



Research Paper

## Foreign policy of Landlocked States: A Case Study of Mongolia

Dr. Vaishali Krishna

Assistant Professor

Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies

School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

Email: vaishalikirshna272@gmail.com

### Abstract

In geographic term, a landlocked country is one that does not have open access to the sea. Throughout history, a centrally located or landlocked country was viewed as having an advantage whereby several decades later, it has been considered a disadvantage of being landlocked. Landlocked countries, therefore, not only face the challenge of distance but also the challenges that result from a dependence on passage through a sovereign transit country. Due to their landlockedness they also depend on strong political relations with transit countries or neighbours and if their transit neighbours are in conflict, either militarily or diplomatically, borders can easily be blocked by the warring transit neighbours. Even when there is no direct conflict, landlocked countries are extremely vulnerable to the political whims of their neighbours. This research paper argues that the landlocked countries are commonly seen as victims of geography, though they can convert it into an opportunity by adopting such a foreign policy which could ensure both sovereignty as well as development. Taking the case study of Mongolia it examines Mongolia's foreign policy as the geography of a country influences its foreign policy. It concludes that geography plays an important role in determining the country's politics, foreign relations and its self-sufficiency in various areas, and so what strategy Mongolia adopted to pursue its foreign policy is the focus of the paper.

**Keywords:** landlocked, geography, Mongolia's foreign policy, geographic neighbours, third neighbours

Received 09 Mar., 2024; Revised 20 Mar., 2024; Accepted 22 Mar., 2024 © The author(s) 2024.

Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)

### I. Introduction

A country's foreign policy, also called the international relations policy, can be defined as "a set of goals outlining how the country will interact with other countries economically, politically, socially and militarily, and to a lesser extent, how the country will interact with non-state actors" (Wanjohi 2011). Since competition and conflict are important ingredients of international relations, certain approaches and mechanisms are needed to address the issues involved for peaceful coexistence. Given that no state can avoid involvement in the international sphere it is imperative that this involvement must be systematic. The systematic involvement of a state is carried out through its foreign policy which is concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states. As Rodee describes, "foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interests" (Lerche and Said 1972). The main purpose of foreign policy is to conduct international relations to the best possible advantage (Naaz 2012).

Several scholars are of the opinion that the national interests of different nations must be compatible with each other in the interest of global harmony and peace. In that sense, international relations embrace all types of complex activities whether cultural, political or those dictated by foreign policy. Modeski defines foreign policy as "the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of the states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment" (Modeski 1962). However, this definition is not practical since the aim of foreign policy should be to regulate and not merely to change the behaviour of other states. According to Palmer and Perkins, "[Different] nations use various mechanisms for the promotion of their national interest, like diplomacy, propaganda, imperialism and colonialism, coercive means, economic

instruments, alliances and treaties' ' (Cited in Krishna 2017). According to Balakrishnan, foreign policy of a particular nation "dictates how a country will act with respect to other countries; politically, socially, economically and militarily, and to a somewhat lesser extent, how it behaves towards non-state actors' '. Indeed, as he argues, "foreign policy is formulated by every state so as to serve its national interests", and hence, "the primary purpose of foreign policy is to seek adjustments in the behaviour of other states, in favour of oneself" (Balakrishnan 2010: 12).

Various theories speak about national interest which stands for "survival and security of the state". According to Hans Morgenthau, the great realist thinker, all politics is a struggle for power, and "as long as the world is politically organized into nations, the national interest is indeed the last word in world politics" (Morgenthau 1960). Further elaborating this idea Spykman makes it clear that "Because territory is an inherent part of a state, self-preservation means defending its control over territory; and, because independence is the essence of state, self-preservation also means fighting for dependent status... the basic objective of the foreign policy of all states is the preservation of territorial integrity and political independence" (Cited in Balakrishnan, 2010). Moreover, Osgood is of the opinion that national interest can be defined in terms of its being a "state of affairs valued solely for its benefit to the nations" (Cited in Krishna 2017). Morgenthau, however, upholds that the main responsibility of a nation-state "is to protect its physical, political and cultural identity against threat from other states" (Cited in Balakrishnan, 2010).

