1994

Beyond realism

Rebecca Ruth Ruelas
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Ruelas, Rebecca Ruth, "Beyond realism" (1994). *Master's Theses*. 950.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.msb2-cczg>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/950

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

BEYOND REALISM

A Thesis

Presented to

**The Faculty of the Department of Political Science
San Jose State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts**

by

Rebecca Ruth Ruelas

December 1994

UMI Number: 1361209

Copyright 1994 by
Ruelas, Rebecca Ruth
All rights reserved.

UMI Microform Edition 1361209
Copyright 1995, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1994

Rebecca Ruth Ruelas

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Dr. Kenneth Peter

Dr. Sharyl Cross

Dr. Roy Young

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

BEYOND REALISM

Rebecca Ruth Ruelas

In international relations, realism, with all its elements of power, has outlined fundamental relations between nation-states. Today, however, we are urged to look again at these principles and evaluate them in respect to new thinking. New thinking takes a different look at international relations in that it focuses on international organizations resolving global human problems. These problems include human rights, environmental degradation and the potential for nuclear catastrophes. New thinking establishes a vision, a goal that the global community might achieve; this ideal is not envisioned by the empirical theory of realism. As contrasted with realism, new thinking moves beyond the finite survival of the nation-state to the ultimate survival of humankind.

To Professor Kenneth Peter - from whom I learned the foundations of political thought, and who, with great skill, patience and encouragement guided me through this endeavor -

To Professor Sharyl Cross - for sharing her knowledge of Latin America, the Former Soviet Union and, in particular, International Relations -

To Professor Roy Young - for his most thoughtful reviews and comments throughout this project -

To Professor Constantine Danopoulos - from whom I learned about International Relations including prolonged wars, and whom I interviewed regarding realism and new thinking, and especially for his kind encouragement -

To Professor Igor Zevelev for sharing his knowledge on new thinking, and for being my special "invited guest" at my thesis defense -

To Associate Dean Marylou Lewandowski - for her encouragement and gentle style -

To Robert Harmon - for his encouragement, knowledge of Political Science, and his extraordinary guidance in using the library's resources -

To Linda Johnson, Steve Higaki, Rae Ann Stahl and Deborah Rodriguez Garcia - for their patience, faith and encouragement as I journeyed through this process -

To my family for their endless belief -

this thesis is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Realism	7
Chapter 3	New Thinking	23
Chapter 4	Conclusion	52
	Bibliography	67

INTRODUCTION

Realism, with all its elements of power, has outlined fundamental relations between nation-states. Today, however, we are urged to look again at these relations and principles and evaluate them in respect to novoe myshlenie (new thinking). New thinking takes a different look at international relations in that it focuses on international organizations resolving global human problems rather than power; on a balance of interests rather than on national interests; and on the survival of humankind rather than the finite survival of the nation-state.

The relations between nation-states, as foreseen by the new thinkers, establishes a vision, a goal, that the global community might achieve. The idea of a future ideal is not expressed by the realist thinkers; they look at the world as it is, and not as it ought to be.

Although realist thought, in international relations, has impacted the manner in which political scientists have viewed the relations between states, this vision has also made its impression on the foreign policies of nations. However, this theory does not accurately assess the trouble found throughout the world and the efforts to resolve the problems through negotiations and cooperation. New thinking focuses on these issues--thereby moving beyond realism.

To better understand the approach of these two theories, they will each be examined. First the assumptions will be assessed. Second, the historical development of each will be explained, as well as the theories themselves. Finally, concrete examples to illustrate the viability of the theory of novoe myshlenie will be demonstrated.

