

NAME: Janice Firebrand Johnson

STUDENT ID NUMBER: UM75140HIN84319

PROGRAM: Masters in Diplomacy and World Affairs

AIU EXAM

Course Title: "Foreign Policy and Diplomacy"

School: Business and Economics

Major: Economics

ATLANTIC INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

October 2022

DESCRIPTION OF COURSE

- States as Players
- What Is Foreign Policy?
- The Analysis of Foreign Policy
- Explaining Foreign Policy: The “Levels of Analysis” Framework
- The International System Level
- Polarity and Polarization
- The Nation-State Level
- The Individual Level
- What Is Diplomacy?
- IR CRITICAL THINKING BOX “Playing the Game of International Relations: What are the Most Effective Approaches to Diplomacy?”
- The Changing Nature of Diplomacy
- The Good Diplomat and Good Diplomacy:
- Rules to Follow in Negotiations
- The Good Diplomat
- Good Diplomacy
- Game Theory
- The Dynamics of Strategic Bargaining

Study Materials

Books & Chapters: FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS by

Rochester, Chapters 3 & 4

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER FOR CHAPTER 3

1. How would you define “foreign policy”?
2. In a nutshell, how would you describe U.S. foreign policy today?
3. Which level of analysis do you think is most useful in explaining the foreign policy behavior of countries—the international system level, the nation-state level, or the individual level?
4. At the system level, how often do states behave as unitary, “rational actors,” as “billiard balls” interacting with each other?
5. At the nation-state level, in the United States and elsewhere, does public opinion affect foreign policy decisions? Should it, that is, should leaders take into account public polls when making foreign policy decisions or should they act mainly based on what they deem to be in the national interest, regardless of public sentiment?
6. At the individual level, how important are single individuals, such as an Adolf Hitler or a George W. Bush or a Barack Obama, in determining foreign policy and shaping major international events? Does the great man or woman theory of history, risk exaggerating the importance of individual leaders?

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER FOR CHAPTER 4

1. In what ways has diplomacy changed over the years?
2. What is meant by “coercive diplomacy” and “diplomacy of violence”?
3. Based on scholarly evidence, what works better in diplomatic bargaining—sticks or carrots?
4. What insight do the Chicken and Prisoner’s Dilemma games provide into the dynamics of international bargaining?

5. Frederick the Great once said, "Diplomacy is only as good as the number of guns backing it up." Discuss. What does the scholarly literature tell us about the utility of economic instruments of bargaining as opposed to military instruments?

INTRODUCTION

International relations is about how countries or nations relate and interact with one another in terms of politics, economics, and world organizations that have the interest of nation-states and the development of nations. This allows international politics and national politics to come into play. This is because of the fact that national politics affects international politics and vice versa. However, politics is a competition, a game that has rules; and this is why foreign policy is very important to look at when it comes to international relations. Decisions made by a nation will be influenced by the other nations with which they have relations. Hence, making it imperative for a foreign policy.

Foreign policy guides the activities and relationships of one state in its interactions with other states. The development of foreign policy is influenced by domestic considerations, the policies or behaviors of other states, or plans to advance specific geopolitical designs. A state's foreign policy consists of the strategies it uses to protect its international and domestic interests and determines the way it interacts with other state and non-state actors. The primary purpose of foreign policy is to defend a nation's national interests, which can be in violent or nonviolent ways.

In this exam, I will be addressing questions about foreign policy, the foreign policy behavior of countries, US foreign policy, foreign policy at the international level, nation-state level and the individual level. I will

also touch on diplomacy, the types of diplomacy and how, it has changed over the years. This exam draws its questions and answers from chapters 3 and 4 of Rochester's "Fundamental Principles of International Relations".

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER FOR CHAPTER 3

1. How Would You Define Foreign Policy?

In simple terms, Foreign Policy is a government's strategy in dealing with other nations; a set of political goals that outlines how a particular country will interact with other nations of the world. It refers to the plans that a government puts in place in order to lead them in achieving their objectives and protecting their relations with other nations. Foreign policy helps to guide nations from violence and maintain peaceful interactions within the international space. These policies are crafted with intentionality and a purpose. Foreign policies have a very good impact on nations and their interactions.

