Foreign Policy Analysis and Critical Geopolitics: Beginning of a New Dialog?

Nuri SALIK[*]

Abstract

This article argues that the dialog between Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) and Critical Geopolitics (CGP) can enrich FPA, deepen FPA's engagement with International Relations (IR) theory and present a new research agenda for FPA's middle-range theorizing. In the study, it is put forward that the conversation between FPA and CGP can strengthen the connection between FPA and IR theory in various ways. CGP's emphasis on agent-centrism, ability to transcend the inside-outside dichotomy, critique of natural law-like generalizations in foreign policy, preoccupation with how-possible type questions, and interdisciplinarity can all contribute to FPA and FPA's relationship with IR. Thus, the theoretical foundations of CGP, which are largely derived from post-structuralism, have a significant potential to strengthen the connection between FPA and IR.

Keywords: International Relations, Foreign Policy Analysis, Critical Geopolitics

Dış Politika Analizi ve Eleştirel Jeopolitik: Yeni Bir Diyaloğun Başlangıcı mı?

Özet

Bu makale, Dış Politika Analizi (DPA) ile Eleştirel Jeopolitik (EJ) arasındaki diyaloğun, DPA'yı zenginleştireceğini, DPA'nın Uluslararası İlişkiler (Uİ) teorisiyle olan angajmanını derinleştirebileceğini ve Dış Politika Analizinin orta düzey teorileştirmesi için yeni bir araştırma gündemi sunabileceğini savunmaktadır. Çalışmada, DPA ile EJ arasındaki diyaloğun, DPA ile Uİ teorisi arasındaki bağlantıyı çeşitli şekillerde güçlendirebileceği öne sürülmektedir. EJ'nin özne-merkezciliğe yaptığı vurgu, iç-dış ikiliği aşma yetisi, dış politikadaki doğal hukuk benzeri genellemelere getirdiği eleştiri, nasıl-mümkün tarzı sorularla meşgul olması ve disiplinler arası olmasının hepsi DPA'ya ve DPA'nın IR ile ilişkisine katkı sağlayabilir. Bu nedenle, büyük ölçüde post-yapısalcılıktan türetilen EJ'nin teorik temelleri, DPA ile Uİ arasındaki bağlantıyı güçlendirmek için önemli bir potansiyele sahiptir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Uluslararası İlişkiler, Dış Politika Analizi, Eleştirel Jeopolitik

Introduction

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA), which is considered the sub-field of the discipline of International Relations (IR), emerged in the 1950s and early 1960s thanks to the new methodological developments in IR. Especially, the Behavioralist School's challenge to realism's notion of state contributed to FPA's emergence as a distinct field of study. With the impact of behavioralism, FPA rejected realism's taken-for-granted approach to state as an abstract and rational unit of analysis from the beginning and posited that interstate relations could be understood by paying

[*] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Ankara / Türkiye, e-mail: nurisalik@gmail.com
ORCID : https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4311-7167.

attention to agents of foreign policy or state elites who act on behalf of their political community. Thus, FPA's primary objective has been to open the black box of state by focusing on the domestic level such as decision makers, decision making process and its milieu to make sense of foreign policy decisions and actions of states. In that regard, FPA's emphasis on domestic sources of foreign policy has differentiated from realism's insistence of external sources of foreign policy.

Although FPA has been accepted as the subfield of IR, there has been a debate on how to foster the link between the two owing to their emphasis on various units and levels of analysis. Hudson and Vore (1995) and Hill (2003) argued that IR did not have a theory of human political choice and FPA can provide IR theory with human agency. It is obvious that there are certain deficiencies of mainstream theories of IR such as realism, liberalism and Marxism to account for foreign policies of states. Wendt's constructivism is also criticized for ignoring agency and focusing on structure to explain state behaviors in the international system. Among the theories IR, post-structuralism is hailed for offering a methodology to the development of middle-range theorizing of FPA, i.e., discourse analysis to explain foreign policies of states. Yet, the dilemma of putting texts or people producing them at the center of analysis made post-structuralism's linkage to FPA problematic. In this context, the subject matter of this article is significant as it aims to contribute to this debate by underlining great potential pf Critical Geopolitics (CGP) as a strand of post-structuralism to enrich and contribute to FPA's middle-range theorizing thanks to its agent-centrism and emphasis on discourse analysis.

CGP argues that there is a direct relationship between power relations and geographical space, which reflect discourses of foreign policy makers and their policy behaviors. Thus, the article posits that CGP offers new dimensions and analytical tools in analyzing foreign policies of states. In this respect, CGP's focus on agents as primary unit of analysis in foreign policy making, its disposition to overcome inside-outside dichotomy, criticism of natural law-like generalizations in explaining state behaviors, preoccupation with law-like generalizations and interdisciplinary approach are explained as the most remarkable contributions of CGP to the field of FPA, which also foster ties between FPA and IR.

First, the article will start with the evaluation of FPA's origins, development, and main premises. Second, the relationship between FPA and theories of IR will be analyzed. Third, CGP's roots and theoretical underpinnings will be explored. Finally, the ways of initiating the dialog between FPA and CGP as well as CGP's contribution to bolstering FPA's linkage to IR will be elaborated.

1.   The Origins, Development and Main Premises of FPA

Valerie Hudson (1994) defines FPA as "the subfield of international relations that seeks to explain foreign policy, or, alternatively, foreign policy behavior, with reference to the theoretical ground" (p. 14). In their latest research, Chris Alden and Amnon Aran (2017) say that "FPA is the study of the conduct and practice of relations between different actors, primarily states, in the international system" (p. 3). Deborah J. Gerner (2007) argues that FPA focuses on "the intentions, statements, and actions of an actor—often, but not always, a state—directed toward the external world and the response of other actors to these intentions, statements

and actions" (p. 18). Margot Light (1994) expresses that FPA essentially deals with the transactions between states, domestic conditions that produce these transactions, the impact of the system and its structures on them and vice versa (p. 94). Jean-Frédéric Morin and Jonathan Paquin (2018) assert that FPA underscores the constant interaction between the actors and their environment, so it necessitates multiple levels of analysis to make sense of foreign policy of the state (p. 1-2).

Although FPA is not a grand theory and does not seek to provide an overarching study of international relations, it can be clearly observed that its emergence, development and premises are heavily influenced by the epistemological developments in IR. It is widely accepted that FPA as a profession and a subfield of IR appeared in the 1950s and early 1960s in tandem with the advent of new methodological approaches in IR (Hill, 2011, p. 916; Hudson, 1994, p. 5). FPA's emergence as a distinct field of study was essentially facilitated by the Behavioralist School, which posed a methodological challenge to realism's abstract, unitary, rational and power-seeking notion of state in international affairs (Tayfur, 1994, p. 119). The growing interest in scientific research and positivist methodology in social sciences in the U.S. due to the Cold War dynamics contributed to the emergence of FPA as well (Neack et al., 2007, p. 6).

