

The Foreign Policy - Theoretical Overview

Introduction

The theoretical research and overview of the foreign policy is one of the conditions in order one state to have sustainable and beneficial foreign policy. In this context, the theoretical knowledge about the relations between the foreign policy and other relevant factors can be sometimes crucial for the success of the foreign policy of one particular country. This paper presents the relations of the foreign policy towards the diplomacy, but also towards the domestic policy and the degree of dependence in shaping a foreign policy with character of political system. However, this paper deals with the changes in the international relations and their impact on the foreign policy.

The term “foreign policy”

As in the international relations and on international scene, various events and changes used to occur almost always. These developments have been studied within disciplines such as sociology, history, economics, etc. However, the events that occurred on the international arena during the twentieth century created such tectonic quakes that for their better understanding and explanation there was a pressing need to create a new scientific discipline that explains and examines them scientifically. A respond to this need was the appearance of the science of international relations. In this context, the foreign policy is an essential part of international relations. Although it must be noted that sometimes the foreign policy can be studied through other scientific disciplines and other aspects. Also, within the science of international relations, there are multiple perspectives of the foreign policy, its objectives and deciding factors for the behavior of states. For example, looking through the realist’s perspective the foreign policy is a process of constancy in attempt to influence others, or knowing how to force the others to conduct in a way that would be beneficial for your own interests. At the same time the perspective of the liberals concerning foreign policy is that it is shaped according the international system, political system and domestic politics. Further on, it could be noticed that the main goal of foreign policy, according to the perspective of realists, are the direct military - security objectives of the states. On the other hand the liberals see the long-term economic and social welfare of society as main goals of the foreign policy. When it comes to the answer of the question “which factors have decisive impact on the behavior of states”, again there is a variety of answers. Thus, from the perspective of the realists the decisive factor is the interests in terms of power, and about the leaders it is said that all of them (leaders) are alike in their behavior when it comes to decide about foreign policy. The liberal’s perspective refers to the fact that democrats and their governments are not only limited by state facilities but also by social requirements and needs...

The name “foreign” policy comes from the Latin word “foris” - which means “out”. However the term “foreign policy” is not always used by all authors. Some authors use the term “international policy” as a synonym. Their argument is that the international policy is basically the same with the foreign policy. This claim is supported by the argument of the same factors that argue that completely the same internal and external factors determine the formation and direction of both policies. Yet even

these authors acknowledge the apparent difference in the size range. Namely, the international policy is very broad category defined as sum or group of foreign policies of different states.

Hence logical questions arise: What is foreign policy? How could the foreign policy be understood? How could the foreign policy be defined? The understanding of the foreign policy is generally along the line such as: everything that the state does towards the other states or with other states is named as foreign policy. Yet this conception of foreign policy is not entirely correct. The previous notion has obvious misleading statement and it reduces the foreign policy to an only policy among states. But, it neglected the fact that the foreign policy also includes the policy of the state towards the international organizations and NGOs with international prefix. Previous understanding of foreign policy can be very likely considered as a problem especially in today's world of globalization. This is because there are still unexplained processes of interdependence in full therefore the globalization cast a shadow on the previous understanding of the foreign policy. This is because the above understanding of foreign policy assumes that the state (government) alone can decide on its foreign policy towards other countries, or establish its own authentic and independent position. This, in today's world of globalization and mutual interdependence of states, can be called at least naive. Globalization as process or international system, in good part, is still an enigma. Various authors have tried to find a definition to explain this new international system called globalization. According to Friedman (2006) after the end of the Cold War, it becomes obvious that the world is no longer in bipolar international system of Cold War, but at the same time during the first few years it was difficult to determine what was the new frame and a new system like, in which the world entered after the fall of the Berlin Wall. " *We knew a new system was aborning that constituted a different framework for international relations, but we couldn't define what it was, so we defined by what it wasn't. It wasn't the Cold War. So, we called it the post-Cold-War world*" [1, 11]. This illustrates the international relations' problems facing the defining the new system. Still Friedman [1, 11] continues: " *The more I traveled, though the more it became apparent to me that we were not just in some messy, incoherent, indefinable post-cold world. Rather, we were in a new international system. This system had its own unique logical rules, pressures and incentives and it deserved its own name 'globalization'. Globalization is not just some economics fad, and it is not just passing trend. It is an international system - the dominant international system that replaced the Cold War system after the fall of the Berlin Wall.*" He argues that within the globalization, unlike the previous system of a cold war, there are three systems of balance which overlap and affect one another. The first system is the traditional balance between states. In the new system the balance is set between the USA on one side and all other countries on the other side. The second is the balance between states and global markets. The third is the balance between states and individuals. Globalization has pushed many of the obstacles for movement of wealthy people, divided the world in networks and for the first time in history enabled tremendous power of individuals so that they could influence states and markets. For the first time there are as Friedman calls "super-powerful individuals". One such example is Osama bin Laden, a powerful individual with its own network, an individual who declared war to the most powerful country in the world - the United States. For the first time in history we have a declaration of war by a super powerful individual to a super powerful state. For the first time in history the power of the state as a single powerful entity in international relations and systems is shattered. Therefore the claim that foreign policy is what the state makes toward other states, in today's modern

