
Public Policy and Foreign Policy: Divergences, Intersections, Exchange

Howard H. Lentner¹
City University of New York

Abstract

Policy studies tend to be divided between domestic matters and foreign affairs. Scholars seldom employ one another's literature, and they largely draw on different traditions within political science. This article explores the potential for cross-fertilization and calls for greater integration of these related subfields.

The argument considers the case for unity, parallelism, and overlap between domestic public policy studies and foreign policy studies. It examines the reasons for the divide and surveys a variety of attempts to find solutions for the problem of intersection at the boundary between national life and the international environment. It places the dichotomy in a broader context of political science as a whole and offers suggestions about potentially fruitful exchanges. It treats globalization and suggests that a theory of the state could be helpful to both tendencies in policy studies.

Introduction

Policy studies scholars tend to be divided between those concerned with domestic matters and those focused on foreign affairs. They seldom employ one another's literature, and they largely draw on different traditions within political science. In universities foreign policy analysis and public policy courses are taught by different instructors, each set of whom largely ignores the literature of the other. Nevertheless, from the perspective of one who has spent a career teaching international politics and foreign policy, they might both benefit from more exchange. This article explores the potential for cross-fertilization and calls for greater integration of these related subfields within political science.

The argument is organized along the following lines. In the first section, I consider the case for unity, parallelism, and overlap between domestic public policy studies and foreign policy studies. Despite the case for convergence, there remains a dichotomy; the second section examines the reasons for the divide. Third, I then provide a very brief treatment of the subfield of foreign policy studies, which for a time has diverged from both public policy and international politics studies. Fourth, I survey a variety of attempts to find solutions for the problem of intersection that arises from foreign policy's position at the boundary between national life and the international environment. The fifth section places the dichotomy in a broader context of political science as a whole and offers suggestions about potentially fruitful exchanges. In the sixth section, I treat the phenomena of globalization and identify the core matter as the absence of a theory of the state that could be helpful to both of these tendencies in policy studies. In the seventh and last section, I conclude by calling for increased cross-fertilization between these subfields and offer a number of specific illustrations of the type of exchange I have in mind.

Unity, Parallels, Overlap

Barbara Nelson (1996, p. 552), in her overview of public policy and administration, stated,

Instead of place or governmental function, public policy is distinguished by four intellectual imperatives: an interest in the *whole pattern of political systems and their processes*, a belief that *the consequences of governmental actions are important*, a struggle to produce *useful as well as theoretically and empirically sound knowledge*, and a conviction that *democracy matters*.

These imperatives—holism, consequences, usefulness, and democracy—apply equally to foreign and domestic public policy matters.

Holism

Although dedicated to the foreign policy of the United States and concentrated on the problems in the world that the United States faced, Dean Acheson, Former Secretary of State, had an acute appreciation for the reliance for success of that foreign policy on the many public policy decisions that were made in the domestic political system (Acheson, 1958, pp. 23–28). He viewed the life of the country through a prism of wholeness.

Although Americans are notoriously indifferent to foreign affairs, they are sometimes reminded of how intertwined the country and the world are. The 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor, the Cuban missiles crisis in 1962, and the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, are all hallmarks of shock, and they all give recognition to how entangled the country is with the rest of the world. Moreover, players and processes in policymaking are similar in both domestic and foreign affairs. Although one cannot easily fit the analysis of the foreign policymaking process into such general public policy considerations as policy cycles, iron triangles, issue typologies, and so forth, Hilsman in his book on foreign and defense policy (Hilsman, 1987, p. 175) refers to “subgovernments and cozy little triangles.”

There certainly are connections among components of society dealing with foreign affairs, just as there are among those involved in domestic policy issue areas. For example, the military-industrial-academic complex is well known, and the sugar and cotton industries have protectors in both Congress and the executive branch that make American foreign policy toward many sugar- and cotton-producing countries more difficult because of the subsidies that emanate from the nexus of interests in the United States.