Basically, FPA came into existence as a reaction to realist assumptions about interstate relations in world politics (Alden & Aran, 2017, p. 6; Gerner, 2007, p. 19). In opposition to realism's abstract notion of state as the primary unit of analysis, FPA has pointed to real actors as the uppermost unit of analysis in explaining interstate relations. Drawing on the methodological insights of the Behavioralist School, FPA has put forward that all relations between states are carried out by human beings acting alone or in group. Therefore, FPA scholarship has contended that the key point is to understand the decision makers (human beings), who are acting on behalf of their political community or state. FPA scholarship has also underlined the importance of decision-making processes and decision-making context wherein decision makers act and interact with others. In short, FPA has rejected realist perception of state, sought to open the black box of state by bringing domestic aspect back (decision makers, decision-making processes and decision-making context) and challenged realist distinction between inside and outside in foreign policy analysis (Hill, 2003, p. 6-7; Hudson, 1994, p. 1-2; Webber and Smith, 2002, p. 12).

It is commonly accepted that three paradigmatic works laid the ground for FPA: Richard Synder, H.W. Bruck and Burton Sapin's Decision-Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics, James Rosenau's Pre-Theories and Theories of Foreign Policy and Harold and Margaret Sprout's Man-Milieu Relationship Hypothesis in the Context of International Politics (Hudson, 1994, p. 5; Hudson, 2012, p. 15). These studies brought fresh methodological perspectives to analyze foreign policy and bequeathed different ways, approaches, and traditions to coming generations of FPA scholarship. For example, Synder and his colleagues were the first scholars who opened the black box of state and turned attentions to real actors in foreign policy-making. In this respect, they contributed to the development of FPA's core theme, foreign policy decision-making (FPDM) (Hudson, 2014, p. 16; Gerner, 2007, p. 19). FPDM approach has challenged the realist idea of objective primacy of international environment over decision makers and underscored the

significance of decision makers' subjective interpretation of it. Furthermore, FPDM has brought domestic sources of foreign policy to the center of analysis against realism's insistence on external sources of foreign policy (Tayfur, 1994, 120).

The Behavioralist School found its most remarkable representation in FPA with the emergence of Comparative Foreign Policy Approach (CFP), which was first and foremost represented by James Rosenau. Parallel to scientism of behavioralism, CFP aimed at creating a general theory of foreign policy by means of methodology of natural sciences, i.e., positivism (Tayfur, 1994, p. 122). Rosenau was critical of the dearth of theoretical investigations in the study of foreign policy and thus suggested an actor-specific theory which sought to establish "cross-nationally applicable generalizations about nation-state behavior" (Hudson, 2012, p. 16). Rosenau also proposed an in-depth methodology to analyze foreign policy by underlining that foreign policy analysis should be multilevel, implying that multiple levels of analysis from individual leaders to international system should be included in foreign policy analysis. He also posited that foreign policy analysis should be multi-causal and correlate insights from various disciplines in social sciences (Neack, 2008, p. 22-23; Hudson & Vore, 1995, p. 213). CFP was heavily influenced by Synder's decision-making approach as it was the first scientific attempt at foreign policy analysis (Tayfur, 1994, p. 122). Rosenau's article "Foreign Policy: Fad, Fantasy or Field?" was another major contribution to the CFP school. In this study, Rosenau criticized previous studies for being excessively preoccupied with case studies and contended that meaningful generalizations in the study of foreign policy can only be achieved by means of the methodology of comparative analysis (Tayfur, 1994, p. 123). When we examine the studies by Rosenau and Synder, it is clearly seen that their approaches to foreign policy were multi-causal and interdisciplinary in their nature (Hudson & Vore, 1995, p. 213).

The third study that shaped the formation of FPA belongs to Harold and Margaret Sprout. Sprouts argued that the most crucial part of foreign policy is psycho-milieu of the individuals and groups who take part in foreign policy decision-making (Hudson, 2014, p. 17; Hudson, 2012, p. 17). According to them, foreign policy can only be properly understood by looking at undertakings of decision makers. Without analyzing these undertakings, international factors would be misguiding in understanding and explaining foreign policy. For this reason, they put forward that foreign policy analysis should focus on psycho-milieu of decision makers. For Sprouts, psycho-milieu basically meant international context which is perceived and evaluated by decision makers (Hudson & Vore, 1995, p. 213).

According to Valerie Hudson and Christopher Vore (1995), these three studies have set five basic principles of FPA scholarship. First, foreign policy choices can be grasped by knowing the particularities of people who are at the center of foreign policy decisions. Second, the particularities of individuals should be incorporated as examples of larger categories of variation in formulating cross-national and middle-range theory. Third, FPA theory building should entail multilevel analysis. Fourth, FPA theory building should entail an interdisciplinary approach. Finally, foreign policy-making process is as much important as foreign policy outputs (p. 214).

The classic FPA scholarship covers the period between 1954 and 1993, which is mainly divided into two periods: 1954-1973 and 1974-1993. FPA witnessed its

most prolific years during the 1960s and the 1970s as there were lively intellectual debates on the scope and methodology of the discipline during those years. Although there was a period of decline in FPA scholarship from the mid- to late 1980s, the field was able to recover and survive in several ways. In the classic period, FPA scholarship has developed around several approaches such as *leadership and decision-making*, *groupthink, small-group dynamics*, *organizational process and bureaucratic politics*, *comparative foreign policy*, *events data approach, domestic and societal dimension of foreign policy* etc. Under these research groups, FPA scholars produced significant number of books and articles on the study of foreign policy by placing different actors such as leaders, groups, bureaucracies, regime types, culture, domestic interest groups, public opinion etc. into the center of their analyses (Hudson, 2012, p. 20-29; Hill, 2011, p. 922-927; Hudson, 2014, p. 18-31).

FPA has never tended to explain international system as a whole, but rather offered a way to understand how actors located in the domestic and international structures behave (Hill, 2011, p. 919). Therefore, FPA approaches have been considered to be middle-range theories focusing on certain range of issues or phenomena in the world and seeking to mediate between grand principles and the complex reality on the ground (Smith et al., 2012, p. 7; Morin & Paquin, 2018; p. 7-8; Neack, 2008, p. 13; Neack, 2018, p. 12).

With the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the bipolar system, FPA entered a new phase since it was understood that actor-general theories of IR were unable to account for the systemic change in the international system (Morin & Paquin, 2018, p. 10). FPA as an actor-specific theory began to attract attention in this milieu because the systemic constraints of the Cold War were no more in force. By adhering to its core principles, FPA scholarship blossomed in the post-Cold War era around several issues such as the role of leadership in the systemic change, dynamics of decision-making process in closed regimes such as the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and Eastern bloc countries, as well as the activities of the non-state actors such as the Lutheran Church and the Green Movement and their impacts on the international system. The second reason for the rise of FPA in the post-Cold War era was that the difference between actor-general theories of IR and actor-specific theory of FPA, especially in terms of methodological preferences, was recognized. Scholars conceded that timeless generalizable abstractions of mainstream IR theories cannot be applied to actor-specific theory of FPA, which is concrete, contextual, complex, and not parsimonious in its very nature. As a result, FPA has kept growing incessantly since the end of the Cold War up to the recent years around various issues and topics (Hudson, 1994, p. 13-21; Hudson, 2014, p. 32-35).