However, it is the geography of a country that influences its foreign policy and it plays an important role in determining the country's politics, foreign relations and its self-sufficiency in various areas. In geographic parlance, a landlocked country is one that does not have open access to the sea. Geographers like Debris and Steck (2011) are of the opinion that the impact of being landlocked is relative. Throughout history, a centrally located or landlocked country was viewed as having an advantage whereby several decades later, it has been considered a disadvantage of being landlocked. It can be argued that the economic development of a landlocked country is constrained by the presence of several factors like remoteness from major markets, poor infrastructure and border causing difficulties, which imply high transportation costs.

Landlocked countries, therefore, not only face the challenge of distance but also the challenges that result from a dependence on passage through a sovereign transit country. Due to their landlockedness they also depend on strong political relations with transit countries or neighbours and if their transit neighbours are in conflict, either militarily or diplomatically, borders can easily be blocked by the warring transit neighbours. Even when there is no direct conflict, landlocked countries are extremely vulnerable to the political whims of their neighbours. Thus, the landlocked countries are commonly seen as victims of geography, though they can convert it into an opportunity by adopting such a foreign policy which could ensure both sovereignty as well as development. This is true in the case of Mongolia. This research paper, therefore, provides an overview of Mongolia's foreign policy.

### **Factors Influencing Mongolia's Foreign Policy**

In studying Mongolia's foreign policy one may rely on the influencing factors of a state's foreign policy that can be categorized into internal and external factors. Among the internal factors the size of a state's territory as well as its population significantly influences its foreign policy (Appadorai 1981). Some of them believe that the countries with small territory and population do not expect much to carry great weight in international affairs while compared to large countries. Others, however, say that "sometimes even small states which have rich resources leave a deep impact on world politics" (Chatterjee 2012). Mongolia is a fine example of such a small state which has natural resources in abundance that attract many players in the world, hence influencing its foreign policy.

As such the geography of a country, including its size, topography, population, climate, hydrography, location in relation to other land masses, and water-ways etc. influences the country's foreign policy tremendously. Generally, land-locked countries, nations in the tropics and those bordering a superpower are less self-sufficient in comparison to the countries which have access to warm-water ports or are located in the temperate zones and far from superpowers. Mongolia's landlocked geographical location between Russia and China has had a deep impact on determining its foreign policy. Similarly, historical and cultural traditions of a country also influence its foreign policy. Usually, "people possessing a unified common culture and historical experience can pursue an effective foreign policy because of the support of all sections of society who share the same identity and values" (Chatterjee 2012). By sharing the same identity and values based on nomadic civilization and Buddhist culture the notion of being a Mongol among the Mongolian people has had remarkable influence on the foreign policy making of Mongolia (Soni 2014).

While formulating its foreign policy a country has also to take note of the reaction of other states to its various actions. Unlike the Cold War period when Mongolia was under Soviet grip and had no foreign policy of its own, the initial years of the post-Cold War period saw Mongolia formulating its own independent foreign policy in which it took into consideration the perceived reaction of other states, particularly the neighbouring

ones. Similarly, alliances concluded by various states also greatly influence the foreign policy. The states parties to alliance have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies and refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to them (Chatterjee 2012). During the Cold War period Mongolia was a loyal member of the communist bloc dominated by the former Soviet Union, which dictated its domestic and foreign policies with large amounts of economic aid (Batbayar 2003). As a communist state, the country was a one-party totalitarian state ruled by the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) and the ideology of Marxist-Leninism. In fact, Samuel Huntington describes the post-Cold War Mongolia's transition to democracy as the process of transplacement primarily because democratization resulted from joint action by groups both in power and out of power (Huntington 1991).

At the same time, the major changes occurred in Mongolia's two neighbouring countries-Russia and China also had a direct impact on its external environment, particularly in terms of security. The reforms and restructuring of the country's internal political, social and economic systems together with a changed geostrategic scenario externally provided it with favourable conditions for conducting a foreign policy based on realism and its national interests. While highlighting the factors influencing Mongolia's foreign policy making the general provisions of the official document entitled as *Concept of Foreign Policy of Mongolia* declares that "Mongolia's foreign policy shall be based on its national interests, as defined in its Constitution", and that "the country's specific external and internal situation constitutes the basis of determining its foreign policy objectives, principles and priorities." The document further states that "Mongolia's foreign policy objectives reside in ensuring its independence and sovereignty by following trends of human society's advancement, maintaining friendly relations with all countries, strengthening its position in the international community and forming with influential countries in the region and in the world a network of relationship based on the interdependence of political, economic and other interests."