world and today's international system of globalization, can be called naive for simple reason that the decisions of the state are not and cannot be as independent as they were in past.

How can the foreign policy be defined then? There are several authors who have brought and gave their definitions of what they consider foreign policy actually is.

One of them is Janev [2, 67] who defines foreign policy "*as a state policy towards the subjects of international relations. It is a complexion of elements and processes in conducting social changes, where these changes and processes are conducted in relation with international subject*". Without making profound analysis of the definition of Janev can be easily seen in the first portion that the main element and the main role is given to the state on one hand and international entities on the other hand.

Tonovski [8], in turn, defines foreign policy as "*a specific, conscious and organized activities, which with the help of certain methods and tools (specialized bodies, groups and individuals) is implement by a state on pre-defined goals and interests whose importance transcends national borders*" In the definition of Tonovski the element "state" is essential again. Namely, in his definition it is the state that is implementing a specific, conscious and organized activity with the help of certain methods and tools beyond its borders, and because of pre-defined purposes.

A similar definition is given by Smith, Hadfield & Dunne (2008) who claim that foreign policy is a given strategy of approach chosen by the national government to achieve its objectives in relations with external entities. According to them, this includes the decision not to do anything. Although this definition reduced down the foreign policy to a strategy of approach chosen by the national government, yet again the element of "state" is present (national government). Namely the national government determines the strategy of approach in relations with external entities, and because of obtaining certain goals.

Hill gives a rather different view and definition of foreign policy. He says [6, 3] that foreign policy is the "*sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in the international relations.*" In the last definition the phrase "independent actor" is encountered; although in brackets it is put that this actor is usually (but not always) the state. The term "independent actor" enables in general to understand that it includes not only the states but also other entities such as the EU. So in this last definition, the word "state" is totally properly avoided, which in today's world of

globalization is especially true.

It is believed that further listing of other definitions of foreign policy would be unproductive. Despite abundant definitions, existing and trying to define the foreign policy, they do not contradict (or not significantly, at least in the basic elements) to one another. Mostly all of them accept that the foreign policy is a specific, conscious and organized action or a strategy of approach, or what state (the term "independent actor" would be better to use) does or does not go beyond the state borders with the international entities trying to achieve some pre-defined goals.

The relationship between foreign policy and diplomacy

Many people do not make a difference between the term “foreign policy” and the term “diplomacy”. Despite their similarities, however it could not be agreed that these two terms have the same meaning, although there is a high degree of interdependence between them. Thus, a country striving to have successful foreign policy makes a perfect logic to invest in creating its own numbered and experienced diplomacy. However, the reverse is also quite legitimate, thus if a country has a strong diplomacy, and many experienced diplomats, then it tends to have active foreign policy.