After explaining the definition, origins, and development of FPA, we can finally summarize the main assumptions of FPA scholarship. Hill, who is one of the eminent scholars of FPA scholarship, succinctly outlines five underpinning principles of FPA. First, "process affects outcome" is the primary assumption FPA. Although the field of FPA is not solely composed of decision-making, it is undeniably a vital aspect of it. Second, the study of foreign policy is not able to produce an overarching perspective to cover all theories of IR. FPA simply deals with how actors behave and deal with domestic and external structures in which

they are situated. Third, FPA has a special emphasis on the concept of analysis. Analysis in FPA basically means that it primarily focuses on deconstructing foreign policy-making to make sense of underlying motives behind events. Fourth, FPA engenders middle-range theories which means that it does not seek to create either a grand theory or a micro theory. FPA is situated in between the two and it aims to explain bounded and specific aspects of human behavior. Finally, FPA's main focus is agency. FPA primarily focuses on decisions and actions of decision makers rather than the systemic impact of structure within which they act (Hill, 2011, p. 918-920).

2. The Relationship between FPA and Theories of IR

This section briefly covers the relationship between FPA and theories of IR in order to investigate the possible ways of strengthening this relationship. As Hudson and Vore (1995) have rightly argued, IR is devoid of a theory of human political choice to anticipate attitudes of human collectivities such as nation-states. For this reason, they have posited that FPA is capable of providing IR with what it needs, i.e. human agency (p. 210). Hill has underlined the same point and explained that FPA can fill a huge gap in IR thanks to its emphasis on the primacy of agency (Hill, 2003, p. 23). On the other hand, IR and FPA have been mostly considered incongruent due to their focus on different levels and units of analysis in explaining interstate relations (Smith et al., 2012, p. 5; Wæver, 2002, p. 27). Theories of IR primarily seek to analyze the nature and functioning of the international system as a whole. IR theories generally explain external conducts of states through systemic variables and thus they do not try to understand why states may act differently under same international constraints. So, IR theories are mostly descriptive and prescriptive in explaining foreign policy and they do not offer guidance to understand foreign policy-making (Neack, 2018, p. 138; Morin & Paquin, 2018, p. 8-9). To illustrate, realism focuses on the impact of anarchy on state behaviors, and it is not interested in what is going on within state mechanism during the process of foreign policy-making. Realism examines foreign policy at the systemic level and disregards agents who are officially in charge of foreign relations. Realism also explains external conducts of states by referring to certain issues such as achieving power-maximization, protecting national interest, and keeping balance of power intact (Neack, 2008, p. 18). FPA, by contrast, is committed to look below the state level by taking actor-specific information into consideration (Hudson, 2012, p. 14). Besides, FPA seeks to account for different behaviors of states in the international system. That's why, FPA opposes Kenneth Waltz's neorealism as it develops a structural analysis of international relations around generalizations with a little space for human agency (Hudson, 2014, p. 12).

On the other hand, it would be mistaken to claim that realism is totally irrelevant to the field of FPA. Neoclassical realism, which is considered the most suitable approach within the realist tradition, has been deployed to analyze foreign policy in recent years (Carlsnaes, 2012, p. 120). Neoclassical realism has gained prominence because it investigates the ways to reconcile the tension between the general and the particular in foreign policy-making. While not ignoring the structural constraints of the anarchic international system as insistently expressed by neorealism, at the same time neoclassical realism seeks to explain the way through which intervening variables such as perception, decision-making and policy implementation mediate the structural constraints of the international system

in foreign policy. Therefore, neoclassical realism brings domestic variables and specifically actors back into foreign policy analysis, which draws it closer to FPA (Wohlforth, 2012, p. 39-40; Kozub-Karkut, 2019).

Liberalism, which is another mainstream theory of IR, has something to say about foreign policy (Doyle, 2012, p. 54). Liberalism basically explores the ways to achieve peace, cooperation and coordination among sovereign states operating under anarchic international system. Liberalism as a pluralist theory is open to utilize all levels of analysis according to research subjects of scholars. Persons, groups, cultures, structures, non-state actors and international organizations can be subject matters of the liberal study of foreign policy (Neack, 2008, p. 18). To illustrate, liberalism claims that foreign policy is affected by domestic liberal socio-political order because public opinion or democratic leaders in such an order shape foreign policy in accordance with the principles of liberalism. The most famous liberal approach in explaining interstate relations is the "democratic peace theory", which promotes the idea that democracies do not fight each other. However, liberalism does not aim to develop a theory of foreign policy, and instead just prescribes some values for good foreign policy behavior (Doyle, 2012, p. 69).

Similar to mainstream theories, most of the critical theories of IR do not provide a framework for studying foreign policy-making and foreign policy behaviors. To illustrate, Marxism is premised on economic structuralism and thus it gives limited explanations for the external conducts of states (Neack, 2018, p. 156-158). Marxism could only account for foreign policy at the state and systemic levels. At the systemic level, Marxism considers the asymmetrical relations between the developed and underdeveloped states on account of capitalist world order. Therefore, it investigates how these asymmetries might exert influence on the behaviors of states located in core, periphery or semi-periphery. At the state level, Marxism takes class relations to its center and explains interstate relations with reference to the interests of economic elites. In short, Marxism puts states into broad categories which only outline certain policies for states from political economy perspective. That's why, Marxism does not account for how states may act differently in the international system (Neack, 2008, p. 18).

Wendt's conventional constructivism is also considered unsuitable for the study of foreign policy as it principally explains state behaviors through structure rather than agency (Hudson, 2014, p. 12; Carlsnaes, 2012, p. 121-122). Trine Flockhart (2012) stresses that constructivism as an applied framework has considerable potential to make sense of foreign policy behaviors. Especially, foreign policies of institutions such as NATO and EU could be studied from constructivist perspective as it deals with how the identity of actors could change over time. Therefore, constructivism has potential to expose the relationship between changing roles and identities of actors and their external behaviors. Although Flockhart underscores the potential of constructivism, she admits that constructivism's emphasis on structure rather than agency is the main problematic aspect of it in terms of the field of FPA. She says that the dialog between constructivism and FPA could be sustainable if the former pays more attention to agency.

Post-structuralism is another critical strand in IR which deals with the study of foreign policy. The novel contribution of post-structuralism to FPA is

unquestionably introducing discourse analysis to the field. Discourse analysis provides the field with an empirical ground to study and analyze foreign policy. Post-structuralism challenges realist assumptions and claims that inside-outside dichotomy, which is the benchmark of realist theory, is constituted in discourse. In post-structuralism, discourse is not something only related to words but rather a kind of practice through which values, norms and identities are formed. In post-structuralist foreign policy, discursive practices constitute meaning and "otherness" in relation to identities. Lene Hansen (2012) says that "foreign policies are dependent upon particular representations of the countries, places, and people that such policies are assisting or deterring, as well as on representations of the national or institutional self that undertakes these policies" (p. 95-96). Similarly, Judith Butler explains that identity is not something natural, but it is performative and formed by expressions that are thought to be its results. In this respect, post-structuralism's performative approach to identity differs from Wendt's constructivism, which basically takes identity as composition of intrinsic and pre-social elements (Hansen, 2012, p. 100-101).