Even *Mongolian Foreign Policy Blue Book* issued by the Ministry of External Relations of Mongolia in 2000 clearly says that a relatively favourable internal and external environment opened broad perspectives for pursuing an active, innovative and rational foreign policy that "truly upholds Mongolia's national interests, enables to accelerate its economic development and ensure its national security" (Mongolian Foreign Policy Blue Book 2000). In that sense, both the internal as well as external factors influencing the foreign policy making as discussed above are relevant in the case of Mongolia. And there is no doubt that Mongolia's foreign policy essentially revolves around the country's national interests in the first place (Soni 2015).

### **Foreign Policy Strategy towards Geographic Neighbours**

In line with the theory of Realism one of the main characteristics of Mongolia's foreign policy is its pragmatism, and therefore, it relies on ongoing international political reality as well as the trends of international economic development (Soni 2012). In this sense, the top priority direction of Mongolia's foreign policy lies in taking an active part in the process of establishing a global multilateral security mechanism. Indeed, as *Concept of Foreign Policy* stresses, Mongolia's foreign policy aims at ensuring the security and prosperity of the country both internally and externally by "forming with influential countries in the region and in the world a network of relationship based on the interdependence of political, economic and other interests" (Soni 2001). The general principles of both the 1994 *Concept of Foreign Policy* as well as the 2011 revised *Concept of Foreign Policy*, in part, declares the following:

- (a) While following a policy of creating realistic interest of developed countries in Mongolia, it will seek to avoid becoming overly reliant or dependent on any particular country....; and
- (b) Mongolia will not interfere in the disputes between its neighbouring countries [Russia and China] unless the disputes affect Mongolia's national interests.

Evidently, the entire spectrum of Mongolia's foreign policy had a vital impact on the country's geographical location, and so the relationship with geographic neighbours-Russia and China was given a very high priority. Mongolia declared to have a balanced relationship with both the neighbours (Enkhbayar 2008). Since the *Concept of Foreign Policy* puts emphasis on "balanced" or "equidistance" in maintaining relations with Russia and China, principally due to the historical, geographical and economic factors, the policy core has not been to adopt the line of either of these two countries but maintain a balanced relationship with both of them.

Whereas Mongolia now maintains a strategic partnership with Russia and partnership of good neighbourly friendship and cooperation with China, the so-called "third neighbour" policy also forms the part of its multi-pillar foreign policy, "which articulates a policy of balance" (Wachman 2009). In simple words, the "third neighbour" policy means that Mongolia will no longer be dependent only on one neighbour but rather on as many as countries and international institutions as possible apart from being a part of both Northeast Asia and Central Asia (Soni 2001). Nevertheless, Mongolia tried to forge its relations with a whole community of developed countries in the East and West, mainly with the United States, international organizations and other stakeholders which could support its democratic nation building and development.

The manifestation of Mongolia's post-2000 foreign policy in terms of its balance of influence behaviour is its bilateral military engagement with the US, its re-establishment of military relations with Russia, its military engagement with other strategic states and institutions in Asia, and its continued relations with Beijing so as to indirectly balance China (Reeves 2012). In that sense, Mongolia has placed a priority focus on regional and global issues, particularly those concerning the Asia-Pacific region. So far as Mongolia's approach towards regional and global issues is concerned, we find there is a commonality of interest between Mongolia and other countries of the world. Since Mongolia has established partnerships with neighbouring countries and many other countries around the world through open, peaceful and multi-faceted diplomacy, these partners have cooperated in Mongolia's development as well.

### **Mongolia's "Third Neighbour" Foreign Policy**

In recent years, one may find that "the dominant stated theme of Mongolian foreign policy has been the so-called 'third neighbour' policy; that is, attempts by successive Mongolian administrations to build closer ties with partners other than Russia and China, its dominant neighbours" (Dierkes 2011). The "Third Neighbour" policy came into existence as a policy of balancing Mongolia's two geographic neighbours, resulting from the country's internal and external objectives as specified in the *Concept of National Security* and *Concept of Foreign Policy*. In one of his latest articles, Soni has highlighted the fact that Mongolia is now looking beyond its geographic neighbours and hence "today Mongolian diplomacy is indeed characterized by the 'third neighbour' policy" (Soni 2012). This policy has been one of the more innovative foreign affairs approaches in the country's history.