As from a historical perspective, we can see that internationally-wise that there was almost no phase of international relations without any sort of diplomatic activity. Although the beginning of the “modern” diplomacy is associated with northern Italy in the 13th century, there was some kind of diplomacy since the ancient times. In ancient Greece, for example, the city states had their own “diplomats” who were sent to other city-states to discuss and dissolve certain specific issues, without having permanently diplomatic missions set in those city states. Something similar to today's modern diplomats in ancient Greece were the citizens entitled as “proxenos”. This title had been awarded to a man who lived in one city state but had maintained close ties with the city-state that has awarded him the title. Perhaps the first permanent diplomats of a foreign country to another country were the so-called “apocrisiarii”. They were a kind of permanent representatives of the Roman Pope in Constantinople. Over the time, need for having its own “eyes and ears” in another states that will inform from first-hand, become inevitable for each serious state.

The development of new and modern communication devices set a new dilemma. The question was: Do the states still need diplomatic mission in time where the information became much more accessible and traveling became incomparably faster than before? The answer to the previous question is – yes they will. The diplomats have more features and tasks and getting information is just one of them. Today they are part of the unbreakable network setup as part of the foreign policy of any serious state. The importance of diplomacy in today's world can be seen through the huge budgets allocated for diplomatic service and for achievement of its goals in general.

But, how can we define ‘diplomacy’? Similar as the foreign policy definitions, “diplomacy” has several definitions also. For many people the diplomacy refers to a skill of representatives of states or groups to negotiate.” *The diplomacy can be defined as a appropriately organized social activity, whose main intent is to represent the state in the international relations and to work on achieving foreign policy objectives by use of peaceful tools*” (Vukadinovic 1998, p.186) (Translation by D.M.). Tonovski [8, 1] believes that “*diplomacy is always an expression of the total activities of all the participants in international political life which, according to their abilities, need time for action, tend to realize optimal international goals*” (Translation by D.M.).

If the definitions of foreign policy with the definitions of diplomacy are compared, it can be seen that both are appointed to realize some goals on the international level. So, what is the difference between the foreign policies and the diplomacy and is there a difference between them at all? Although the diplomacy has been and for some people still is synonymous for foreign policy, the foreign policy is a term that is much broader than the notion of diplomacy. The diplomacy is inevitable and perhaps most important foreign policy tool. The diplomacy does not exist just for itself but it is placed in the service of achievements of the foreign policy goals. Simply, foreign policy is what you want to

achieve and according to this it determines the desired goals, while the diplomacy is the chosen method through which you will seek to achieve the same goals.

It will be useful to observe the relations between the diplomacy towards the creation of general foreign policy of one concerned state, i.e. the degree of influence of the diplomacy in shaping the foreign policy. Most scholars agree that diplomacy has no monopoly over the formation of foreign policy but it participates indirectly through the way of diplomatic negotiations and representation of the basic foreign policy line of a state in front of the other members of the international community. While, institutions such as the Head of State, the President of the Government, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and so on directly create the foreign policy. The diplomat mission, either as permanent representative in another country, or as a negotiator, in behalf of his own country in diplomatic discussions, is to transfer and sometimes interpret the decisions and moves of his state officials in order to be properly understood in a state where he performs the mission. So the diplomat does not create foreign policy of its own country but only explains, interprets and justifies it. However, the diplomats, even indirectly can have their influence in shaping of the foreign policy. This can be done by sharing their own views supported by their authority and their experience inside their home country or through the manner of certain negotiations outside their country and so on.