In the post-Cold War era, post-structuralism has become popular in the field of FPA and many scholars used discursive methods to examine how decision makers make sense of the world around them and implement foreign policy (Düzgit & Rumelili, 2019; Balcı, 2007). These studies focused primarily on public speeches and documents to understand foreign policy decisions and behaviors. By looking at the blossoming post-structuralist foreign policy analysis after the Cold War, Hudson and Vore (1995) argued that discursive methods have a great capacity to contribute to the development of middle-range theorizing in FPA (p. 222-223).

Similarly, Morin and Paquin (2018) underlined the significance of discourses and metaphors in explaining foreign policy behaviors of states. They maintained that metaphors constitute thought, imply specific behavior and then produce realities in foreign policy. For example, the concept "war on drug", which was coined during the presidency of Nixon, preceded military interventions of the U.S. in Latin American countries aimed at decreasing the supply of narcotics (p. 294).

Hill is another scholar who has valued the post-positivist approach to foreign policy by underlining that language is undeniably a vital element in foreign policy analysis. According to Hill, language, whether official or private, is a valuable source to inform us about mindsets and actions of individuals. However, Hill explained that although post-structuralist studies are important, they can still be statist and national. Accordingly, Hill mentioned the studies of David Campbell (1992), Roxanne Doty (1993) and Henrik Larsen (1997) as statist in their approach to foreign policy. He pointed out that post-structuralist theory can lend itself to foreign policy analysis efficiently if it bears on analysis of choice and deals with the issue of evidence appropriately (Hill, 2003, p. 9). Regarding the relationship between discourse analysis and the field of FPA, Ole Wæver (2002) also explained that there has been less attempts to link discursive method to FPA (p. 27).

This article argues that Critical Geopolitics (CGP) as a strand of post-structuralism with its emphasis on the power of agency and discursive practices can enrich FPA theoretically and enhance the dialog between FPA and IR. The roots

and theoretical underpinnings of CGP are analyzed to highlight this argument in the next section.

3. The Roots and Theoretical Underpinnings of CGP

CGP, which fundamentally challenges the key assumptions of classical and neo-classical geopolitics, appeared in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a sub-field of human geography. Two trends triggered CGP's advent and contributed to its development as a distinct field of study at this juncture. First, social sciences underwent a significant methodological and theoretical debate during the 1980s due to the rise of post-positivist, social constructivist and radical perspectives, which challenged positivist orthodoxy and became influential in many disciplines such as international relations, political science, sociology and geography (Dalby, 1991, p. 261-269; Agnew, 2016, p. 22). Second, the end of the Cold War, which constituted the spatial structure of the geopolitical thought for over forty years, facilitated the questioning of rigid geopolitical assumptions and language on which foreign policy conducts were based (Agnew, 2002, p. 109; Ó Tuathail, 2003, p. 3). Consequently, both new ontological and epistemological challenges in social sciences as well as the transformation of political structure of world politics were instrumental in the formation of new geopolitical thinking. Immediately after the birth of this approach, CGP scholars began to think beyond the Cold War geopolitics and question state-centric analyses in political geography and international relations.

CGP has fundamentally dealt with the geographical assumptions and representations that shape the making of world politics (Kuus, 2017, p. 1; Jones et al., 2004, p. 14). The basic premise that has underpinned CGP reasoning is the idea that "geographies of global politics were neither inevitable nor immutable, but were constructed culturally and sustained politically by the discourses and representational practices of statecraft" (Dodds & Atkinson, 2000, p. 9-10). Unlike classical geopolitical reasoning, CGP has specifically questioned the visualization of the world to prove partial and subjective nature of geopolitical claims. Géaroid Ó Tuathail pointed to broader modern reasoning behind the concept of geopolitics pertaining to the politics of geographical knowledge and development of governmentality. He argued that CGP seeks to deconstruct hegemonic fixations as well as social production of supposedly natural geographical knowledge in the conduct of foreign affairs (Ó Tuathail and Dalby, 1994, p. 513). In this respect, CGP suggests that geopolitical representations in international politics should be taken seriously because scripting of the world concerning places, peoples and issues in a particular way by the national security intellectuals form and legitimize their foreign policy actions as well as hegemonic aspirations (Ó Tuathail, 1992, p. 439; Flint, 2006, p. 16; Dodds & Atkinson, 2000, p. 11).

Ó Tuathail was the first scholar using the term "critical geopolitics" in his doctoral dissertation entitled "Critical Geopolitics: The Social Construction of Place and Space in the Practice of Statecraft" at Sycruse University (Ó Tuathail, 1989). CGP drew considerable interest among the scholars of political geography as well as IR, which brought about its flourishment rapidly in 1990s. The intellectuals of CGP set out to challenge state-centric and objectivist nature of classical geopolitical reasoning and scholars who strove to legitimize this thinking

during the Cold War. CGP scholars contend that geopolitics is not an impartial analysis of pre-given, natural and commonsense geographical realities of the world but it is highly ideological form of writing and mapping the global space by the intellectuals of statecraft, i.e. the community of leaders, bureaucrats, foreign policy advisors and experts. CGP scholars have started out by questioning and problematizing how geographical knowledge is produced and political spaces are categorized, represented and dealt in a particular way by the political elites. They also paid special attention to these elites' embeddedness within their local, national, and transnational interpretive communities (Ó Tuathail, 1989, p. 47).

CGP scholars also maintained that international politics is totally geopolitics because it naturally involves spatial suppositions and practices about places and people across the world. They emphasized that spatial suppositions and political practices are not objective, but rather shaped by interests and identities (Agnew, 2003, p. 2-4; Dodds et al., 2016, p. 6). By emphasizing and problematizing spatiality of world politics, CGP has not sought to add a geographical perspective to international politics, but it has rather insisted that the study of politics must entail a critical inquiry into spatiality of world politics (Kuus, 2017, p. 2).

When we look at the intellectual origins of CGP, we see that they go back to the critical theories of the Frankfurt School philosophers such as Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer and Jürgen Habermas, and later to Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci (Kelly, 2006, p. 28). Among them, Foucault is widely accepted as the philosophical father of CGP thinking. Foucault's interview with Yves Lacoste in French Journal *Herodote* in 1976, in which he underlined the centrality of geopolitical designs in the formation of discourse and Edward Said's famous book Orientalism, which skillfully revealed the creation and evolution of the imaginary geographies of the Orient, are shown as the early sources of CGP (Atmaca, 2011, p. 37; Dodds & Sidaway, 1994, p. 516). CGP particularly has been built upon post-structuralist strand of critical social theory but avoided putting a strict distinction between post-structuralism and other strands of critical social theory such as Marxism, post-colonialism and feminism. For this reason, CGP has not developed a single theoretical model or methodology rather it has promoted alternative approaches and various critiques to analyze international affairs (Kuus, 2017, p. 5). Therefore, the analytical focus of CGP has been to challenge the conceptual framework that historically shaped thoughts on geography and international relations and to initiate a new dialogue between geography or international relations and social theory, feminism, deconstruction, psychoanalysis and social movements theory etc. (Ó Tuathail & Dalby, 1994, p. 513).