The term "third neighbour" was fashioned in August 1990 by the visiting US Secretary of State James A. Baker while delivering a speech to support Mongolia's first move towards democracy aftermath the first free elections held in July of that year. According to Soni (2012), such a fresh idea was quickly picked up and reinterpreted by the Mongolian elite and policy makers, who for centuries had never thought of anything beyond a pawn between the Russian and Chinese. Though the term began to be used in Mongolian media and scholarly works, it was not reciprocated in the United States until the late 1990s when Alicia Campi, a well-known expert on Mongolian affairs reminded the American officials at the first American bilateral conference in Washington, DC to declare that their Mongolian counterparts could refer to the United States as a "third neighbour" (Soni 2015).

Simultaneously, Mongolian foreign policy had by then already affirmed that Mongolia will focus its attention on developing friendly relations with state beyond its geographic neighbours. This policy was then titled as the "third neighbour" policy under which Mongolia could strive to overcome its physical geographical location and increase its security internationally. The "third neighbour" policy easily explains the "multipillarity, complexity and openness of Mongolia's foreign policy [which] undoubtedly attracted attention of the regional and world community, and the country's position on the international arena has been strengthened substantially" (Tuvshintugs 2010).

In 2012, while giving an interview to Allen Wagner on "Mongolia: Growth, Democracy, and Two Wary Neighbours" for *The National Bureau of Asian Research*, Alan Wachman spoke in length about Mongolia's "third neighbour" approach to foreign relations. He said that this approach "is driven most forcefully by geography" (Wachman 2012). Since those states that are landlocked face monumental challenges to development, Mongolia too comes into this category as it is bounded by only two states-Russia and China who happen to be communist behemoths. Wachman (2012) feels that "by linking its security to a roster of states other than Russia and China, Mongolia has made its intention clear to act internationally with as much freedom as it can muster from constraints that Moscow or Beijing might wish to impose."

Also both Russia and China are still cautious of external powers, particularly the United States, setting down roots in states along their borders. While the Chinese are vigilant about the prospect of encirclement, Russia seems especially unsettled by the prospect of a democratic Mongolia entangled with powerful Western democracies elsewhere, the United States chief among those democracies. This is what Wachman, in his earlier article published in 2009, describes as "the geopolitical gambit" (Wachman 2009). His latest analysis too points to the fact that "Mongolia hopes its 'third neighbour' approach to security will encourage those external balancers to develop interests - economic, ideological, and strategic - in Mongolia that would significantly impede the effort of either Russia or China to trample Mongolia's independence."

Obviously, in order to loosen the pressure of Russia and China, Mongolian leaders have developed the "third neighbour" policy. This policy consists in creating new strategic alliances abroad without causing economic and commercial issues with the Russians and Chinese. In this vein, Mongolia maintains strong ties with the United States, the European Union, Japan, India and Australia, to name a few. These bilateral relations and cooperation are organized at all levels: business and trade, political and military. Economic vulnerability of Mongolia largely explains the important efforts of the Mongolian authorities to convince foreign countries to

invest in Mongolia particularly in the infrastructure sector which the country needs a lot (Mongolia's Foreign Policy 2012).

However, the 2011 Foreign Policy Concept makes it clear that unlike Russia Mongolia's understanding of its relations with China has changed despite Ulaanbaatar's continued ties with Beijing. While the 1994 Foreign Policy Concept categorises relations with China and Russia as the state's principal foreign policy concern, the 2011 Concept gives equal priority to Mongolia's relations with its third neighbours, particularly the United States. This movement away from unqualified engagement with China towards robust engagement with China, balanced with cooperation with third neighbour partners, particularly military relations with the United States, provides evidence that Mongolia's foreign policy strategy towards China has changed remarkably since 2000 (Reeves 2012). Sarlagtay too has clearly remarked that the military has become a vital foreign policy instrument since early 2000 for winning the support from the U.S. and Europe. The political goal of joining the War against Terrorism and the U.S. led Iraqi War was to get leverage in Washington's politics. This was the essential first step to make third neighbour policy from declaration to reality. Over 20 years of sustained democracy was the biggest reason for Mongolia to be recognized as a responsible partner although successful Mongolian Armed Forces' Peacekeeping Operation missions also played a role (Sarlagtay 2012).

