

FOREIGN POLICY OPTIONS FOR MONGOLIA: TO LEAD OR BANDWAGON?

*B.Enkhzorig**

Since the long-lasting Soviet led communist bloc was collapsed in the late 90's a multilateral options for the independent, self-esteemed foreign policy activities engaged by countries from Central to North-East Asia. Yet not all of so called *regime-freed* countries seemed to follow the foreign policy line based on the values of democracy, but rather deemed to hope greater powers would give them chance to gain prosperity just as they modify and/or harmonize their foreign policy with theirs. Foreign policy analysts arguably call this “bandwagoning”, and furthermore looking in the foreign policy concept of Mongolia, it has obviously been stated that balanced foreign policy, which equally deals with bigger countries called “visionary – more successful”. Most of us would certainly recognize that, but in the very sense, do we wish that this type of balanced-policy would remain stabilized forever in the realist arena of international relations?

In 1994, Parliament of Mongolia approved the security and foreign policy concept - fundamental policy documents, enshrined the core principles which to be maintained in the activities directed to the external affairs. Obviously, this document had entirely been shaped on the liberal notion of international relations, which convinces that the non-violence and equality will be the true basis for everlasting peace and order. And ever since the adoption of this “notion” based document mongolian foreign policy fully went on like organizing state visits – with no visionary perception, attending some UN or US led conferences – with no strict policy guidelines, presenting reports – with no context harmonization and last but not least, acting like a zoo monkey that pays more attention to whom throws him more bananas. I surely can divide the entire problems into two factors, namely internal and external and an internal factor will be introduced this time. With all that said, blind steps are not just because of concept itself but rather being honest, it has been rooted from following three core things start with foreign practitioners themselves. Our very first diplomat professionals of modern time were educated from the Moscow institute of foreign relations. The institute accomplished its mission throughout last six decades and still in great significance. Despite all these achievements, old school syllabuses have been enriched by new features of theory and practices of modern international relations and security affairs. Institutes and universities are facing vis-a-vis demand to renew their curriculum in

* B.Enkhzorig - Foreign policy analyst

immediate and aforementioned institute was also included at higher level. Seen as in reality of doing things, graduates from this institute that currently working in the ministries are not willing to take appropriate measures that basing on early achieved results but more likely to hold up any process at the negotiation phase and as of this it clearly shows their inability towards foreign policy decision making. The point is that in order to meet those requirements, a initiative to send our youngsters to highly qualified, western oriented schools with no “*but*” must be fulfilled.

Second thing to count on is that on the stage of developing policy guidelines, analyst involvement with valuable suggestions and expertise still lacks not because of their effort to, but from an intentional negligence of old school practitioners with esteemed promotion ranks of the ministry itself. Foreign relation conducting bodies equipped with full decision making authority have their own think tanks. State provides them with enough budget and power in order to conduct activities, such as research work and strategy papers, in interference-free condition. In addition, only well-famous outstanding scholars and researchers are more likely to be hired there. In the early 2000, a foreign policy center was established at the ministry of foreign affairs of Mongolia, but soon after the center was dismissed with insufficient budget explanation. The author humbly believes that mostly of smaller states must support think tanks in order to make right decision and of course, engage right activities abroad. What I truly mean is that so called foreign policy think tanks are must be an engagement cornerstone for foreign policy.

And last but not very least of all, politicians themselves with “superior thoughts” are without any demurs, deserve more fault than any other factors. As mentioned above that concept implemented not exactly as it was stated, a policy paradox more smoothly went on from 2000, as MPRP took on full political charge. Arguably ever since then, whoever, small, medium, or “*king size*” officials speak (especially, such no interesting speech by appointed non professional ambassadors), whatever, on more or less important topics mainly connected with foreign relations of Mongolia, whenever, during conference or workshop as he or she certainly has no idea what those meaningless expression would cause in the near or far future.

If we can not, or avoid to be willing to make more strict action towards decision making, at least internally changing these three complex problems, then there is no need to talk about to lead in foreign policy options and survive in the emerging chaos constantly!