The relation between the foreign policy with the domestic policy and the degree of dependence in shaping a foreign policy with the character of the political system

The relation between the foreign policy with the domestic policy

It would be useful to take into consideration the relationship of foreign policy with domestic policy. State boundaries are the center of this division. State boundaries are at the same time the limits of the domestic politics and the field outside this limits area is reserved for the foreign policy. So the goals that should be achieved on international level are carried through the instruments of foreign policy. Some theoretical views move on the line of what the state makes on the international level is directly related to internal needs, or related to domestic politics, even when it is not so obvious. Some posts go a step further arguing that the foreign policy is nothing but a simple continuation of the internal politics of a country outside its borders. It is quite complicated to agree with this claim. This kind of statement would be way too much of a simplification. There is an existence of a link or connection between the foreign and domestic policy, of course. Going even a step further and saying that the overall policy of the state is nothing else but the sum of the external and the internal policy, is agreeable as well. However as Tonovski [8, 2] stated "*both aspects of the public policy have their own autonomy*" (Translation by D.M.). It is a statement to agree with entirely. Claiming that the foreign policy is purely a continuation of the domestic policy despite being a way too much of a simplification, might also be considered as neglecting the principle of autonomy of both policies. Thus, it is fair to consider that domestic politics has its own (large) impact on the creation of foreign policy, but one cannot see why the reverse could not be the case. Thus is quite legitimate to say that the foreign policy of a State can have its impact on the domestic policy. There are numerous examples. Let's take the case of Republic of Macedonia. One of the Macedonian foreign policy top priorities is obtaining a membership in NATO and the European Union. Both organizations have their own principles and conditions that must be fulfilled in order the country to become their new

member. The criteria for entry into the EU are called Copenhagen criteria¹. NATO alliance despite all, is an organization of military nature - military alliance. However, despite the existence of good military capabilities the existence of democracy in countries that tend to join NATO is still required. All this criteria have an influence into the domestic politics of Republic of Macedonia in the direction of making reforms to meet the conditions for achieving foreign policy objectives.

The degree of dependence in shaping a foreign policy with the character of the political system

Once if it's accepted that there is a link of interdependence between the foreign and the domestic policy of a country, then it would be desirable to consider the degree of dependence in the shaping the foreign policy with the character of the domestic political system.

In order to see the degree of dependence there should be a historical overview done. In monarchies, at the time when the countries were not so solid works and they were considered as personal property to their rulers, the impact of man-monarch was crucial for the formation of foreign policy. This was the case simply because formally, there was only one existing person who could decide (although there were some trustworthy advisers of the monarch and participated in this process).

Or let us consider an autocratic state. Let's take the example of Nazi Germany and its foreign policy. Nazi Germany based the overall foreign policy on the postulates and the understanding to an only one man - Adolph Hitler. Referring to the literature for the period of Nazi Germany, the aforementioned is highly supported. The literature review indisputably shows that all the major decisions in the foreign policy of Nazi Germany were mostly made by the "Führer" or with his blessing. Such is the tendency in all contemporary autocracies, but yet let's not forget the fact that "the supreme leader" regardless of his official title, must rely on some socio-political forces.

Italy appears as an interesting example during the rule of Benito Mussolini. The existing literature of this period shows that Italy's foreign policy was built based on the strong influence and the will of one man - Mussolini. However this is not enough to classify Italy in times Mussolini of in the group of modern autocracies. This is because the great influence of the party oligarchy that existed at that time cannot be ignored. This can be illustrated trough the example of adopting a decision on the capitulation of Italy. In fact, this decision was not taken by Mussolini but by the party oligarchy. The border between the oligarchy and autocracy is difficult to stress in cases where one person is extremely powerful. This example shows that the oligarchic systems arrangements do not have only one formal holder of foreign political decision. Although, as already mentioned, the example of Italy in times of Mussolini is qualified somewhere between autocracy and oligarchy.

The abovementioned examples have shown that the general trend is in favor of having strong link between the foreign policy (especially the manner of its creation) and the character of the political system within a state. So in autocratic state order the foreign policy is generally created by the will of one man, and in the states where oligarchy is primal rule, the foreign policy is being created in the small oligarchic circle.