### **India as Mongolia's Third Neighbour**

India has been getting much importance in Mongolia as the latter's third neighbour partner. It all started in 2009 when the two sides felt a need to come together to boost India's Asian strategy particularly in East Asia and Central Asia, and signed "a comprehensive partnership treaty to cooperate in developing Mongolian uranium mining with a MoU on the peaceful use of radioactive minerals and nuclear energy" (Soni 2015). India's importance further increased when it was clearly defined as a third neighbour in Mongolia's 2011 Concept of Foreign Policy so as to deal with the Chinese threat perception. In addition, like all small states with large neighbours, Mongolia also wants a measure of "strategic autonomy" from dominant neighbours and acts internationally (Soni 2016).

Moreover, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's visit to Mongolia in June 2015 culminated in signing of a Strategic Partnership between the two countries which demonstrates that not only Mongolia's "third neighbour" policy but also India's "Act East" policy are paying their dividend, particularly in containing Chinese activism. The focus is on harmonising 3 Ts – Trade, Tourism and Technology - recommended by the Ministry while attempting to expand & enhance the bilateral trade and economic cooperation with Mongolia. Recently India has initiated the process to establish Mongolia's first oil refinery built with assistance from India which is expected to be completed by 2025. Main items of exports to Mongolia include sugar, medicines, mining machinery and auto parts, etc. Imports from Mongolia include raw cashmere wool. A dedicated Business meet titled 'Expanding 3T horizons with Mongolia' was organised in March 2022 in association with Mongolian National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MNCCI) with participation from 250 businessmen and entities. Given the small size of Mongolian population, Mongolia does not have as much of a leisure tourism potential. However, there is potential for 'Spiritual Tourism' as well as 'Medical Tourism' – both of which have been prioritised as focus areas.

In 2020, despite Covid pandemic, India-Mongolia Health Cooperation Centre was established which is attempting to attract Mongolians for various treatments. The number of 'Medical Visas' issued by the mission since 2022, have registered a sharp increase and so far in 2023, an average of 35 'Medical Visas' are being issued. A 'Medical and Wellness Tourism Event' is planned. Mongolia's economy is projected to accelerate to 5.2 percent growth in 2023 from 4.7 percent in 2022 as mining and exports expand and the post-pandemic recovery in services continues. Its GDP in 2023 is around 18.78 which is expected to be 19.55 in 2024. Supporting the Mongolian economy to be more resilient, diversified, and inclusive is a key objective of ADB, where India is a founding member therefore supports Mongolia in its development vision" (Vision 2050) "to become a "dynamic and modern economy with a thriving middle class by 2050".

## **II. Conclusion**

As a landlocked country Mongolia believes that the landlocked countries are considered to be victims of geography. However, Mongolia has tried to convert its being a victim of geography into an opportunity by adopting such a foreign policy which ensures both its sovereignty as well as development. In order to loosen the pressure of Russia and China, Mongolia has developed its "third neighbour" policy within the framework of its overall foreign policy. This "third neighbour" policy consists in creating new strategic alliances abroad without causing economic and commercial issues with the Russians and Chinese, and hence Mongolia maintains strong ties with the United States, the European Union, Japan, India, South Korea, Turkey and Australia in addition to a few other countries. There has also been talks about permanent neutrality. Attaining the status of permanent neutrality is a new dimension of Mongolian foreign policy, but many experts agree that it seems to be "a logical extension of the "Third Neighbour" policy, declaring its intention of adopting a permanent neutral status in this

intricate and globalized era. But as of now being a unique small power in Asia, Mongolia tries to pursue its third neighbour foreign policy in order to sustain its sovereignty and development in addition to having a worthy place in the international relations.