Almost every state intentionally creates foreign policy in order to have a successful government. We can say foreign policy is like a manual that helps in the operations, relationship and interaction between states. If compared to a book, then a guidebook has been, purposefully written for the sake of international relations. Additionally, it is the blueprint of international politics. Just as a blueprint helps in the building of a structure, foreign policies also help in the building of a nation state with other nation states. Foreign policy is very crucial to maintain a good relationship between nation states. As international politics is compared to a game, the players of international politics and international relations are the key creators of foreign policies.

National leaders thoughtfully make these foreign policies and when it is not well done, it receives criticism. It may include small decisions, future decisions and in the near, present decisions. Countries rely on the foreign policy to know their level of interactions with other countries. Although, foreign policy is a strategy in the international arena, the interest of the people in the country is considered.

Foreign policies are not a cunning way to manipulate other countries but a way to help each other. The United States was once criticized for a lack of foreign policy directions. As foreign policy is seen as an external action, it is domestically or nationally influenced. Nations contribute, formulate or support the plans that affect international interactions. Governments take a critical look at foreign policies as this could protect its country's peace or disrupt it. Therefore, foreign policies can be seen as an objective or means to achieve the objectives. All these means of achieving objectives still include strategies, guides or plans. This guides the diplomatic relations countries have with one another.

The Importance of Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is important because it determines the state of relationships between countries and guides the diplomats in negotiations. Foreign policy helps to reduce or prevent conflicts and aggression between nations in their interactions. When a country is too aggressive in its dealings with other nations and refuses to take into consideration, the legitimate interests of other countries, it may face a push back or even an armed conflict.

Foreign policy also helps to prevent or in worse case scenarios, solve international problems amongst nations through diplomacy. In other words, diplomats try to keep problems from developing into conflicts that require military settlements.

Foreign policy is used to defend a nation's national interests.

Aims/Goals of Foreign Policy

The goals of foreign policy are:

1. To maintain a balance of power among nations.
2. To work with allies in solving international problems.
3. To promote world peace and a secure global environment.
4. To preserve the national security of the United States.

2. Briefly, How Would You Describe U.S Foreign Policy Today?

U.S Foreign Policy has been the subject of much debate, praise and criticism both domestically and abroad. It is complex and extremely messy; and it looks like a disorganized plan. As defined, foreign policy is a purposeful strategy to achieve objectives. The U.S in a way does not have a policy that is accepted by the populace. Six months after Ronald Reagan assumed the U.S. presidency, a newspaper headline read, “Reagan pressed to spell out foreign policy”. This revealed that the US policy was not well defined and he was charged with the task of making the policy clear to the populace. The U.S. foreign policy seems to be very loose and the people seem to be disappointed in their foreign policy.

As described by Rochester, after a year in the White House, Reagan’s successor, George H.W. Bush was criticized for not having a game plan, which is the foreign policy. He was also criticized for passively reacting to events instead of shaping it. In addition, he was blamed for no grand strategy, no design to guide the ship of state. This makes the U.S. foreign policy look like a ship without a captain. This can be said about U.S foreign policy, if it is not well strategized and the interests of the people not considered. The U.S has a foreign policy, but the people do not feel the impact. Hence, making them criticize the implementation.

Bill Clinton was also criticized for lack of foreign policy direction. This was a wake-up call to the populace to find out about how presidential candidates will tackle the issue of foreign policy. Henry Kissinger does not even believe that there is a foreign policy as he stated in his scholarly writings that “foreigners looking at American policy have a tendency to assume that anything that happened was intended and that there is a deep, complicated purpose behind our actions. I wish this were true, but I don’t believe that it is”.