The connections between issue areas frequently enough become apparent, as when the civil rights movement was bolstered by the independence of African countries whose representatives traveled what was an embarrassingly segregated route from New York to Washington. Both business and labor are mightily affected by multilateral trade agreements with other countries, as their intense lobbying efforts attest. Most citizens have a sense of global environmental trends that may have an impact on their own lives. In the 1970s, the two oil crises stemming from the 1973 war in the Middle East between Israel and its Arab neighbors and the 1979 Iranian revolution, respectively, drove home to Americans, Europeans, Japanese, and nations throughout the world that their economies and comfort levels were importantly affected by international events.

Consequences

Foreign policy concentrates on war and peace; trade, investment, and finance; protecting the country against threats and taking advantage of opportunities to promote its interests—all of these are consequential. When linked with defense and security, the expenditures alone indicate the importance of governmental actions; when one adds the impact on government of the international environment, as indicated by the immense growth in the national government's size and complexity as a result of World War II and the Cold War, for example, the consequences seem enormous. We are reminded of this impact with regard to the new Homeland Security Department, which was created as the largest American national government reorganization since the beginning of the Cold War in the late 1940s.

Usefulness

Although there is some tension in foreign policy analysis, as in the public policy field as a whole, between striving for relevance and immediate application on the one hand, and theory development on the other, everyone in the foreign policy field strives to influence the course of policy and to exert some control over public choices. For example, Kenneth Waltz, the leading theorist of structural realism—which draws a sharp distinction between the system structure and internal state arrangements—has often been criticized for neglecting domestic politics. Yet his chapters on economic and military effects of structure in his seminal book, *Theory of International Politics* (Waltz, 1979), were derived in part from a study of interdependence that he did for the United States Department of State. Incidentally, Nelson (1996, p. 568) nods approvingly in the direction of theory, for the very good reason that it is useful, and, citing Graham Allison (1971) and Alexander George (1980), she writes that “[s]ome of the theoretically richest work has looked at foreign policy decision-making.”

Other public policy authors allude to foreign policy matters. For example, Lindblom (1980) mentions such problems as the environment, which includes both domestic and international dimensions, and nuclear war. He also refers to the Cuban missiles crisis, the international drug trade, and economic development (Lindblom, 1980, p. 67). As discussed below, Lindblom provides a rich array of concepts that might be applied to foreign policy analysis, and those sharing his concerns could benefit from some of the foreign policy literature.

Democracy

Ever since the French and American Revolutions, democracy has mattered in the modern world of politics, including all that falls within the purview of public policy. Since Woodrow Wilson certainly, but even before, American foreign policy has been affected mightily by the ideology as well as the practice of democracy. Concerns with democratic participation—including those affected in agenda formation as well as policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation—insinuate themselves not just in domestic political processes but also in foreign policy processes and even

international policy processes. For example, one of the themes in Joseph Stiglitz's book on globalization (2002) is that the interests of more components of society should be represented in the International Monetary Fund and other international economic and financial institutions.

In addition to these considerations, the foreign policy analysis subfield has been characterized by as many different frameworks as the seven included and the many omitted by Paul Sabatier in his *Theories of the Policy Process* (1999). In my opinion, such a proliferation of frameworks offers testimony to the absence of coherent and elegant theory that explains recurrent phenomena.

As in the rest of political science, public policy has formed an arena for rational choice theory. Foreign policy has lent itself less to the rational choice approach, although some writers have tried to fit the complex politics of foreign policy into very narrow channels of conceptualization and explanation. On the whole, Deborah Stone's strong critique of the public policy literature, laid out in her *Policy Paradox* (1997), applies to the foreign as well as the general policy literature. Certainly, there has been a disparagement of politics rather than a treatment of politics "as a creative and valuable feature of social existence" (Stone, 1999, p. x). Seldom does the literature deal with political community, as opposed to an individualistic market model: the bureaucratic politics literature falls here. The battered concept of national interest, however, does imply a political community. The absence of theory and the bias of objectivity that privileges certain analytical claims over others, which Stone decries, plague foreign policy as well as general public policy.