¹Consisting of principals as the rule of law, respect and protect the rights of minorities, the human rights, the economic criteria and so on.

If we continue to analyze the relationship between the foreign policy and the political system in the terms of who brings the decision making in the foreign policy, then we can make a general division. The division is made between countries with democratic systems and non-democratic systems. In spite how general this division may seem, yet some general tendencies can be seen. Thus, in the countries with undemocratic political systems, the foreign policy is consider as a “state business” and very high level politics and therefore it should not be decided, and sometimes not even discussed from the common people. This policy is considered as reserved for only a small closed group. In democratic political systems on the other hand, the opposite is true in general. Foreign policy has an increasing number of participants and stakeholders. Certainly the creation of foreign policy is dependent on the type of the democratic system, whether it's parliamentary system or whether a presidential system... However, whatever the democratic system is, the holders of public functions are subject to the democratic control of its own citizens through the regular or emergency elections, referendum, and control of parliament.

Although what has been said is to some extent generalizations, the previous examples illustrate that the foreign policy in a particular country is largely dependent on the political system within the state. In addition to this statement the “Democratic Peace Theory” can be mentioned. Primary argument of this theory is that the states with democratic systems do not fight or very rarely fight with each other. This theory directly confirms the previous statement stating that the foreign Policy of states is dependent on the nature of the internal political system. Thus, the theory of democratic peace suggests a direct link between the domestic political system and foreign policy. The theory of democratic peace is based on its primary claim – the democracies do not fight among each other (or very rarely fight), and further on the theory builds the logical conclusion that the more democracies worldwide, the more secure world will be. This theory has produced the term “peace zone” or “zone of peace”. The term is used to refer to democratic countries in the world, thus the countries where peace reigns (because under this theory the democracies do not fight among each other). The theory of democratic peace offers three arguments that justify the claim that democracies do not fight with each other. The first argument consists in the claim that democratic governments are elected and subject to re-election, so therefore they must be accountable to the people, and people generally do not want war. So the government will not go against the will of their voters². The second argument consists of the fact that democratic states have their own constitutions, which determines exactly when the state can go to a war and what conditions must be met for this, then, which are the institution responsibilities and so on. So the very existence of the Constitution greatly restricts the arbitrariness that might arise from the heads of state. Finally, the democratic countries respect the international law and they will always strive to solve the problems under the international law regulations thus avoiding war as a means of achieving their goals. At the same time, there are some studies that have shown that as much as the democracies do not go into a war between them at the same time, they are prone to go in war against non-democratic and totalitarian states. Some statistics (Reiter & Stam 2002) argue that even $\frac{3}{4}$ of the wars ended with victory of the democratic countries. Furthermore, the victims caused by democratic states at war are significantly smaller than the number of casualties caused by undemocratic states and so on.

² which is the idealist's view in the international relations

Certainly there are some critics to this theory, i.e. some parts of this theory. The further explanation is rated as unproductive of this theory and its critics, because the theory was mentioned only in the context of confirmation of the importance given to the relationship between the domestic political systems that influences the process of creating a foreign policy.

Theoretical approaches

Let's see what the theory claims about the approaches and the concepts of studying the foreign policy. We will present three approaches. Each of these approaches adequately contributed to a better understanding, shaping and implementing the foreign policies of states.

One of those approaches is the geopolitical method. It is consisted of studying the correlation of geographical position and political orientation or strategy of a particular state. The beginnings of this method are commonly associated with Aristotle and its analysis of its geographic factors that had affected the political form in the city-states in ancient Greece. Today this method is inevitable. According to Mirchev [9, 11] "*Numerous social thinkers, since ancient times till nowadays, considering and contemplating politics, have had and still have on their tables- geographical maps besides their pads and pencils.*" When discussing about geopolitics it should be noted that within the theory there are terms such as "classical geopolitics" and "modern geopolitics". In the first term much more emphasis is placed on the impact of geographical and spatial factors. "Modern geopolitics", however is much more interested in the human factor rather than geographical. Thus, it is more concerned with demographics, population, ethnology, shaping political institutions and so on. For the geopolitics as written by Parker (1997), he claims that its values and character are becoming more and more regional, local, humane and peace loving. These contrasts with the general view of the geopolitics as a phenomenon in larger countries – the major powers, have in many aspects developed the ideology or doctrines thus justifying the strategic interests, goals and ambitions of these powers. Often the geopolitics was used as preparing of the public for aggression and so on.