George Harvey also described American policy as a policy to have no policy. Although American leaders assure their people of a good foreign policy, the people believe otherwise. After the cold war ended, American leaders tried to change the narrative. Now, the American administration publicly shares their national security strategy annually to congress. National leaders make their foreign policy known to the populace. Leaders try their best to have a foreign policy that will protect their national security, trade, foreign exchange rates, and other things that affect national policy. American leaders find themselves making foreign policies on things that are more discreet.

The Purpose of American Foreign Policy

The four main objectives of U.S. foreign policy are:

- i. The protection of the United States and its citizens and allies
- ii. The assurance of continuing access to international resources and markets
- iii. The preservation of a balance of power in the world
- iv. The protection of human rights and democracy.

3. **Which level of analysis do you think is most useful in explaining the foreign policy behavior of countries—the international system level, the nation-state level, or the individual level?**

Scholars and Diplomats have found it useful to think about the numerous factors that shape international relations by breaking them down into three different levels – international, state and individual. These three different levels of analysis illuminate why countries go to war pursue alliance or sign treaties.

The International Level

The international level also known as the systemic level argues that foreign policy can be understood even without looking at the internal characteristics of nations or individuals. Rather, the characteristics of international system leads nations to behave in a particular way based upon how much power they hold. In other words, the systemic level analyses how countries relate with each other and the balance of power they have. Countries tend to reciprocate the kind of relationship received from other countries. This has an impact on foreign policy and international relations. The international system level also describes states not overpowering each other. States form relationships that will promote peace amongst themselves. There are major powers that may come together as multipolar or just two major powers identified as bipolar. There are various states coming together to form this kind of polarity but there have not been any singular states claiming to be the overall powerful.

The most easily understood example of international level analysis is the Cold War, when there was a bipolar system where two nations, that is, the United States and the USSR, both held substantial power. When two nations hold the majority of international power, there will inevitably be tensions between the two nations, and all their decisions will be based on maintaining their power among nations and preventing the other nation from gaining more power. As China gained power in the 1970s, a tripolar system emerged, and no one wanted to be the "odd man" out, when the other two nations allied against the third. The United States used this to its advantage by reopening relations with China and thus forcing the USSR's hand in diplomatic relations. A more modern example would be U.S. intervention in Iraq;

supporters of international level analysis argue that the United States is the only power, that is, the superpower - in a unipolar system, necessitating its military action to demonstrate and maintain its power.

The Nation-State Level

The nation-state analyses the characteristics of a state, what makes one nation powerful than the other. A nation state's resources and population sometimes affects or determines how powerful a state is. For example, Saudi Arabia may be powerful in terms of oil capacity. The United States is also powerful because they are the third largest country after China and India. This affects international relations, as one state may be dependent on the other nation-state for their country's development. In addition, the economic status of a country affects its relations with other countries. For example, the United States has a better economic status compared to Ghana, which makes the United States more powerful than Ghana. The economic status of a country also determines whether the country needs help or not, which is directly to give foreign aid to other countries.

Advocates of state level analysis argue that the international system level tells only part of the story of international relations, but looking at the backgrounds of states, that is, their type of government, economic performance, geography, history and cultural values, can offer a more complete explanation. In this view, it is imperative to note that the Cold War was not just a conflict between two superpowers but that one of the two powers was a democracy. Similarly, the economic systems of the two powers, capitalist and communist, are also significant. A state-level analyst could point to the collapse of the USSR's economy in the 1980s as one of the factors leading to the end of the Cold War. The U.S. intervention in Iraq could be explained by the U.S cultural belief that its political and economic systems are "good" while other systems are bad.