Dichotomy

Given the substantial amount of overlap, how can we explain the existence of a dichotomy, as Fred Lane has formulated it, between domestic and foreign in policy studies? James Rosenau (1971) has argued that foreign policy takes place at the intersection of the domestic and foreign arenas. I think that foreign policy analysis is pulled in two directions, tugged by general policy analysis concerns on the one hand and international politics concerns on the other. Some analysts fall into the category of American (or other countries') politics, while others draw their inspiration from international politics, which tends to be focused on the external world and its constraints.

There are foreign policy writers who concentrate on exactly the type of analysis that most public policy analysts do—Graham Allison (1971; Allison & Szanton, 1976), John Steinbruner (1974), I.M. Destler (1972), Roger Hilsman (1987), Alexander George (1980), Richard Neustadt (1970), Paula Stern (1979), and many others. And there have been outstanding governmental studies, similar to the Hoover Commission's, that aim to make foreign policy operations more effective. The most prominent of these in the United States were those done by the Jackson subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee (*Organizing for National Security*, 1, 2, 3, 1961; *Administration of National Security*, 1965) in preparation for the turnover from the Eisenhower to the Kennedy administration and by the Murphy Commission (United States, 1975; United States, 1976) following the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal.

On the other hand, the writers who associate themselves with international politics have mostly followed the realist tradition, which abstracts the external concerns and behaviors of a country from its whole life. This tendency has been enhanced by neorealism, which draws a rigorous distinction between the unit and system-structure levels of analysis in order to build theoretical understanding. Thus, the tendencies of divisiveness of the two groups of analysts are reinforced both by the domestic versus international dichotomy and by the tension between an emphasis on immediate policy relevance versus a quest for theoretical elegance, with its only longer-term practical policy applications. Furthermore, in political theory, John Locke (1681) drew a distinction between the executive and federative powers, the latter unconstrained by domestic limitations imposed on the former. This distinction, upheld in the United States by the Supreme Court in the *Curtiss-Wright* case (1936), concedes exceptional powers to the president in dealing with foreign affairs. It obviously affects the general view of the matter and, thus, analysis.

Foreign Policy Analysis

Fomented by the work of the Harold and Margaret Sprout (1962) and of Richard Snyder and his associates (1954) in the preceding decade, in the 1960s foreign policy analysis within the field of international politics began to diverge from structural and interactional analysis. The earliest and still influential attempt was Richard Snyder's (Snyder, Bruck, & Sapin, 1954) decision-making scheme, first broached in 1952, in which the state was reduced to a set of decision makers who, armed with their own beliefs and procedures, stood at the center of pressures from constituents at home and pressures emanating from other states abroad. The single strict application of the scheme was to the Korean War (Snyder & Paige, 1958; Paige, 1968), but decision-making analysis has continued to inform research on foreign policy. Despite a theoretical claim that to understand what one state did was to understand the behavior of all states, the Snyder approach suffered both from a lack of theory and of appreciation for the diversity of cultures and political systems.

Then, joining in the behavioral trends in political science as a whole, foreign policy analysis became preoccupied with theory development (Rosenau, 1966). For the most part, however, this preoccupation deteriorated into a concern with positivist methodology, and the subfield became increasingly irrelevant to policy problems and the policy process. In my judgment, by the late 1970s it had ceased to advance and cumulate, although devotees have continued to promote the specialization of foreign policy analysis (Hermann, Kegley, & Rosenau, 1987; Neack, Hey, & Haney, 1995). To an extent, the specialization has further fragmented into divisions, for example, between those addressing the foreign policies of the major powers (Pastor, 1999) and those focusing on what used to be called the Third World and has more recently come to be termed the Global South (Braveboy-Wagner, 2003). In recent years, the subfield has returned to the condition against which it rebelled: case study analysis (Beasley, Kaarbo, Lantis, & Snarr, 2002).

Another characteristic that has attended the foreign policy analysis subfield over the years is a tendency, when searching for theoretical insights and methods, to

turn to other disciplines. For example, some have drawn on social psychology (Kelman, 1965) while others (Hermann, 1978) have employed personal psychology. Computer analysis played an important role in the so-called events-data movement (East, Salmore, & Hermann, 1978). These are but a few instances in which political scientists in this subfield overlook their own discipline and reach out to other disciplines for ideas and theories.