It is interesting to note that although the realists are very concerned with "understanding the world" as it actually manifests itself, the theorists overlook the fundamental changes that have taken place with the negotiations of nation-states as members of international organizations.¹

There are four major assumptions which the realist thinkers set forth as their foundation of political thought. These assumptions will be contrasted to the beliefs of the new thinkers. The first assumption held up by the realists is that nation-states are the principal actors in the international arena. The second assumption is that national interest or security interests of a state will prevail. The third assumption looks at human nature and defines it as having a propensity toward evil. Finally, the fourth assumption identifies the element of power as the

¹F. Parkinson, The Philosophy of International Relations: a Study in the History of Thought (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977), p. 158.

foundation of relations between nation-states.

First, the principle that nations are the most important actors is a fundamental principal of realism. Each nation-state is sovereign with no authority above it. The realist theory assumes that the world is centered on each individual state where the gathering of nations is but an "anarchical society."² This society exists because there is no authority above the nations except the nations themselves. This assumption is also known as the "state-centric" assumption.

New thinkers, on the other hand, believe that while nations are important, international organizations such as the United Nations are the principal actors. The United Nations is seen as the "guarantor of international peace and security."³ It predominates in the international arena where it deals with global issues. These issues require nation-states to come together, work together, resolve problems together to insure the survival of humankind.

The second assumption is the issue of national interests or security interests. This, according to the

²Michael Joseph Smith, Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986), p. 219.

³Vladimir Petrovsky, "New Thinking: Questions and Answers," PS: Political Science & Politics 23:1 (March 1990) p. 30.

realist, prevails due to the importance of survival for the nation-state. National security outlines the strategy of each nation from which it may maintain or increase its power. "States try to maximize the likelihood that they will achieve what ever objective they have set."⁴

For the new thinker, national interests are embodied in the global human problems such as human rights, the environment and nuclear weapons. The element of security is very important for each individual nation, however, "equality in international affairs" must prevail.⁵ This balance of interest requires a look into the world's problems, especially those that have the potential of marking the end of life as we know it on our planet earth.

The third assumption investigates the elements of human nature. Realists believe that humankind has a propensity toward evil, and generally is "not innately good or perfectible."⁶ Hans J. Morgenthau sees the world as "imperfect" resulting from "forces inherent in human

⁴Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, International Relations Theory (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1987), p. 33.

⁵Mikhail Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), p. 128.

⁶Viotti, International Relations Theory, p. 33.

nature."⁷ "Forces" as outlined by Morgenthau are opposing interests where "moral principles can never be fully realized."⁸ Ultimately, humans are motivated by power, and they will do what is necessary to achieve a sense of security. These elements are played out in the international arena.

The new thinkers fundamentally agree that humankind has a propensity toward evil. In an interview, Professor Constantine Danopoulos stated that Alexander Yakolev, an advisor to Gorbachev, implied that new thinkers agreed with this assessment of humankind.⁹

The fourth assumption is power. For the realists, the struggle for power is at its core. The pursuit of power is inescapable, and international politics is marked by the conflicts of power. According to the realists, states engage in an unending pursuit and quest for power. "Levels of technology, population, natural resources, geographical factors, form of government, political leadership, strategy and ideology," as well as, military capabilities mark the

⁷Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971), p. 3.

⁸Ibid., p. 3.

⁹Constantine Danopoulos, interview held at San Jose State University, San Jose, California, August 1994.

realist view of power.¹⁰

The new thinkers look to the struggle to overcome global issues as its core. This ultimately will assure "a lasting and just peace."¹¹ Negotiations, compromise, resolutions typify the international environment of the nation-states. For harmony among nations prevail in this view of the international arena leading to a deep seated belief in the renunciation of war. As the realists look to the conflicting national objectives, war erupts, but for the new thinker the striving and struggling for compromises bring about resolutions to such global disasters as war.

The following is a look at these two competing theories: realism and new thinking. The conclusion demonstrates the reality of new thinking in the relations between nation-states yesterday and today.

¹⁰Morganthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 3.

¹¹Edward C. Luck and Toby Trister Gati, "Gorbachev, the United Nations and U.S. Policy," The Washington Quarterly 11:4 (Autumn 1988), p. 34.