The Individual Level

The individual level emphasizes the "great man in history" concept. In this view, the very personalities of leaders shape foreign policy. Leaders are not simply mechanically responding to international or state systems, but taking an active role in determine international relations. Foreign policies cannot be implemented without individuals. However, the environment in which an individual finds himself/herself shapes their perception about issues. The individuals needs to be involved in the decision of foreign policy, because every policy is ultimately about them and not only resources. Individuals' image of the world affects their behavior. As Rochester rightly described, "it is what we think the world is like, not what it is really like that determines our behavior". The decision makers and leaders who are the actors of foreign policy are influenced by their experience and perception. Their experience or background affects their thinking and the way they act. Perhaps the most obvious example of the individual level analysis is explaining World War II through Adolf Hitler's leadership; another example would be when scholars attribute the end of the Cold War to the relationship between President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev. Once again using the Iraq War example, an individual level analysis would examine the character and ideology of George W. Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney and other key players in influencing the U.S. military action.

Considering all three analyses, all seem to have described foreign policy in a way. International system level analyzing foreign policy in its balance of power, nation state level describes the characteristics of the nation-state. Individual level also shows how perception and image affects the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. However, foreign policy behavior can be analyzed in other ways such as empirical analysis. Evaluation of foreign policy also needs to be analyzed. Therefore, we can say that the international system level, the nation state and individual level are all useful in the analysis of foreign policy. It adds more understanding to it.

4. At The System Level, How Often Do States Behave As Unitary, “Rational Actors,” As “Billiard Balls” Interacting With Each Other?

A unitary state, or unitary government, is a governing system in which a single central government has total power over all of its other political subdivisions. A unitary state is the opposite of a federation, where governmental powers and responsibilities are divided. In a unitary state, the political subdivisions must carry out the directives of the central government but have no power to act on their own. In other words, the central government has total control and authority over all the country’s political subdivisions (for example, states). Unitary governments often create and remove **subdivisions** frequently, with constituents having not power to challenge the authority or constitutionality of acts that are passed.

In October 1962, Russia planted a missile in Cuba, which is ninety miles away from the American mainland. In a force debated, they managed to make Russia remove the missiles. States behave as a unitary rational actor by trying to act not in unity but in a solo, waving power for themselves. In this way, like a billiard ball on a pool table, countries will be colliding with each other. Nations will be on the run to be in some sort of a way fighting for the benefits of their people. As described by Rochester, states are conceptualized as monolithic entities producing foreign policies that will lead towards them achieving power, wealth and national security. Though they are interacting with each other as nations, their foreign policy aim is to gain their own country’s goals and not to relate in a way as a country of teams.

The Soviet Union’s decision to plant missiles is another example of countries acting in unitary rational actors, as billiard balls. The installation of the missiles was for their own country’s benefit, at the expense of United States’ safety. The missiles posed a very uncomfortable danger to the U.S. but the Soviet Union was not ready to remove it. It was the use of blockade, which forced the Soviet Union to remove the missiles unwillingly. This was a call to the national security of the U.S.

Foreign policy is affected using this kind of model. Governments tend to analyse their opportunities and their challenges to set up or create their foreign policies. Now the unitary billiard ball analysis is not often used. Instead of nations maintaining their relations, countries are rather in a competition. They tend to collide with each other and then find out what is going on in other nations.

5. **At The Nation-State Level, In The United States And Elsewhere, Does Public Opinion Affect Foreign Policy Decisions? Should It, That Is, Should Leaders Take Into Account Public Opinion Polls When Making Foreign Policy Decisions Or Should They Act Mainly Based on What They Deem To Be In The National Interest, Regardless Of Public Sentiment?**

The public has shown its importance when it comes to foreign policy. In the United States, the personal interests of the public are considered when making decisions, and not only for national interest. Leaders of a country in a democratic setting get their power from the public. In a democratic state, it is very important to consider the interest of the people when creating foreign policy. Many scholars have studied the role of public opinion as a determinant of foreign policy. Public opinion then becomes like a focus or a guide in the creation of foreign policies.