Gearóid Ó Tuathail, Simon Dalby and John Agnew are mostly accepted as the forerunners of CGP thinking (Yeşiltaş, 2014, 240; Dodds et al., 2016, p. 11). Their works have contributed immensely to the development of CGP as a separate field of study up to now. Although there have been some criticisms against CGP scholarship (Squire, 2015; Haverluk et al., 2014) it has been able to survive and grow with increasing contributions of numerous scholars across the world. Today, critical geopolitics is a vibrant and methodologically rich field of inquiry, which helps us make sense of international politics from critical perspective.

Ó Tuathail broadly defined critical geopolitics as "no more than a general gathering place for various critiques of the multiple geographical discourses and

practices that characterize modernity" (Jones & Sage, 2010, p. 316). For Ó Tuathail and Agnew (1992), geopolitics is not the study of geographical reality but rather "a discursive practice by which intellectuals of statecraft 'spatialize' international politics in such a way as to represent it as a 'world' characterized by particular types of places, peoples and dramas" (p. 192). Drawing on Foucault's ideas, they have emphasized that geopolitics as a discursive practice is a form of power-knowledge nexus. In opposition to positivist geographical perception of intellectuals of classical geopolitics, CGP scholars have reevaluated the concept of geopolitics from a critical perspective by taking the concept of power into the center of geography. They have emphasized that geopolitics is not the study of natural or pre-given geographical reality, but it is a discursive practice through which political elites make spatial categorizations in world politics. Therefore, geography is not an out-there reality, but it is a site of power struggle between competing authorities that strive to organize, occupy and administer space through their discourses. Discursive practices, which entail cultural formations, specified interests and ideological categorizations, directly help the formation of identities of states against the external world (Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 1; Yeşiltaş, 2014, p. 240; Dalby, 1991, p. 273-274).

Similarly, Colin Flint (2006) explained that geopolitics fabricates images and classifies territories and peoples in theory, language and practice. These images then provoke rivalries and serve to control territories in world politics. Yet, Flint underlined that geopolitics cannot be confined to the notion of struggle over territory and the tools of justifying actions. Geopolitics is more than this. It is principally a way of "seeing" the world" (p. 13).

CGP has basically sought to enhance our awareness of two main issues: spatiality and subjectivity in international affairs. On spatiality, CGP has problematized the current territorialized perceptions of politics and underlined nuanced perceptions of complex spatialities of power in world politics. Unlike classical geopolitics, CGP has assigned priority to conflictual, contextual and messy spatiality of international politics by emphasizing the importance of interpretive cultural practices and discursive construction of ontological claims. In so doing, CGP has essentially problematized traditional demarcations between domestic and external, political and non-political, state and non-state and sought to deconstruct these binary oppositions in order to establish a space for alternative discussions, narratives and actions in world politics. Regarding subjectivity, CGP has cautioned us to think carefully about the agents of geopolitics and the way through which their practices have produced particular spatial relations. In this sense, CGP has offered a pluralistic approach to make sense of geopolitical practices by underlining the existence of diversity and multiplicity of the traditions in geopolitical thought or practice across the world. CGP has promoted the idea that multiple geopolitical cultures exist due to specific geopolitical contexts and intellectual traditions in different parts of the globe (Dodds et al., 2016, p. 7-9; Kuus, 2017, p. 5-7). CGP's post-modern investigations on spatiality and subjectivity have essentially challenged the idea of universal and objective geographical knowledge claims in classical geopolitics.

According to the CGP scholarship, the production of geographical knowledge is not a neutral enterprise, but it is deeply vetted in power relations.

Hence, CGP scholars put forward that geopolitics is not a value free concept, yet it is a discursive construction which serves political goals and a way of governing the world by the core/hegemonic states (Yeşiltaş, 2014, p. 240; Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 46). Agnew (2016) broadly underlined this point by saying that geographical assumptions and schemes are socially constructed by human beings in different historical-geographical circumstances to serve political purposes. To illustrate this point, Agnew contended that classical geopolitics functioned as a "geographical mask" for imperialism and hegemony of Western states (p. 20). CGP's sensitivity about hegemonic fixations in world politics is significant because the intellectual value of CGP arises at this juncture. Ó Tuathail (2016) also underlined this point by stating that CGP enables us to think critically about the geography of the world, to deconstruct hegemonic discourses and to question the given legacies of imperial practices for achieving greater emancipation (p. xxi).

Dalby and Ó Tuathail explained that CGP's emphasis on the relationship between space and power is vital because it has a great potential to explain foreign policy behaviors of states. To illustrate, the late Cold War military and diplomatic strategy of the American statesmen tended to behave places and peoples in an exceptionally simplistic way, i.e., discursive representation of some regions as vulnerable spaces for communist intervention. This representation in turn enabled the U.S. to justify covert and overt operations and interventions in some countries such as Nicaragua (Dodds, 2016, p. 15; Agnew & Corbridge, 2003, p. 48-49). Consequently, by examining language and discourse of geopolitics used in the texts of speeches, treaties, documents and memoirs, CGP scholarship has shown that it is possible to uncover the purposes of geopolitical discourses and offer alternative views to them (O'Loughlin, 1994, p. viii).

As mentioned above, inspired by post-modern criticisms that have problematized "the epistemological limits of the ethnocentric practices" that form the backbone of Cold War geopolitics, CGP has investigated geopolitics as a broad social, cultural and political practice rather than as an evident reality of world politics (Ó Tuathail & Dalby, 2002, p. 2). While not dismissing the traditional meaning of geopolitics as the conduct of the intellectuals of statecraft, CGP has broadened this understanding by considering geopolitics as a wider social and cultural category. Ó Tuathail and Dalby categorized geopolitics into three main types: practical, formal and popular. Practical geopolitics, in the traditional sense of the concept, means the practices of political leaders, government officials and bureaucrats of foreign ministry. Formal geopolitics deals with the geopolitical knowledge produced by the strategic community within a state or a number of states, i.e. think tanks, universities etc. Popular geopolitics involves geopolitical metaphors and images in popular culture such as journals, magazines, novels, movies and cartoons. These three types of geopolitics together form geopolitical culture of a state, region or an alliance (Ó Tuathail & Dalby, 1994, p. 513; Ó Tuathail & Dalby, 2002, p. 5). They are highly interconnected since academics, journalists and government representatives regularly come together and exchange their geopolitical discourses and ideas (Atmaca, 2011, p. 39).

