factors

Ethiopia shares a boundary with all the states of the Horn of Africa which are very difficult to fully monitor and conflict-ridden region. Ethiopia bounded in East by Djibouti, in the south east by Kenya, in North by Eritrea, in the south-west by Somalia in West by both by Sudan and South Sudan. Thus, as far as Ethiopia is the land locked country found at the nucleus of the Horn of Africa which is the single geostrategic important in the world due to its proximity to Red sea, oil endowed countries and Nile River. The political dynamism in any of Horn of African states have its own impact on Ethiopia, what threaten the national interest of Horn African states today will also threats the national interest of Ethiopian tomorrow.

Thus, the presence of the military base of other countries such as USA, France, China, Saud Arabia and others in Djibouti determine the foreign policy style, approach, and orientation of the country. Moreover, EPRDF government of Ethiopia also believed that; the development plan and foreign policy objectives of the country will sustainable and realized if there are a shared vision and action for peace and development with all Horn African states. Therefore, this implies that the political dynamism in the Horn of Africa is the other major determinant factor that determines Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF regime because Ethiopia found at the centre of Horn African states and this pave the way for Horn of African states to easily threat Ethiopia.

Each of Horn African can pose threat to Ethiopia, for instance, Eretria was one of headache of Ethiopian security since the outbreak of war in 1998 and state of deadlock or stalemate which lasted from 2000-2018. Ethiopia have almost harmonious relations with all neighbor states except Eritrea till joint is friendship signed between Ethiopia and Eritrea on July 08 2018, failed state Somalia is another security threat to Ethiopia since it is the city of terrorist organization like Al-Shabab, civil war in South Sudan since December 2013 posed the security threat to Ethiopia due to its spillover effects. The shared resources between and among Ethiopia and Horn African countries and dynamics of Nile hydro politics is the other external determinant of Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF government. This also

determine Ethiopian foreign policy due to the fact the twin objective of Ethiopian foreign policy under the current regime can be realized only by extracting and using Ethiopia's natural resource especially the Nile which is a potential resource that generates hydro-electric power but this potential resource shared by Horn African states and Egypt and again utilization of this resource all require the consent of these riparian states though Ethiopia contributed 86% of blue Nile and this shared resource determine Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF government.

The dynamics of the political system in Horn Africa states and African states, in general, is the major external determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under the EPRDF regime because Ethiopia found at the nucleus of Horn African states and the hub of African politics by virtue of hosting AU and United Nation Economic Commission for Africa (AUNECA).

Global factors

The second external determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF government is political dynamism in the global world and the emergence of international issues such as terrorism, environmental problem, and raise of non-western powers such as Asian giants, Turkey and Brazil. The emergence of terrorism alarmed all nation states across the world to redefine and reinterpret their foreign policy specially to curb this global security threat. September 9/11 attack of the pentagon and world trade center by terrorist organization rejuvenate Ethio-USA security relations and it turned the eye of USA to Ethiopia as the natural security ally and security partner and it also forced Ethiopia to adopt the counterterrorism law in 2009 and redefine its own foreign policy so as to avert this global crime. Thus, the emergence of terrorism as the threat to global peace and security is the major external determinant of Ethiopian foreign policy under the incumbent government and again following the 9/11 attacks against the United States, the Horn has come under increased study as a strategic focal point in the war against terrorism and other violence.

The second global factor that determines Ethiopian foreign policy under the incumbent government is the environmental problem which is also the concern of all nation states in the world. Thus, as far the environmental problem is a trans-boundary problem which knocks the door of all nation states, mitigating this problem also requires the effort of all nation states in which Ethiopia is also a partner. Therefore, the emergence of the environmental problem which concerns all nation state and serious threat to the continual survival of the world nation state is the other external determinant of Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF government.

The rise of non-western powers such as China, India, Brazil, Turkey as an alternative allay of Ethiopia determined the approach, orientation and style of Ethiopian foreign policy under the EPRDF government. In addition to western powers, 21st century manifests the rise new Asian emerging economies, the emergence of Beijing consensus, New Delhi consensus, and South- South cooperation to a replace Washington consensus as alternative allay and development model for Ethiopia determine the foreign policy of Ethiopia under the EPRDF government.

Generally, though Ethiopia's national interest was redefined, and much emphasis was given to internal vulnerabilities like underdevelopment and lack of good governance, dynamics of politics at international level and emergence of trans-boundary problems like terrorism, environmental problem and rise of non-western powers as alternative development archetype for Ethiopia are the main external determinants of Ethiopian foreign policy under EPRDF regime.