Therefore, leaders are concerned about the opinion of the public in making decisions because the power lies with the people. Even in a dictatorship system, the public serves as an important feature in a successful reign. Public interest is not only considered in the formulation of foreign policies, but in domestic decision-making as well. The public can pressure a leader to make certain decisions, which include foreign policies. Interest groups can become heavily involved and concerned in foreign policy. For instance, The Vietnam War, where American soldiers were increasingly dying, the public seeing on television, dead bodies of the army, mounted pressure on the government to end the war. The public was now opposing the war as it

claimed more lives than it provided any solutions to the reasons of the war. A leader also seeks the support of the public opinion in the implementation of a policy.

In a way, public opinion is very important to decisions including the making of foreign policy. Notwithstanding, the same public can also become a standing block to decisions. The public may also delay the process of foreign policy. Though there is a significance in public opinions, it also creates a hindrance to good international relations. There is evidence that leaders may choose to consider their international relations over the opinions and interests of their public. Some studies find dictatorship to be a good way to have a better foreign policy. Democracy is disadvantaged in that regard. However, we cannot say that public opinions should be totally ignored; rather, there should be a balance of the public opinion and the national interest of the state in determining foreign policies.

6. At The Individual Level, How Important Are Single Individuals, Such As An Adolf Hitler Or A George W. Bush Or A Barack Obama, In Determining Foreign Policy And Shaping Major International Events? Does The Great Man Or Woman Theory Of History, Risk Exaggerating, The Importance Of Individual Leaders?

Karl Max said **that** men make history, but they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. This suggests that Adolf Hitler did not cause World War II. This is because circumstances are larger than a single individual is. The environment therefore affects individuals' decisions. However, individuals have a role to play in foreign policy making. Proponents of the great man (or woman) school stress the overriding importance of single individuals in a moving history and changing the course of events (Rochester, M). Thomas Carlyle described the role of individuals as the history of the world is but the biography of great men.

According to Rochester J. Martin. President George W.H. Bush had unpleasant memories from World War II. This led him to prevent and stop wars, an example is Iraq's aggression against Kuwait in 1990 (Rochester, M). Individuals' experiences influence their perception and thinking in decision-making. These experiences also affect foreign policy making. Leaders with their perception and image have a different way to make decisions and approach issues. Dulles's negative image of the USSR led him to selectively ignore that information or attribute the behavior to Soviet weakness rather than a possible dovish shift in Soviet policy.

Barack Obama also took decisions based on his perceptions and image. The 9/11 disaster made Americans suspicious of other Islamic countries. The great man or woman theory explains that individuals are not important in decision-making and governments would have made their decisions regardless of individual opinion. However, leaders depend on their experiences and inbuilt character to make decisions or find solutions to a problem. The great man or woman theory in some way risks the importance of individuals in foreign policy making. For example, Hitler was a great leader who made decisions that affected other countries negatively such as Europe.

There have been instances that individuals have had an impact on foreign policies; and it is dictatorship. In democracy, leaders also have the final say or have a powerful influence in making decisions and relating to other countries. As explained by Rochester, individuals matter because they have different perceptions and do not see the environments the same way. We all have a way of analyzing, thinking, and our background and beliefs affect our decisions. All these combined, help in making of foreign policies.

QUESTIONS FROM CHAPTER 4

1. In What Ways Has Diplomacy Changed Over The Years?

Diplomacy comprises of written and verbal communication by representatives of states, (such as leaders and diplomats) intended to influence events in the international system. Diplomacy is the main instrument of foreign policy, which represents broader goals and strategies that guide a state's interactions with the rest of the world. International treaties, agreements, alliances, and other manifestations of international relations are usually the result of diplomatic negotiations and processes. Diplomats may also help to shape a state by advising government officials.

Diplomacy can be explained as the formal arrangements made by states to have their foreign relations smoothly, which includes the exchange of ambassadors and embassies. We do not know when human societies first felt the need to communicate with one another but it is safe to assume that they did so from the very earliest times.

The conduct of diplomacy has changed significantly over the past sixty years. Prior to World War II, diplomacy was essentially a government-to-government relationship. Since the war, it has broadened to include a government - to - foreign people connection, now called public diplomacy. It now includes the role of ambassadors, the role of public diplomacy, the role of multilateral diplomacy, the role of formal diplomacy and domestication diplomacy. At first, states had to send emissaries to other states for discussions but now embassies are created as institutions in other states. The appointment of ambassadors is also not ceremonial but a standard set of protocols followed to appoint an ambassador.