### References

- [1]. Appadorai, A. (1981), "Domestic Roots of India's Foreign Policy: 1947-1972", Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- [2]. Balakrishnan, T.K. (2010), Foreign Policy of Mongolia: Problems and Paradoxes, Delhi: Mohini Publishers.
- [3]. Batbayar, Ts. (2003), "Foreign policy and domestic reform in Mongolia", Central Asian Survey, vol. 22, pp. 45-59.
- [4]. Chatterjee, Aneek, ed. (2012), World Politics, New Delhi: Palgrave.
- [5]. Dierkes, J. (2011), "Mongolia's 'third neighbour' policy and its impact on foreign investment", 15 February, East Asia Forum, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/02/15/mongolias-third-neighbour-policy-and-its-impact-on-foreign-investment/>
- [6]. Enkhbayar, N. (2008), "Mongolia's Foreign Policy: Efforts towards Regional Peace and Security", Mongolian Journal of Strategic Studies, 6-7.
- [7]. Naaz, Farah (2012) "Role of National Interest", in Rumki Basu (ed.), International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues, New Delhi: Sage, pp. 53-57.
- [8]. Huntington, Samuel P. (1991), The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century, Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- [9]. Krishna, Vaishali (2017), "Mongolia's Foreign Policy: Profiling Fundamental Aspects", International Journal of Applied Social Science, International Journal of Applied Social Science, vol.4 (9 &10), Sept. & Oct., 2017, pp.402-414.
- [10]. Lerche, Jr., Charles O. and Abdul A. Said (1972), Concepts of International Politics, New Delhi.
- [11]. Ministry of External Relations of Mongolia (2000), Mongolian Foreign Policy Blue Book, Ulaanbaatar: The Policy Planning and Coordination Department.
- [12]. MIT Sloan Archive (2012), "Mongolia's Foreign Policy: The Quest of the 3rd Neighbor", 18 March, [http://mitsloanblog.typepad.com/natural\\_resources/2012/03/mongolian-foreign-policy-the-quest-of-the-3rd-neighbor.html](http://mitsloanblog.typepad.com/natural_resources/2012/03/mongolian-foreign-policy-the-quest-of-the-3rd-neighbor.html)
- [13]. Modeski, George (1962), A Theory of Foreign Policy, London.
- [14]. Morgenthau, Hans J. (1960), Politics among Nations, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- [15]. Reeves, Jeffrey (2012), "Mongolia's evolving security strategy: omni-enmeshment and balance of influence", The Pacific Review, 25 (5):589-612.
- [16]. Sarlagtay, Mashbat Otgonbayar (2012), "Mongolia's Immediate Security Challenges: Implication to Defense Sector and The Regional Cooperation", Security Outlook of the Asia Pacific Countries and Its Implications for the Defense Sector, NIDS Joint Research Series No.7, Tokyo: The National Institute for Defense Studies, pp.103-116.
- [17]. Soni, Sharad K (2016), "Emerging Dimensions of India-Mongolia Relations", Indian Foreign Affairs Journal, vol.11, no.1, pp.51-62.
- [18]. Soni, Sharad K (2015), "The 'Third Neighbour' Approach of Mongolia's Diplomacy of External Relations: Effects on Relations between India and Mongolia", India Quarterly, vol. 71, no.1, pp.37-52.
- [19]. Soni, Sharad K (2014), "Debating Nomadism versus Modernism: Some Reflections on Mongolian Identity Issues", in Suchandana Chatterjee (ed.), Image of the Region in Eurasian Studies, New Delhi: KW Publishers. pp.87-100.
- [20]. Soni, Sharad K. (2012) "Looking beyond Geographic Neighbours : Post-Soviet Mongolia's "Third Neighbour Policy", in Suchandana Chatterjee, Anita Sengupta and Sushmita Bhattacharya (eds.), Eurasia: Twenty Years After, Delhi: Shipra Publications, 486-503.
- [21]. Soni, Sharad K (2001), "Mongolia's Foreign Policy Priorities", Himalayan and Central Asian Studies (New Delhi), vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 55-66.
- [22]. Tuvshintugs, A. (2010), "Mongolia's National Security: Past, Present and Future Perspectives," in K. Warikoo and Sharad K. Soni, eds. Mongolia in the 21st Century: Society, Culture and International Relations, New Delhi: Pentagon Press, 71-83.
- [23]. Wachman, Allan M. (2009), Mongolia's Geopolitical Gambit: Preserving a Precarious Independence While Resisting "Soft Colonialism", EAI Fellows Program Working Paper Series 18, Seoul: The East Asia Institute.
- [24]. Wanjohi, Anthony M. (2011), "State's Foreign Policy: Determinants and Constraints", KENPRO Online Papers Portal, <http://www.kenpro.org/papers/foreign-policy-determinants-constraints.htm>