The geopolitical terms are not something unknown in the Macedonian foreign policy, although it must be admitted that many of these terms were "imported" from different external sources. Thus the term "Western Balkans" is used in relations with the EU and describes the Balkan countries that are non-EU countries, including R. Macedonia. This term observed through a purely geographical prism is not correct. Macedonia and Serbia for example, geographically speaking, could be considered as central Balkans, but not as the Western Balkans. However the term "Western Balkans" is accurate and geopolitical indicates the Balkan states that are west of the two Balkan EU member states³. Another term of such type is the "Adriatic group" imported from the vocabulary of the NATO alliance. The term indicating three states⁴, including the Republic of Macedonia, that has no outlet on the Adriatic Sea. Again, if the term is observed from a purely geographical point of view is not correct. Nevertheless if this term is observed from a geopolitical point of view, it actually has a great

³ Bulgaria and Romania

⁴ Croatia, Albania and Macedonia

sense. This term was in service of certain geopolitical goals. It was actually meant to describe the Balkan states that should join NATO in “package”.

A second approach that helped into the development of the studies of foreign policy and which certainly deserves attention is the comparative politics approach. This approach has been especially developed after the end of the World War II. It is considered as a sub-discipline of political science. It mainly deals with comparison of ways of building political systems and ways of building within the political systems including electoral models and systems, political party systems, parliamentary models, political culture, democratic values, political opinion and so on. The questions like who rules, how the interests are represented, who gets and who loses, and so on are also treated. After the appearance of authors such Lipset, Eckstein and Satori, this model experienced some changes. These authors mainly dealt with comparing the performance of democratic systems with non-democratic systems. Some of them went even further and tried to offer mechanisms for pressure on undemocratic “imperfect societies” in order to democratize them. This certainly had a great influence on the shaping of foreign policy.

A third approach is the so-called approach of “World Politics”. This approach has a global scope of coverage of issues and is in many aspects interdisciplinary. It has understanding of the world as a system of interactive impacts of economic, organizational, political and cultural forces. It often deals with development issues, and questions about the problems of balancing the inequalities of different levels of development from the perspective of the mission of the universal political organizations such as UN, respect for universal human rights, avoiding conflicts and wars and so on. Especially interesting is the work of Rourke & Boyer [3]. They are concentrated primarily on the evolution of patterns of world politics. This is performed by examining factors such as nationalism and the role of national states, international organizations, international security and safety, economy, global competition and cooperation, preservation and awareness of human rights and human dignity and so on.

The changes in the international relations and their impact on the on foreign Policy

There were tectonic disruptions on the international relations in the last two decades. The cold war that threatened to turn into a real third world war, luckily ended without occurring of the dark predictions. The Communism had fallen apart with dramatic speed like a tower of cards. Various thinkers have tried to give an answer to what was happening and what will the world be after the Cold War. There were questions about the future of democracy such as: will it spread it throughout the entire world - or not. Famous Fukuyama (1992) perceived these changes as “the end of history” because according to him the liberal democracy is the final form of organization and governance. Thus democratization of the whole world is an expected thing. On the other hand, Huntington (1992) saw the democratization process coming in “waves” but was not so optimistic that democracy will ever prevail in the world. The spread of democracy was not the only issue that was raised after the end of the Cold War. Certain other dilemmas appeared that may have existed previously but now they have gotten a new meaning. The questions about the relationship between the democracy and the foreign policy, specifically on the question on the effectiveness of foreign Policy in democracies now have gotten a new dimension. Suddenly there were new topics and terms. As a new theme, the

question about the possible loss of sovereignty of states in the new globalized world was raised. There were also questions about the relationship between the foreign policy and human rights. The arousing of the term “humanitarian intervention” was used as justification for invading Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999 by the NATO Alliance. Many have seen this as a direct interference of a military alliance in the internal affairs of a sovereign, independent and a member of the UN. Furthermore, this was done without approval of the Security Council of UN. Hence, logical questions followed about how truly sovereign are the states in today's world of international relations.