The creation of embassies has also increased, however not all countries are able to afford the expenses it comes with. The embassy is an institution and the institutionalization has reduced negotiations. Government officials also bypass embassies and directly have discussions with other government officials in another state. Public negotiations have also increased with press conference.

In the twentieth century, states have felt the need to publicize diplomatic process. Public diplomacy is preferred over secret diplomacy. According to Rochester, without phases of secrecy and avoidance of publicity, agreements are virtually impossible. The role of secrecy in agreements or negotiations is crucial. States used to have exchange of ambassadors that is bilateral. In the twentieth century, multilateral diplomacy was practiced. Before then, multilateral was limited to special meetings but now it has become increasingly preferred because of the existence of many problems, the proliferation of intergovernmental organizations at global and regional levels and the existence of many poor countries.

States were using an informal diplomacy for negotiations and later started to combine informal and formal diplomacy in order to reinforce messages they wish to convey. Tacit diplomacy allows communication between governments that for ideology or other reasons may not have official diplomatic contacts. Although, tacit diplomacy is important it is quick to cause misunderstanding. Tacit diplomacy is an informal way of nonverbal communications.

Throughout history, various forms of diplomacy have been observed between countries and governments. This development is due to the activity of various factors, and as long as the factors of transformation remain, the process of transformation remains. The new age in international relations has been marked by significant developments in diplomacy. The increasing role of global awareness, the diminished governance of states, the growth of information and communication technology, and the growth of non-state actors are among the main factors contributing to the development of diplomacy.

2. What Is Meant By “Coercive Diplomacy” And “Diplomacy Of Violence”?

Coercive diplomacy simply means diplomacy of threats. Diplomats apply coercive diplomacy when a demand is not met; rather than using negotiation, they threaten adverse consequences. They use threats in

bargaining. There are four ways of bargaining - punishment, threats, promises and rewards. This diplomacy is sometimes called strategic bargaining.

Coercive diplomacy is used to limit the use of military action. It is usually applied to help influence other states to stop an action. The coercive diplomacy is described as “**carrots and sticks**”. When threats and punishment are used, it is described as “*sticks*” and when promises and rewards are used, it is described as “*carrots*”. According to George (1971), coercive diplomacy is “forceful persuasion” and “focuses upon affecting the enemy’s will rather than upon negating his capabilities. If threats alone do not suffice and force is actually used, it is employed in a more limited, selective manner.” It should be emphasized that the use of force is limited.

An example of the use of coercive diplomacy is United States threatening Russia to end the war with Ukraine. Other nations have tried to use rewards and promises and other countries used threats and punishment. Russian players were not even considered for the world cup coming up in November 2022. Russia has also decided to make other nations trade only in its currency. Americans have also used some form of threats and punishment to make the war end. Another example is the United States trying to stop North Korea from the development of nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, *Violence diplomacy* is the use of deadly force or the use of military actions such as firing of guns to persuade other states to do what they do not want to do. Violence diplomacy also known as diplomacy of violence involves bargaining power that comes from the ability of nations to inflict physical harm on each other. Some acts relating to violence diplomacy - Notions of deterrence, retaliation, reprisal, terrorism, nuclear blackmail, wars of nerve, armistice, and surrender.

The use of threats to force is usually seen when one state is superior to the other states. Realists tend to place greater faith in the use of threats and punishments, while liberals also believe that a better way like the use of rewards and promises is good. Liberals want the use of a nicer approach and a mannerly way of

bargaining; realists also believe that sugarcoated words cannot yield results. However, the use of threats and punishments or the use of promises and rewards depends on the situation. A mix of the two strategies, which Rochester describes as a tough love approach, might work best. Competence and deterrence are used to persuade one side to do something they do not wish to do. Sometimes, this can be used for coercive diplomacy. It is usually used in military tradition. An example according to Rochester is Israel discouraging or persuading Iran from wiping Israel off the map.