Of course, the policy analysis subfield includes scholars who do the same thing. For example, Baumgartner and Jones (1993) employ a punctuated equilibrium model, which they, as well as other political scientists, have borrowed from evolutionary biology.

Meanwhile, the dichotomy between domestic and foreign remained, and the intersection problem persisted. Some analysts have tried to address it.

Different Solutions to the Intersection Problem

In foreign policy studies there have been many attempts to overcome the dichotomy, or to deal with the intersection problem arising from foreign policy's position at the boundary between domestic public policy and the external world. Certainly, it is clear that, with due allowance for bureaucratic specialization, at high levels the same agents deal with both domestic and foreign affairs; many of the same constituents are affected by both even though certain obvious exceptions—like the difference between exporters and domestic sellers of products—need to be stressed; the same tax base supports policies in both arenas; and pressures arise in society to participate in shaping policy, regardless of issue. On a major matter such as the 1997–1998 Asian economic crisis, the United States Secretary of the Treasury took the lead. Following the 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, one of the more significant modifications of government organization involved forging cooperation between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency in the area of gathering and sharing intelligence about threats against the homeland, although this is an area subject to modification. In academic analysis, most of the endeavors to bridge the dichotomy focus on the chief executive who, in turn, links the two sides, domestic and foreign.

Although designed to separate international politics analysis from decision making, the Snyder (Snyder et al., 1954) scheme's perspective placed national authorities at the center of pressures from constituents at home and pressures emanating from other states abroad. Thus, it implicitly grappled with the nexus of domestic and foreign policymaking.

Another important contribution to the intersection problem was made by Michael Brecher, a Canadian, who wrote a fine study of foreign policy decision making in Israel (Brecher, 1972). Drawing on earlier work by Margaret Sprout and Harold Sprout (1962), Brecher placed at the center of his analysis a distinction between the operational environment and the psychological environment, and he made the coincidence of these the test of success in foreign policy. Despite a very rich and sophisticated descriptive analysis that included the images of the elites, mass public opinion, and various layers of the external environment, Brecher's central argument falls exactly within the theory of realism in which rational

calculation of forces in play determines policies and success is the standard for assessment.

One of the cleverest and most influential scholars in this area was Alexander George (1980). He was concerned with real foreign policy problems, yet he also strove for systematic knowledge and broader theoretical insight. George advocated the structured comparative method of doing case studies. He also focused importantly on presidential decision making, in which the criterion applied was the intelligent and effective use of information. Robert Jervis (1976), applying social and individual psychological theories to foreign policy analysis, contributed to dealing with the intersection problem by analyzing how perception and misperception affected the clash of material forces in foreign policy. More recently, he has devoted his attention to the impact on the domestic as well as the international life of systemic considerations (Jervis, 1997). Another take on the matter was offered by Robert Putnam (1988; Evans, Jacobson, & Putnam, 1993) who conceived of international bargaining as a two-level game in which central decision makers face domestic constituents, on the one side, and foreign interlocutors, on the other.

Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye's work on complex interdependence (1989) importantly provided a model which, applied under appropriate circumstances, showed that policymaking in international relations sometimes worked very much like policymaking in the domestic arena, with both governmental and nongovernmental participants contending to set agendas, shape policy formulation, and affect implementation. They detailed how this model can be applied to the multilateral issue areas of oceans and money and to the bilateral relations between the United States and, respectively, Canada and Australia. In some ways, the study of the 1962 Trade Act by Bauer, Poole, and Dexter (1963) presaged this work, although Keohane and Nye do not mention that study. Neither do they draw at all on Kingdon (1995), who remains the foremost authority in the public policy literature on agenda setting and policy flows. At the same time, as they remind us in the Afterword of the second edition of their book, Keohane and Nye (1989) note that a realist model in which security and force have priority in policymaking continues to be relevant.