REALISM

The fundamental elements of realism, in international relations, were set forth by political scientist Hans J. Morgenthau. In examining this theory, it is evident that relations between nation-states are determined by one element--power. National power is outlined by factors that reflect more than military capabilities. These elements include geography, natural resources, industry, population, national character and government.

Power played out between nation-states leads to alliances and treaties that culminate to a "balance of power."¹² These alliances bring into question the issue of sovereignty and international law. All of these issues, as well as the issue of morality, as outlined by the realists, will be discussed.

The following is a look into the development of realism through two of its early thinkers: Thucydides and Machiavelli. Both of these individuals set forth the foundation of realist thought.

Thucydides is considered the first realist; he examined the Peloponnesian war. He looked into why the war occurred, and he noted that there was great fear associated with a

¹²Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 196.

shift in the balance of power between Athens and Sparta. Thucydides states, "what made war inevitable was the growth of Athenian power and the fear which this caused in Sparta."¹³ In Thucydides' analysis, the shift occurred because "Athens was acting aggressively," and successfully using its military strength--its power--against Sparta's allies.¹⁴

Besides the familiar realist idea of balance of power, Thucydides analyzed diplomacy. Diplomacy was used frequently--particularly with the negotiations that occurred between Athens and Sparta. It was, however, the element of power that marked the Hellenic world. In his famous Melian dialogue, Thucydides shows that justice is an issue only between parties of equal power. He states, "the standard of justice depends on the equality of power to compel and that in fact the stronger do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept."¹⁵ This interpretation of power is fundamental to realist thought.

As a precursor of realism, Niccolo Machiavelli wrote about human nature, alliances and power. Machiavelli stated that "all men are wicked...and they will always give vent to

¹³Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War (New York: Penguin Books, 1980), p. 49.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 82.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 402.

the malignity that is in their minds when opportunity offers."¹⁶ This view reiterates the realist view of human nature. Such a negative view of human nature is significant in that it reduces everything to power.

Machiavelli continues by stating that "security for man is impossible unless it is conjoined with power."¹⁷ Power is seen as a means of achieving security. Some acts are justified because survival of the state or its security is paramount.

Machiavelli also wrote about alliances by stating that there are two particular forms that have been adopted successfully by republics. The first consists "of several republics in which no one of them had preference, authority, or rank above the others."¹⁸ "The second method consists in forming alliances in which you reserve to yourself the headship, the seat in which the central authority resides."¹⁹ These alliances are a form of gathering power for nation-states.

Another realist characterization of Machiavelli's work

¹⁶Niccolo Machiavelli, The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), pp. 216-217.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 209.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 368.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 369.

is that he used historical examples to write about the world as it actually is, and as events actually took place. This issue is one of the fundamental principles of realism. Even the realists of today take an empirical look at the relations between nation-states. They look at actual historical events to make their determinations and evaluations of nations and their relations.

Many political scientists have written on the topic of realism in international relations. However, Hans J. Morgenthau set forth the fundamental principals which have guided realist thought. Morgenthau reiterates Machiavelli when he states that realism is the "theoretical concern with human nature as it actually is, and with the historic processes as they actually take place."²⁰ In this vision, the realists see international politics as the struggle for power.

Although realists have many definitions of power, there are three primary views that outline realist thought, according to Paul R. Viotti and Mark v. Kauppi.²¹ First, A.F.K. Organski sees power as the ability "to influence the

²⁰Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 4.