In using carrots and sticks, States must keep to their word at a right time or execute their bargaining at the right time. For example, if a state promises a government, the other state should not deliver the promise prematurely. Similarly, when a punishment is to be meted, it should be timely to show its credibility.

3. Based On Scholarly Evidence, What Works Better In Diplomatic Bargaining-Sticks Or Carrots?

Aforementioned, carrot-and-stick is a method of persuasion or coercion, characterized by the offer of a promise and reward or the threat of a punishment. Carrots symbolize the use of promises and rewards, while sticks refer to the use of punishment and threats.

Scholarly evidence shows that using sticks or carrots can be advantageous and disadvantageous. Therefore, a mix of both will be beneficial rather than using just one strategy. There is no evidence that one is superior to the other but it depends on the issue. The kind of issue or situation on ground will help determine whether it is better to use the method of persuasion (carrots) or coercion (sticks). States use both carrots and sticks in bargaining. Apart from States, some employers do use carrots and sticks approach to modify the behaviors of their employees, guiding them to avoid actions that are punishable and engage in actions or activities that will give rewards. It is simple, set the goal you would like your employees to achieve and then create a carrot and stick related to that goal.

Whilst liberals point to the lessons of World War II, realists point to the lessons of Munich and the lack of saber rattling. Realists seem to adopt Al Capone's view that you are likely to get farther with a kind word and a gun than just a kind word. The power, identity and other things of the governments bargaining influences their choice of strategy bargaining. When sticks are used, it may make a State achieve its goal of influence on the other States and it can make the nation become hostile. A government or a state may choose to use a more friendly and mannerly behavior to achieve its goal by willingly yielding to the bargaining. The carrots type of bargaining can also make a state look weak and not be taken seriously. The State's demand can even be ignored.

The importance and demerit of strategic bargaining can be weighed. One commentator observed that Bush's administration used neither carrots nor sticks. States cannot use only sticks or only carrots for an effective result. For promises and threats to work, they must be sufficiently credible as perceived by the other side. For example, UK can threaten or promise Ghana, however Ghana must believe that UK can execute its threats or promise and capable of doing it. If Ghana finds out UK is not capable, UK loses her credibility. Scholarly evidences have therefore shown that the best bargaining is the use of mix of carrots and sticks.

4. What Insight Do the Chicken and Prisoner's Dilemma Games Provide into the Dynamics of International Bargaining?

In the chicken game, two teenagers are trying to impress their girlfriends. With girls watching they speed toward each other 100 miles per hour, as their cars seem destined for a head on collision. If one boy swerves and the other does not, then whoever that swerved will suffer negative pay offs, if both swerves, they suffer minor embarrassment. If neither swerve then the worst possible outcome of mutual suicide will occur. This gives insight to a cooperation rather than mutual defection to avoid worst possible outcome of mutual annihilation. (Rochester).

The prisoner's dilemma is a story of two suspects who have been arrested for armed robbery and are being interrogated separately by the police who have reason to believe both have committed the crime but they have to accept the fact that they committed the crime before they will receive a maximum prison term. If one confesses, the person's prison term is reduced and if both confesses, both prison sentences are reduced, reality dawns on them; one decides to confess to have the prison sentence reduced. The other person also thinks the same way. This game provides insight to choose whether to cooperate or defect in international relations or diplomacy.

States do not have unilateral decisions where players are concerned about the immediate outcome. They hold series of negotiations and bargaining, which makes states, come to learn the importance of cooperation or defection. Liberals believe that international organizations can provide ongoing opportunities for states to exchange information, develop trust and cultivate habits of cooperation. This also helps in maintaining a peaceful relation between states.