The trick is to identify theoretically why complex interdependence works so well in North America and in Europe but not in the Middle East or South Asia. In my view, where security is abundant, complex interdependence works as an explanatory scheme; where security is scarce, realism works. With respect to the question posed in this article—that is to say, what are the sources of the dichotomy?—it remains in conditions of insecurity, and it is overcome in secure circumstances. This results from the fact that in conditions of insecurity and great uncertainty the problems faced by foreign policy officials, and thus analysts, tend to be very different from those confronting domestic policymakers and analysts.

More recently, the sociological approach to international politics championed by Alexander Wendt (1999) and John Ruggie (1998) and known as moderate constructivism, argues that structure and agency must not be divided. For theoretical purposes, then, ideas and material forces together shape structures, and what realists consider to be exogenous conditions—for example, anarchy—are shaped more by intersubjective understandings, by ideas, than by power. Thus, it is possible to

begin to reshape the world, to bring about a world polity, to use Ruggie's term. Their project would then, in the long run, erode the dichotomy by eliminating altogether what we now understand as the international political system, anarchy, and interstate war.

Meanwhile, the constructivist project has brought the concept of epistemic communities to bear, in which elites with shared knowledge influence policies across international boundaries (Haas, 1992). This is a claim that, in some circumstances, the dichotomy between domestic and foreign policies has already been eroded in practice. That claim may not be warranted; nevertheless, it does call attention to the possibility that foreign governments and nongovernmental organizations from abroad should be considered candidates for inclusion in Kingdon's array of participants in the processes of policymaking.

The Dichotomy in a Broader Context

Despite a considerable amount of thinking that erodes the distinction between domestic and foreign policy, very substantial gaps remain, partly for theoretical reasons and partly for academic bureaucratic reasons. Specialists frequently have a hard time broadening their outlooks, and academic departments generally have difficulty accepting interdisciplinary studies. Otherwise reasonable and smart professors cling to boundaries within disciplines and even within fields.

The gulf between general public policy studies and foreign policy analysis also reflects larger divisions within political science. Other tensions include that between those specializing in area studies and those seeking global generalizations. Despite some erosion in the post-Cold War period between comparative politics and international politics, few people who have made significant contributions to the state and society literature read international relations books, and few international relations scholars acquaint themselves with the state and society literature. Yet, one can envisage a very fruitful exchange between the state and society people, on the one hand, and traditional realists, on the other.

The split between foreign policy and public policy analysis, of course, represents one of the glaring divisions in the discipline of political science. There are so many ways in which the two subfields could benefit from drawing on the work of the other; I will explore some of these and make specific recommendations for fruitful interchange in the last section of this article. Before doing so, however, I will discuss some broad developments in the world that we study, will note some intellectual trends that try to encapsulate them, and will urge policy scholars to be aware of if not concerned with these developments and trends as they do their work.

Globalization and the State

The buzzword globalization refers to increasing connections across international boundaries, particularly in economics and culture but in politics, environmental degradation, tourism, transmission of disease, drug and arms trafficking, and other dimensions of social life as well. As new problems arising from these connections appear on policy agendas, both those concerned with making policy with reference

to the external world and those devoted to domestic policy face both new actors and redefined issues in modified policy processes.

Kamarck (2000) has detailed how the spread of government reform in the 1980s (privatization) and 1990s (“administrative reform of key state functions”) originated in New Zealand and was transmitted to many countries. Her analysis identifies four causes: global economic competition, democratization, the information revolution, and a performance deficit (Kamarck, 2000, p. 232). This analysis demonstrates some of the effects that public and foreign policy analysts together ought to incorporate into their work.

In addition to external sources of bringing issues to the policymaking agenda, there are increasing numbers of groups that reach across international boundaries, and these groups participate in the processes of making policy, both foreign and domestic. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, for example, maintain pressures on many governments through transnational networks. Especially in the post-Cold War period there has been an exponential growth in the numbers of international nongovernmental organizations, which have little regard in either their conceptions or their actions for the distinction between foreign and domestic policymaking.