²¹Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1993), p. 44.

behaviors of others in accordance with one's own ends."²²

In Organski's view, nation-states use their power to affect the behavior of other nations in an effort to further their own goals. Organski continues by stating, "there is a power aspect to every relationship...whether two nations are friends or enemies or merely potential allies, whether they fight together, trade together or have only certain cultural interests in common, each nation cares what the other is doing, and the minute one nation cares, the other has the power to influence it."²³

Second, Karl Deutsch suggests power is the "ability to prevail in conflict and overcome obstacles."²⁴ Since realists maintain that survival of the nation-state is its primary concern, the ability of a nation to withstand "conflict and...obstacles" is its measure of power.²⁵

A nation continually seeks power. Kenneth N. Waltz emphasizes that power is the supreme value of nation-states.²⁶ However, Morgenthau sees a nation as an

²²A.F.K. Organski, World Politics (New York, 1968) p. 104.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Karl W. Deutsch, The Analysis of International Relations (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968), p. 22.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Kenneth N. Waltz, Man, the State and War: a Theoretical Analysis (New York: Columbia University Press,

abstraction, power is measured by individuals who belong to that nation.²⁷ Therefore, Morgenthau defines the third vision of power "as the power of man over the minds and actions of other men."²⁸ Ultimately, it is the individual who wields the nation's power.

To develop a clearer understanding of the realist view of power, it is necessary to outline Morgenthau's elements of national power. According to Morgenthau, power may be fundamentally defined for a nation through its geography, natural resources, industry, military preparedness, population, national character, diplomacy and government.²⁹ All of these elements of national power determine the power of a nation.

Geographical factors are relatively stable elements of power. The size of the territory and its proximity to waterways are important. The geographical terrain--whether mountainous or desert--also plays a role in the estimate of national power.³⁰

Natural resources play a role in such elements as food

1959), p.37.

²⁷Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 97.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid, pp. 106-158.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 106-108.

and raw material. Self sufficiency in food is a source of great strength. At the same time, the scarcity of food is a source of great weakness. Raw materials are important for industrial production, particularly for waging war. The materials that are used depend on the industrial and military needs of the time--especially with the increased mechanization of warfare. Technological changes have called for the use of new materials or the increase use of old materials.³¹

Modern technology and communication developments have increased the need for industrial capacity as an element of national power. A nation's strength depends on "the number and quality of highways, railroads, trucks, ships, airplanes, tanks, and equipment and weapons of all kinds...[including] guided missiles."³²

The element that attributes factors such as geography, natural resources and industrial capacity their importance for the power of a nation is military preparedness. The nation's military must be capable of supporting any foreign policy it may choose. This ability derives from technological innovations, leadership and the quantity and

³¹Ibid., pp. 110-111.

³²Ibid., p. 113.

quality of the military forces.³³

Technological advancement plays a role in military preparedness because of its necessity in armed conflict. The most powerful of these are the nuclear weapons. The destructive power of both nuclear and conventional weapons is related to the technology behind the weapon.

The leadership quality in the armed forces has always had a decisive influence on national power. This coupled with the quantity and quality of the armed forces can determine the military strength of a nation.³⁴

Although military preparedness is an important factor in assessing the power of a nation, the population of a nation is also important. Large numbers are required "to establish and keep going the industrial plant necessary for successful conduct of modern war."³⁵

The most elusive element of national power is national character. The intellectual and moral qualities that make up national character may include certain cultural characteristics. Nonetheless, the influence may be seen in "those who act for the nation in peace and war, formulate, execute, and support its policies, elect and are elected,

³³Ibid., p. 114.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid., p. 119.

mold public opinion, produce and consume."³⁶

Equally as elusive is national morale. This can be seen in how a nation supports its government's foreign policy. "It permeates all activities of a nation, its agricultural and industrial production as well as its military establishment and diplomatic service. In the form of public opinion, it provides an intangible factor without whose support no government, democratic or autocratic, is able to pursue its policies with full effectiveness, if it is able to pursue them at all."³⁷

A nation's diplomacy is by far the most important aspect of national power. It combines all the power of each factor into a whole--focusing the power and directing the nation. The diplomat is the individual whose efforts affect the outcome of negotiations between nation-states.

The government is also a requirement of national power. Both human and material resources are balanced against a nation's foreign policy. Whenever the very existence of the state is in question, "the policy of national survival overrides"³⁸ all other considerations. A nation "must choose the objectives and methods of its foreign policy in

³⁶Ibid., p. 127.