An example of the chicken game is the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet ship was in full speed towards American ship. However, Soviet Union blinked first, both nations decided to exercise caution. This will promote peace and shows respect to humanity. This can also be a manipulative way of bargaining or diplomacy. This can be applied but when it becomes manipulative, a country's reputation will be affected.

5. Frederick the Great Once Said, "Diplomacy Is Only As Good As The Number Of Guns Backing It Up." Discuss. What Does The Scholarly Literature Tell Us About The Utility Of Economic Instruments Of Bargaining As Opposed To Military Instruments?

Frederick saying that diplomacy is only as good as the number of guns backing it up means that the use of military power will support diplomacy effectiveness. This shows that military force can project an effective

result for diplomacy. For example, President Reagan used violence of diplomacy when he dispatched several jet fighters to bomb five targets in Libya in 1986 to send a message to Libyan leader Muammar Ghaddafi that he should end his war. This means that states should rather use military force to coerce diplomacy. As Alexander George, defined, coercive diplomacy, is similar to diplomacy of violence but not the same. Diplomacy of violence entails the use of arms and it is a force not a threat of force. Frederick the great believes this will achieve results better than coercive diplomacy.

However, the use of military instrument has been found to be dangerous causing loss of lives and properties, which may hinder the progress of the state and affects other poor countries. Economic instruments are sometimes recommended over the use of military instruments. Although, military force is used in bargaining situations, the use of military force will not be necessary when having negotiations with ally states. For example, it is hard for Ghana to use military force if Togo has not opened its borders to Ghanaians. Even states that are not allies will not quickly make use of military force, as this is not a situation to use that. Ghana would not have been praised if the country had used military force. This will crush its foreign policy and international relations.

Economic tools are now looked at instead of the military force. Bush administration, felt pressured to forego military force and pay attention to economic sanctions. These economic sanctions include trade boycotts and embargos, freezing bank assets, and withholding foreign aid. This we can describe as a stick in coercive diplomacy. When a more favorable condition is used, such as additional foreign investment instead of freezing bank assets, additional foreign assistance instead of withholding foreign aid, then it is carrots in coercive diplomacy. This can also be very effective and yield a more conducive environment for negotiations. The use of sticks may also be equally effective but may not provide a friendly atmosphere between states involved.

Although, attention is given to economic threats than military force, its effectiveness may depend on the States that have to be threatened, or force applied. This is because, if the state is not vulnerable to the economic threats that will be used, it will not have any value on them. Klaus Knorr asserts that for State A to have a coercive economic power over State B, the following conditions must exist:

- State A must have a high degree of control over the supply of something that State B values, B's need for this supply must be intensive and B's cost of compliance must be less than the costs of doing without the supply. These also applies to the use of promises or a reward (carrot). Several studies have proved that the use of economic sanctions did not work, in few cases economic sanctions proved highly successful.

Conclusion

States interrelate with each other and this makes it important to have foreign policies that will guide the relationship. This makes diplomacy very critical in international relations. However, some states may have a problem in the implementation of their foreign policy. Diplomacy is sometimes like a tool to carry out foreign policies. There are so many types of diplomacy such as coerce diplomacy, diplomacy of violence, cyber diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, public diplomacy, parliamentary diplomacy, etc. Depending on a given situation, or the situation in which a State finds itself, and the response they are receiving from the other state, that will determine the type of diplomacy applied as well as the approach used in achieving their agenda.

Conclusively, just as every nation has its own foreign policy, they also have their diplomatic approach and relations in dealing with other States. Foreign policy and Diplomacy are two important elements to international relations. This exam has shed more light on foreign policy and diplomacy, the different levels of analysis used in explaining the foreign policy behavior of countries. It has also given an insight into the

chicken and prisoner's dilemma games into the dynamics of international bargaining amongst other topics relating to foreign policy and diplomacy.

Bibliography

1. Rochester, J. Martin. Fundamental principles of international relations. Westview Press, 2010.
2. [The Three Levels of Analysis in International Relations - Synonym](#)
3. [The evolution of the concept of diplomacy - Modern Diplomacy](#)