Ó Tuathail and Dalby (2002) stated that there are five main underpinnings of CGP. First, geopolitics is to be understood as material and representational

spatial practices of statecraft. CGP challenges and examines geopolitical imaginations of states and their founding myths to uncover the artificial distinction between inside and outside. Second, as CGP underlines the many ways of political construction of space, it particularly deals with the practices that produce borders and conducts that identify everyday life of states. In this respect, CGP is not related to the outside of the state but directly to the construction of the binary oppositions such as inside/outside, here/there and domestic/foreign. CGP argues that states are not pre-given entities, but they are constantly constituted by their conducts with outside against which they construct their identities. Thus, foreign policy is directly related to the making of the foreign as an identity and space which makes possible the realization of domestic. Third, CGP posits that geopolitics is not a singular but a plural phenomenon. This means that the plurality of representational practices has spread across societies. Fourth, CGP maintains that the study of geopolitics cannot be politically neutral. As a part of this argument, CGP questions objectivist claims of classical geopolitics for foreign policy. Hence, CGP asserts that geopolitical reasoning cannot be value-free and beyond politics as claimed by classical geopolitics. On the contrary, it is contextual, situated and embodied in discursive practices. Finally, Ó Tuathail and Dalby argue that "in conceptualizing geopolitics as 'situated reasoning' a critical perspective also seeks to theorize its broader socio-spatial and techno-territorial circumstance of development and use." Geopolitics, in a Foucauldian sense, is profoundly manifested in the development of governmentalization of the state (p. 3-6).

To sum up, CGP has posed a substantial post-modern challenge to classical geopolitics by problematizing the nature and the meaning of the concept of geopolitics in political geography and IR (Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 47). CGP's primary analytical interest has been the processes of political construction of territories, borders and actors and how these categories are legitimized within the discourse of political elites. Therefore, discourse has been the most central concept and theme in CGP since its emergence. CGP has taken discourse as an agent-oriented concept that cannot be reduced to Derridean textuality. Thus, CGP has recognized the power of agency to control, shape and use discourses intentionally for the realization of its purposes from the beginning (Müller, 2008, p. 325-326; Müller, 2011).

In CGP, discourse entails both language and practices because foreign policy actions can only be meaningful and justified by means of discourse. Political leaders act through discourse and through evoking certain geopolitical understandings to explain and legitimize their foreign policy action (Ó Tuathail & Agnew, 1992, p. 191). Agnew and Corbridge (2003) have also considered the concept of discourse as an agent-centered concept. According to them, discourse does not have unchanging nature and content, by contrast, it can be transformed by the practices of political elites while spatializing international system in particular historical contexts (p. 48). Similarly, Luiza Bialasiewicz et al. (2007) have underlined that discourse involves both ideal and material as well as the linguistic and non-linguistic aspects, which means that discourses are performative in the sense that they form the object of which they express. According to them, "discourse refers to a specific series of representations and practices through which

meanings are produced, identities constituted, social relations established, and political and ethical outcomes made more or less possible" (p. 406). Therefore, the primary objective of CGP has been to deconstruct the representational practices of foreign policy elites to expose the way how they spatialize international politics (Dodds and Sidaway, 1994, p. 518). The centrality of discourse analysis in CGP makes it suitable for building a bridge with FPA. This connection is elaborated below.

4. FPA and CGP: Beginning of a New Dialog?

This study posits that CGP's theoretical assumptions have a great potential to contribute to the field of FPA. In the study, it is also pointed out that the dialog between CGP and FPA enhances FPA's integration to IR theorizing. How can CGP be linked to the field of FPA and how can it play a role to bridge FPA and IR theory? The study suggests that theoretical underpinnings of CGP can be articulated with FPA scholarship through five main points.

First, CGP can be linked to FPA through its emphasis on agents as the primary unit of analysis in foreign policy-making. As mentioned above, FPA's distinct feature has been the centrality of actors who are in charge of foreign policy-making in opposition to realism's abstract notion of state. Hill (2003) underlined agent-centrism as the core aspect of FPA as follows: "decision-makers who formally responsible for making decisions for the units which interact internationally – that is, mainly but not exclusively states" (p. 20). Like FPA, CGP has been an actor-specific field of inquiry which primarily focuses on the intellectuals of statecraft (leaders, bureaucrats, foreign policy advisors and experts) who spatialize the world through their discourses and implement foreign policy accordingly. In this respect, CGP primarily deals with the role of actors in foreign policy-making and opposes the realist perception of state as a billiard ball. Therefore, both FPA and CGP are not statist and seek to open the black box of state. I think CGP's actor-centric approach to foreign policy as a brand of post-structuralism is quite important. CGP's preoccupation with the role of intellectuals of statecraft in foreign policy-making and its emphasis on the changeable nature of discourse by human beings can strengthen FPA's actor-specific theorizing. Therefore, CGP's agent-oriented post-structuralism is highly suitable for opening new theoretical avenues between FPA and IR.

Second, CGP can be linked to FPA through its disposition to overcome inside-outside dichotomy of realism. As mentioned above, FPA encourages scholars to carry out cross-cutting foreign policy analysis at multiple levels (domestic and international). Contrary to classical realism's strict distinction between inside and outside, FPA seeks to overcome this distinction and explores domestic sources of foreign policy. Similar to FPA, CGP problematizes inside-outside dichotomy of realism by focusing on the ideological construction of spatial boundaries to demarcate domestic space from outside. CGP argues that inside-outside is an artificial dichotomy because political elites construct outside to control and discipline domestic space. The construction of inside vis-a-vis outside through discursive practices of political elites in turn constitute the identities of states. CGP also deals with the socio-historical context of discursive practices. CGP not only traces discursive practices in textuality of geopolitics but also pays attention to the historical, sociological and geographical contexts within which texts are produced

and gain their meaning in discourse (Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 57). In short, both FPA and CGP reject the notion of state as a pre-given entity. CGP's emphasis on the construction of state identity through discourse can contribute much to the theory of state in FPA in particular and IR in general.

Third, CGP can be linked to FPA through its criticism of natural law-like generalizations in explaining state behavior. As mentioned above, theories of IR mostly delve into the nature and functioning of the international system as a whole and tend to explain external behaviors of states through systemic variables. Therefore, theories of IR are generally prescriptive and descriptive in foreign policy. They seek to predict how states may act in the anarchic international system (Neack, 2018, p. 138; Morin & Paquin, 2018, p. 8-9). To illustrate, neorealism's parsimonious approach to behaviors of states operating under anarchy is the best example of law-like generalizations in explaining foreign policy behaviors of states. On the other hand, FPA differs from neorealism's generalizing approach as its main goal has been to explain foreign policy behaviors not to prescribe it. Therefore, FPA scholarship has been characterized by middle-range theorizing, which has a space for explaining variations in state behaviors. Similar to FPA, CGP is open to variations in interstate relations as it pays attention to multiple political spatializations of world politics through discursive practices of political elites. CGP's emphasis on the multiplicity of geopolitical discourses and their impact on foreign policy-making could render FPA a high explanatory power. Consequently, CGP's openness to variations in interstate affairs can contribute to FPA theorizing, which in turn enhances IR theory's sensitivity to particularities in international politics.