Furthermore, there has occurred a weakening in the post-World War II bargain on “embedded liberalism” (Ruggie, 1982), which provided that in return for a liberal international regime states could protect their domestic economies, specifically by maintaining welfare states to protect their own citizens from the buffetings of the international political economy. Not only has that bargain begun to break down but also matters have gone so far in both economic and security affairs that Arthur Stein (2001, p. 277) terms the increased penetration of states as “intrusiveness creep.” A new norm in international affairs that has become quite strongly established is that of transparency, in which states and firms are expected to provide information to all, without regard to whether they are nationals or foreigners.

These conditions lead observers and analysts to search for conceptual apparatuses for understanding the new conditions. A widespread view is that states are eroding and losing control to market and other nonstate forces in the world. In contrast, my view is that the phenomena of globalization and intrusiveness are underpinned by states in two ways. First, to operate effectively, the international political economy requires the stability provided by American military power and policy commitment. Second, the generation of wealth in the context of the international economy requires strong states to support and regulate markets. Thus, increased attention to the concept of the state is warranted.

From the vantage point of international politics, the two main strands of thought, realism and neoliberal institutionalism, have advanced the study of the relations of states, formulating theoretical explanations, devising research programs, and contributing cumulative knowledge. In this field, we study new phenomena, and we address new questions; we no longer keep treading over well-packed ground, and we no longer beat dead horses. What is needed is a theory of the state to complement the structural theory of the international system and an understanding of process where conditions are conducive to peaceful exchange. Whether such a theory may more likely be created by keeping the realms separate or bringing them together is a matter of contention.

My own position is that theoretical advance tends to be more likely when a domain is isolated, recurrent phenomena are identified, and the theorist then offers an explanation for the recurrences. Only when we have such a theory of state formation, operation, and decay will we be in a position to bring structural theory and state theory together into a comprehensive theory of politics. Even while conceptualizing the state, scholars need to keep in mind the advice of Outhwaite and Martell (1998, p. xii) who stress that state formation “cannot operate in isolation from increasingly powerful world-wide political and economic influences.” Perhaps some of those working in general policy analysis can contribute to the construction of a theory of the state, moving themselves away from concerns for description and policy relevance and toward theory building on a different scale. When enterprising and imaginative scholars do that, they can perhaps reach across the dichotomous divide and forge a true intersection, perhaps even a strong nexus.

Meanwhile, there are a number of more immediate and practical ways in which foreign policy analysts and domestic policy analysts can inform one another’s work and, in doing so, advance knowledge in this way of doing political science. Such cross-fertilization can help to shape research agendas, but ultimately textbooks should reflect a new, integrated approach to policy analysis.

Beyond Intersections to Cross-Fertilization

I strongly urge scholars from both subfields to read the literature of the other and to seek insights, knowledge, and methods of attacking the research puzzles of their own respective subfields. Especially to my colleagues in foreign policy analysis, I suggest that the policymaking literature offers a fruitful garden from which to harvest insights and to learn methods. Further, this endeavor would help to anchor foreign policy analysis in political science.

I will briefly illustrate some specific ways in which I think that this collaboration might work. Foreign policy analysts could beneficially employ Kingdon’s (1995) two main organizing ideas: participants and processes. By treating each participant and process as an “impetus” and a “constraint,” they would have a handy means of examining the unfolding of foreign policymaking processes. Similarly, Kingdon and other like-minded policy analysts should consider adding foreign governments and nongovernmental organizations from abroad to the lineup of participants that they include in their work. Furthermore, processes involving such participants may diverge from those that exclude them; this empirical hypothesis is one that seems worth exploration by both public policy and foreign policy analysts, perhaps in joint projects. In addition, I would add to Kingdon’s framework of analysis the phenomena in which certain agendas shape other agendas, for example, war greatly affects civil liberties.