Where was the foreign policy place in all this? Each of these tectonic disturbances in the international relations has left a mark on the foreign policy. The fall of communism, the end of the Cold War the globalization and so on left a qualitative change in international relations that had to be taken into account by the foreign policy. The changes that took place opened a series of questions about the future role of the foreign policy as such. Certainly, the foreign policy was not the same during the Cold War and afterwards. Some authors predicted extremely pessimistic scenarios for the necessity of the further existence of the foreign policy in the new globalized world. Namely some even expected its disappearance, or at least minimization of the need for conducting foreign policy. However this has not proved as true. According to Hill (2003) in order to make the foreign Policy disappear, the independent units (the states) will have to disappear first, but this has not happened. It is obvious that the globalization, the loss of sovereignty, the spread of democracy and so on, had an impact on the foreign policy as such, but none of these factors seriously got into a question about the need for further existence of the foreign policy, and it will hardly happen in the future. Foreign policy remains as a part of the top priorities of any serious state.

Conclusion

The foreign policy continues to be one of the most important elements of the politics of each serious state. Living in the world of globalization has not yet made the foreign policy disappear, but it only has transformed it in another form. Analyzing specific relations of the foreign policy with other relevant concept is crucial for its proper understanding and implementation. That is why continuous and further theoretical analysis of the foreign policy is needed.

References

1. Friedman T. & Krieger J. 2006. *Globalization and state power: Competing paradigms, the new System*. NY, San Francisco etc. Wellesley College.
2. Janev I. 2002. *Medjunarodniodnosi i spoljnapolitika*. Beograd, Institut za politicke studije.
3. Rourke J. & Boyer T. 2002. *World Politics, International politics on the world stage. Brief*. Guilford, CT, MacGraw-Hill/Duhkin.
4. Berridge [G. R.](#) 2009. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*, third Edition. London, Antony Rowe Ltd.
5. Gaw J. 2004. *Triumph of the Leck of Will, International Diplomacy and the Yugoslavia War*. London, Hurst & Co.
6. Hill C. 2003. *The changing politics of foreign policy*. New York, Palgrave MacMillan.

7. Maleski D. 2003. The politician, the diplomat and the people: Macedonian foreign policy experiences. In European Commission for Democracy through Law (ed.) *Democracy, rule of law and foreign policy*. Skopje, Council of Europe.
8. Tonovski G. 2005. *Megunarodniodnosi, Avtoriziranipredavanja*. Skopje, FON University.
9. Mircev D. 2006. *Makedonskatanadvoresnapolitika*. Skopje, Az-buki.

დეჯან მაროლოვი

ვოცე დელჩევის უნივერსიტეტი

მაკედონია

საგარეო პოლიტიკა – თეორიული მიმოხილვა

რეზიუმე

საგარეო პოლიტიკა ერთ-ერთი უმნიშვნელოვანესი პოლიტიკაა ნებისმიერ სერიოზულ სახელმწიფოში. კარგი საგარეო პოლიტიკის არსებობისათვის უპირველეს ყოვლისა საჭიროა თეორიული კვლევების ჩატარება. წინამდებარე სტატია ეხება თეორიულ მიდგომას საგარეო პოლიტიკისადმი ხარისხობრივი მეთოდების გამოყენებით რაც განაპირობებს საგარეო პოლიტიკის კვლევების შემდგომ საჭიროებას.