Fourth, CGP can be linked to FPA through its preoccupation with how-possible type questioning. When we look at the FPA scholarship since its emergence, it has fundamentally focused on "why-question" in explaining foreign policy processes and outputs. FPA scholars have tried to expose the causality behind foreign policy-making by referring to multiple levels of analysis from the characteristics of individuals to the structure of the international system. For this reason, they have generally missed "how-possible questions" in their analysis. CGP's concern with how subjective meanings pertaining to space are constructed through geopolitical discourse can contribute to FPA from a different angle because these constructions in turn make possible and trigger foreign policy behaviors. Roxanne Doty (1993) stated that changing the focus from why-questions to how-possible questions has significant implications for foreign policy analysis. According to her, asking why-questions regarding certain conducts of decision makers or states vis-a-vis other actors naturalizes the existence of these decision makers and states. However, how-possible questions naturally embrace why-questions and enable us to critically engage with the practices that help social actors act (p. 299). Although Doty raises this issue on the ground of Derridean textuality that states "there is no reality out of the text", her arguments are important for CGP as an agent-oriented branch of post-structuralism. To illustrate, CGP involves asking how-possible questions to make sense of the process of ideological construction of borders and geopolitical representations of spaces and peoples in foreign policy through discursive practices of political elites. Therefore, CGP's

emphasis on how-possible questions could supply FPA with new post-structuralist insights and connect it with IR theorizing through this post-structuralist posture.

Fifth, CGP can be linked to FPA through its emphasis on inter-disciplinary approach. One of the key characteristics of FPA scholarship has been its emphasis on inter-disciplinary since its emergence. FPA scholars have been keen to utilize methodological insights of several disciplines from sociology to psychology to analyze foreign policy. It can be argued that CGP can provide a new ground for FPA at this point as it directly intertwines geography with international relations. CGP argues that foreign affairs naturally involve geography as the world is composed of multiple geographical entities. CGP connects the geographical spatialization of world politics with foreign policy as it argues that undertaking foreign policy naturally means engaging in geopolitics. For CGP, designation of a place in a particular way means not only assigning a location or setting, but also opening a space for possible taxonomies, as well as initiating narratives, meanings and foreign policy objectives about it (Agnew & Corbridge, 2003, p. 48; Ó Tuathail, 1996, p. 46). Another contribution of CGP to FPA could be its flexibility in terms of connecting several theories. Although CGP mainly benefits from post-structuralism, it has never confined itself solely to post-structuralism's framework. CGP has been open to integrate insights from several branches of critical social theory such as post-structuralism, feminism, constructivism and Marxism. CGP's openness to different theories has a potential to trigger new theoretical synthesis in FPA, which can also intertwine FPA with IR theorizing.

Conclusion

Even though FPA is recognized as a subfield of IR, there has been discussion on how to strengthen the connection between the two due to their emphasis on different units and levels of analysis. In the literature, it is argued that FPA can give IR theory human agency because IR does not have a theory of human political choice. In this context, traditional theories of IR such as realism, liberalism, and Marxism do not adequately explain variations in foreign policy making and foreign policy behaviors of states. Wendt's constructivism also ignores agency and concentrates on structure to explain state actions in the international system. Although post-structuralism's challenge to realism's inside-outside dichotomy and emphasis on discourse analysis are valued by the scholars of FPA, the relationship between the two has been complicated by the fact that some post-structuralists have placed texts rather than people who create them at the center of analysis.

This article has argued that CGP as a branch of post-structuralism has a great deal of potential to enhance and advance FPA's middle-range theorizing. CGP's focus on agents as primary units of analysis in foreign policy making, its disposition to overcome inside-outside dichotomy, criticism of natural law-like generalizations in explaining state behaviors, emphasis on how-possible type questions and interdisciplinary approach are explained as the most remarkable contributions of CGP to the field of FPA, which also foster ties between FPA and IR.

The article has put forward that both FPA and CGP are actor-specific, and they take foreign policy making elites to the center of their inquiries. In that regard, both FPA and CGP oppose realism's notion of state as a black box and try to open

it. CGP can contribute to FPA's actor-specific theorizing as it argues that foreign policy makers spatialize the world through their discourses and formulate foreign policies of their states accordingly. In this context, CGP's agent-oriented post-structuralist posture enhance theoretical interaction between FPA and IR theory. The article has also underlined that both FPA and CGP seek to overcome inside-outside dichotomy of realism. CGP offers a novel approach in tackling this issue as it underscores the role of political elites in constructing spatial boundaries to separate domestic realm from outside through their discourses. This point is quite significant since this effort directly contributes to construction of state identity. Hence, CGP's preoccupation with identity construction by political elites offers a new approach to theory of state in both FPA and IR.

In the article, it is explained that FPA and CGP are critical of neorealism's emphasis on law-like generalizations in explaining foreign policy behaviors of states. Both FPA and CGP are sensitive to variations in foreign policy behaviors of states due to their preoccupation with domestic realm. The article has contended that CGP's acceptance of multiple geopolitical discourses and their impact on foreign policy making can enhance FPA's explanatory power. Hence, CGP's openness to variations in interstate relations contributes to FPA's middle-range theorizing and IR theories' openness to particularities in the international system. The article has also posited that CGP's how-possible type questioning and interdisciplinarity can contribute to FPA and the relationship between FPA and IR. In the article it is argued that CGP's how-possible type questions regarding the geopolitical constructions of spaces and peoples by discursive practices of state elites can render FPA new post-structuralist insights and enhance its connection with IR. CGP's emphasis on the relationship between geography and IR as well as its openness to other branches of critical social theory can create new theoretical syntheses in FPA, which potentially foster the link between FPA and IR.

In short, this article has argued that CGP's theoretical underpinnings mostly drawn from post-structuralism can enrich FPA and strengthen the linkage between FPA scholarship and IR theorizing. The article also suggests that theoretical and analytical arguments herein be tested with further studies, especially case studies to be carried out in various parts of the world.

References

Agnew, J. (2002). *Making Political Geography*. Arnold.

Agnew, J. (2003). *Geopolitics: Re-visioning World Politics* (2nd ed). Routledge.

Agnew, J. & Corbridge, S. (2003). *Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political Economy*. Routledge.

Agnew, J. (2016). The Origins of Critical Geopolitics. In K. Dodds, M. Kuus & J. Sharp (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics* (pp. 19-32). Routledge.

Alden, C. & Aran, A. (2017). *Foreign Policy Analysis: New Approaches* (2nd ed). Routledge.

Atmaca, A. Ö. (2011). *Old Game in A New World: Turkey and the United States from Critical Perspective*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Ankara: Middle East Technical University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Aydın-Düzgit, S. & Rumelili, B. (2019). Discourse Analysis: Strengths and Shortcomings. *All Azimuth*, 8 (2), 285-305.

Balcı, A. (2017). Diskors ve Pratik Olarak Dış Politika. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, *4* (15), 67-87.

Bialasiewicz, L., Campbell, D., Elden, S., Graham, S., Jeffrey, A., & Williams, A. J. (2007). Performing Security: The Imaginative Geographies of Current US Strategy. *Political Geography*, *26* (4), 405-422.

Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. University of Minnesota Press.

Carlsnaes, W. (2012). Actors, Structures, and Foreign Policy Analysis. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 113-129). Oxford University Press.