Lindblom (1980) places effectiveness and responsiveness at the center of his treatment of public policy analysis. In his contrast of scientific and strategic visions of analysis and his emphasis on power, his views bear exactly on foreign policy analysis; I thus urge those working in this field to exploit his insights. By also stressing the privileged role of the market in democracies, Lindblom’s views

seem especially appropriate for analyzing current American foreign policy, with its globalization agenda that privileges the market in foreign as well as domestic affairs. Foreign policy analysts would also do well to attend to Lindblom's concern with excluding issues from the agenda. While Lindblom stresses that both business and political leaders often fend off issues from the public policy agenda by invoking values, we can see in the current situation in the United States how the policy of a "war on terrorism" has been exploited to shape the policy debate and to keep some issues out of policy debates. Lindblom distinguishes between segmented and common issues and writes that the latter are rising. This certainly calls for an exchange between public policy and foreign policy, for the increase of external pressures tends to make common issues rise, while the easing of those pressures allows segmentation to increase.

While Lindblom stresses the imperfections of democracy and the obstacles to popular control, his analysis would certainly be enriched by incorporating certain considerations from foreign policy analysis. For example, democracy is used instrumentally in foreign policy. It is common knowledge that during the Cold War the United States worked with very unsavory regimes that in the post-Cold War period it presses to embrace democracy. Moreover, the policy of overthrowing democratically elected governments in Iran in 1953 and Guatemala in 1954 and destabilizing the one in Chile in the early 1970s indicates that it is the policies followed by the governments, not the form of their political systems, that remains primary. Similarly, the Bush administration's aspiration to spread democracy in Middle Eastern Islamic countries does not encompass the possibility that a fundamentalist Islamic government could come to power democratically and follow a policy inimical to American interests. Foreign policy analysts are quite conscious of the formidable obstacles that stand in the way of the spread of democracy, in such countries as Iraq, for example; they deal with the centrality of the problem that Lindblom (1980, p. 124) addresses when he discusses the "roadblocks" to popular control in an advanced democratic country such as the United States. Here, it seems to me, common rather than segmented studies by foreign and public policy analysts ought to be the norm.

In their stress on volatile change, Baumgartner and Jones (1993, p. 21) deal in crisis, and they are cognizant of the deep effects of "external shocks . . . on all relevant policymaking institutions." At the same time, their conception that "stability is punctuated with periods of volatile change" involves a long view of political life. That extended view offers a useful corrective to foreign policy analysis, which tends to dwell on crisis. Instead of focusing on decisions, foreign policy analysts might turn their attention to institutions and stability and try to account for changes in them.

These are but a few examples of how engagement by foreign policy and public policy analysts together might promote useful cross-fertilization and new scholarly insights. Such engagement might also strengthen policy analysis within political science as a whole, and it would surely strengthen political analysis in the face of the immense influence of economic analysis in the policymaking arena within national political and social life. That, in my estimation, would be a good thing.

Note

1 In the City University Seminars in Public Policy, which he organized, Frederick Lane gave this title to the session where the paper upon which this article is based was first presented on December 2, 2002: "Foreign Policymaking as Policymaking: Bridging the Foreign/Domestic Dichotomy in Policy Studies." In addition to Fred Lane, I wish to thank Christa Altenstetter, Janet Gornick, and Richard Meagher for comments on and useful suggestions for this article.

About the Author

Howard H. Lentner is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Baruch College and the Graduate School, The City University of New York. He is the author of *Power and Politics in Globalization: The Indispensable State* (2004), *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative and Conceptual Approach* (1974), and "Modernization and Foreign Policy: An Alternative Approach to the Global South," in *Foreign Policies of the Global South: Rethinking Conceptual Frameworks*, edited by Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner (2003).

References

- Acheson, D. (1958). *Power and diplomacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Administration of National Security*. Eighty-eighth Congress, United States Senate. Committee on government operations, subcommittee on national security staffing and operations. Staff reports and hearings. (1965). Washington, DC: USGPO.
- Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Allison, G. T., & Szanton, P. (1976). *Remaking foreign policy: The organizational connection*. New York: Basic.
- Bauer, R. A., Pool, I., & Dexter, L. A. (1963). *American business and public policy: The politics of foreign trade*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and instability in American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beasley, R. K., Kaarbo, J., Lantis, J. S., & Snarr, M. T. (Eds.). (2002). *Foreign policy in comparative perspective: Domestic and international influences on state behavior*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Braveboy-Wagner, J. A. (Ed.). (2003). *The foreign policies of the global south: Rethinking conceptual frameworks*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Brecher, M. (1972). *The foreign policy system of Israel: Setting, images, process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Destler, I. M. (1972). *Presidents, bureaucrats, and foreign policy: The politics of organizational reform*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- East, M. A., Salmore, S. A., & Hermann, C. F. (Eds.). (1978). *Why nations act*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Evans, P. B., Jacobson, H. K., & Putnam, R. D. (Eds.). (1993). *Double-edged diplomacy: International bargaining and domestic politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- George, A. L. (1980). *Presidential decision making in foreign policy: The effective use of information and advice*. Boulder: Westview.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46, 1–35.
- Hermann, M. G. (1978). Effects of personal characteristics of political leaders on foreign policy. In M. A. East, S. A. Salmore, & C. F. Hermann (Eds.), *Why nations act* (pp. 49–68). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hermann, C. F., Kegley, Jr., C. W., & Rosenau, J. N. (1987). *New directions in the study of foreign policy*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Hilsman, R. (1987). *The politics of policy making in defense and foreign affairs: Conceptual models and bureaucratic politics*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1997). *System effects: Complexity in political and social life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Karmarck, E. C. (2000). Globalization and public administration reform. In J. S. Nye, Jr. & J. D. Donahue (Eds.), *Governance in a globalizing world* (pp. 229–252). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1965). *International behavior: A social-psychological analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1989). *Power and interdependence* (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins College.

- Lindblom, C. E. (1980). *The policy-making process*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, J. (1681). *Second Treatise of Government*, 12, paras., pp. 143–148.
- Neack, L., Hey, J. A. K., & Haney, P. J. (1995). *Foreign policy analysis: Continuity and change in its second generation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nelson, B. J. (1996). Public policy and administration: An overview. In R. E. Goodin & H. Klingemann (Eds.), *A new handbook of political science* (pp. 551–592). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neustadt, R. E. (1970). *Alliance politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Organizing for National Security*, 1, 2, 3. United States Senate Committee on government operations, subcommittee on national policy machinery. (1961). Washington, DC: USGPO.
- Outhwaite, W., & Martell, L. (Eds.). (1998). *The sociology of politics, (Vol. 1), power and the state*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Paige, G. D. (1968). *The Korean decision, June 24–30, 1950*. New York: Free Press.
- Pastor, R. A., (Ed.). (1999). *A century's journey: How the great powers shape the world*. New York: Basic Books.
- Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and domestic politics: The logic of two-level games, *International Organization*, 42, 427–460.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1966). Pre-theories and theories of foreign policy. In R. B. Farrell (Ed.), *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics* (pp. 27–92). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1971). Toward the study of national-international linkages. In *The scientific study of foreign policy* (pp. 307–338). New York: Free Press.
- Ruggie, J. G. (1982). International regimes, transactions, and change: Embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order. *International Organization*, 36(Spring), 379–415.
- Ruggie, J. G. (1998). *Constructing the world polity*. New York: Routledge.
- Sabatier, P. A. (Ed.), (1999). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Snyder, R. C., & Paige, G. D. (1958). The United States decision to resist aggression in Korea: The application of an analytical scheme. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3, 342–378.
- Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., & Burton, S. (1954). *Decision making as an approach to the study of international politics*. Foreign Policy Analysis Series No. 3. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sprout, H., & Sprout, M. (1962). *Foundations of international politics*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Stein, A. A. (2001). Constrained sovereignty: The growth of international intrusiveness. In R. Rosecrance (Ed.), *The new great power coalition: Toward a concert of nations* (pp. 261–281). Lanham and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Steinbruner, J. D. (1974). *The cybernetic theory of decision: New dimensions in political analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stern, P. (1979). *Water's edge: Domestic politics and the making of American foreign policy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Stone, D. (1997). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- United States. (1975). *Report of the commission on the organization of the government for the conduct of foreign policy*.
- United States. (1976). *Appendices and supporting materials to the report of the commission on the organization of the government for the conduct of foreign policy*.
- United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation*, 299 U.S. 304.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.