Dalby, S. (1991). Critical Geopolitics: Discourse, Difference, and Dissent. *Environment and Planning: Society and Space*, *9* (3), 261-283.

Dodds, K. & Atkinson, D. (2000). Introduction to Geopolitical Traditions: A Century of Geopolitical Thought. In K. Dodds & D. Atkinson (Eds.), *Geopolitical Traditions: A Century of Geopolitical Thought* (pp. 1-24). Routledge.

Dodds, K. & Sidaway, J. D. (1994). Locating Critical Geopolitics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *12*, 515-524.

Dodds, K. (2016). Introduction: Geopolitical Foundations. In K. Dodds, M. Kuus & J. Sharp (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics* (pp. 15-17). Routledge.

Dodds, K., Kuus, M. & Sharp, J. (2016). Introduction: Geopolitics and its Critics. In K. Dodds, M. Kuus & J. Sharp (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics* (pp. 1-17). Routledge.

Doty, R. L. (1993). Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines. *International Studies Quarterly*, *37* (3), 297-320.

Doyle, M. (2012). Liberalism and Foreign Policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 54-77). Oxford University Press.

Flint, C. (2006). *Introduction to Geopolitics*. Routledge.

Flockhart, T. (2012). Constructivism and Foreign Policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 78-93). Oxford University Press.

Gerner, D. J. (2007). The Evolution of the Study of Foreign Policy. In L. Neack, J.A.K. Hey & P. J. Haney (Eds.), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation* (pp. 17-32), Prentice Hall.

Hansen, L. (2012). Discourse Analysis, Post-Structuralism, and Foreign Policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 94-109). Oxford University Press.

Haverluk, T. W., Beauchemin, K. M. & Mueller, B. A. (2014). The Three Critical Flaws of Critical Geopolitics: Towards a Neo-Classical Geopolitics. *Geopolitics*, *19* (1), 19-39.

Hill, C. (2003). *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill, C. (2011). Foreign Policy Analysis. In B. Badie, D. Berg-Schlosser & L. Morlino (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Political Science vol. 3* (pp. 916-928). Sage Publications.

Hudson, V. & Vore, C. S. (1995). Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Mershon International Studies Review*, *39* (2), 209-238.

Hudson, V. (1994). Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, *1* (1), 1-30.

Hudson, V. (2012). The History and Evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 13-34). Oxford University Press.

Hudson, V. (2014). *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (2nd ed). Rowman & Littlefield.

Jones, L. & Sage, D. (2010). New Directions in Critical Geopolitics: An Introduction. *Geojournal*, *75* (4), 315-325.

Jones, M., Jones, R. & Woods, M. (2004). *An Introduction to Political Geography: Space, Place and Politics*. Routledge.

Kelly, P. (2006). A Critique of Critical Geopolitics. *Geopolitics*, *11* (1), 24-53.

Kozub-Karkut, M. (2019). Neoclassical Realism and Foreign Policy Analysis – A Possible Way of Integration. *Teoria Polityki*, 3, 201-227.Kuus, M. (2017). Critical Geopolitics. Oxford Research Encyclopedias, International Studies. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.137.

Larsen, H. (1997). *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe*. Routledge.

Light, M. (1994). Foreign Policy Analysis. In A.J. Groom & Margot Light (Eds.), *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory* (pp. 93-108). Pinter.

Morin, J. & Paquin, J. (2018). *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Toolbox*. *Palgrave* Macmillan.

Müller, M. (2008). Reconsidering the Concept of Discourse for the Field of Critical Geopolitics: Towards Discourse as Language and Practice. *Political Geography*, *27* (3), 322-338.

Müller, M. (2011). Doing discourse analysis in Critical Geopolitics. *L'Espace Politique*, *12*, 1-21.

Neack, L. (2008). *The New Foreign Policy: Power Seeking in a Globalized Era* (2nd ed). Rowman & Littlefield.

Neack, L. (2018). *Studying Foreign Policy Comparatively: Cases and Analysis* (4th ed). Rowman & Littlefield.

Neack, L., Hey, J. A. K. & Haney, P. J., Generational Change in Foreign Policy Analysis. In Laura Neack, Jeanne A.K. Hey and Patrick J. Haney (Eds.), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation* (pp. 1-16). Prentice Hall.

O'Loughlin, J. (1994). Introduction. In J. O'Loughlin (Ed.), *Dictionary of Geopolitics* (pp. vii-xi). Greenwood Press.

Smith, S., Hadfield, A. & Dunne, T. (2012). Introduction. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield and T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 1-12), Oxford University Press.

Squire, V. (2015). Reshaping Critical Geopolitics? The Material Challenge. *Review of International Studies*, *41* (1), 139-159.

Tayfur, M. F. (1994). Main Approaches to the Study of Foreign Policy: A Review. *Metu Studies in Development*. *21* (1), 113-141.

Tuathail, G. Ó. (1989). *Critical Geopolitics: The Social Construction of Place and Space in the Practice of Statecraft*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Sycruse: Sycruse University.

Tuathail, G. Ó. (1992). The Bush Administration and the 'End' of the Cold War: A Critical Geopolitics of US Foreign Policy in 1989. *Geoforum*, *23* (4), 437-452.

Tuathail, G. Ó. & Agnew, J. (1992). Geopolitics and Discourse: Practical Geopolitical Reasoning in American Foreign Policy. *Political Geography*, *11* (2), 190-204.

Tuathail, G. Ó. & Dalby, S. (1994). Editorial. *Environment and Planning D; Society and Space*, *12*, 513-514.

Tuathail, G. Ó. (1996). *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space*. Routledge.

Tuathail, G. Ó. & Dalby, S. (2002). Introduction: Rethinking geopolitics: towards a critical geopolitics. In G. Ó Tuathail & S. Dalby (Eds.), *Rethinking Geopolitics* (pp. 1-15). Routledge.

Tuathail, G. Ó. (2003). Introduction: Thinking critically about geopolitics. In G. Ó Tuathail, S. Dalby & P. Routledge (Eds.), *The Geopolitics Reader* (pp. 1-12). Routledge.

Tuathail, G. Ó. (2016). Foreword: Arguing about Geopolitics. In K. Dodds, M. Kuus & J. Sharp (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics* (pp. xix-xxi). Routledge.

Wæver, O. (2002). Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy: Discourse Analysis as Foreign Policy Theory. In L. Hansen & O. Wæver (Eds.), *European Integration and National Identity: The Challenge of Nordic States* (pp. 20-49). Routledge.

Webber, M. and Smith, M. (2002). *Foreign Policy in a Transformed World.* Prentice Hall.

Wohlforth, W. C. (2012). Realism and Foreign Policy. In S. Smith, A. Hadfield & T. Dunne (Eds.), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (pp. 35-53). Oxford University Press.

Yeşiltaş, M. (2014). Jeopolitik. In Ş. Kardaş & A. Balcı (Eds.), *Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş: Tarih, Teori, Kavram ve Konular* (pp. 235-245). Küre Yayınları.