³⁷Ibid., p. 129.

³⁸Ibid., p. 140.

view of the power available to support them with a maximum of success."³⁹

Public opinion is especially important to all governments. Fundamentally, approval must be secured from the people for the nation's foreign policies. A nation's public opinion is "dynamic, ever changing...continuously created and recreated."⁴⁰ Although the government may at times compromise regarding its policies, it must also fight to maintain what it considers good foreign policy.

It is the culmination of each of these elements of power, as defined by Morgenthau, that positions each nation in the international arena. Power is the driving force for realists, and in the international setting the balance of power is paramount. The balance of power is established out of "the aspirations for power on the part of several nations, each trying either to maintain or overthrow the status quo."⁴¹ In an effort to maintain equilibrium, the nations to be balanced limit the encroachment upon their interests and rights which may destroy their nations.⁴² Henry A. Kissinger's classic expression of balance of power

³⁹Ibid., p. 139.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 142.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 161.

⁴²Ibid., p. 163.

illustrates that in the lessons of history "no order is safe without physical safeguards against aggression."⁴³ To meet this aggression, it is necessary for nation-states to unite against it.

To the realist, "no nation will agree to concede political advantages to another nation without the expectations, which may or may not be well founded, of receiving proportionate advantages in return."⁴⁴ However, alliances are necessary to maintain a balance of power in a world made up of numerous nations. As their foundation, an alliance requires common interests. The alliance "adds precision...to an existing community of interests and to...[their] general policies and concrete measures."⁴⁵

Alliances are the result of diplomacy. Kissinger describes classical diplomacy as "the adjustment of differences through negotiations."⁴⁶ Negotiations between nation-states are the basis for cooperation and resolutions of differences. Even Robert O. Keohane, a noted neorealist, reiterates that cooperation is not automatic--it "requires

⁴³Henry A. Kissinger, A World Restored (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957), pp. 317-318.

⁴⁴Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 174.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 176.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 1.

planning and negotiation."⁴⁷ Keohane observes that the mutual interests of individual nation-states "can be realized through...cooperation."⁴⁸ "Even sovereign governments that recognize no common authority may engage in limited cooperation."⁴⁹

This raises the issue of sovereignty--the supreme legal authority of a nation. The law is given and enforced within a certain territory independent from any other nation.⁵⁰ Some realists acknowledge Morgenthau's claim that sovereignty cannot be shared or relinquished. "If sovereignty means supreme authority, it stands to reason that two or more entities--persons, groups of persons or agencies--cannot be sovereign within the same space."⁵¹ According to these realists, there is no limited sovereignty.

Other realists agree with Waltz as he maintains that "the sovereignty of states has never entailed their insulation from the effects of other states' actions. To be

⁴⁷Robert O. Keohane, International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory (Boulder: Westview Press, 1989), p. 11.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 132.

⁵⁰Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 305.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 312.

sovereign and to be dependent are not contradictory conditions."⁵² Waltz continues by stating that a sovereign nation-state "decides for itself how it will cope with its internal and external problems, including whether or not to seek assistance from others and in doing so to limit its freedom by making commitments to them."⁵³

Although nation-states recognize shared commitments, it has resulted in the less than strict observance of international law. Even though international law is created by necessity and mutual consent, it is not always effective or actually enforced. The foundation of international law is the international treaty. Although the treaties may be signed and ratified, it is uncertain as to whether or not the treaties are valid. Issues brought to the jurisdiction of the international courts remains with the states submitting the disputes to adjudication.

According to the realists, there are rules of conduct which govern all societies. Power is subject to limitations and superior power gives no right to use that power without restraint. Ethics, mores and laws are the three rules of conduct which govern international societies, and sanctions

⁵²Kenneth N. Waltz, "Political Structures," in Neorealism and its Critics, ed. Robert O. Keohane (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), p. 90.

⁵³Ibid., p. 90.

and commands govern each rule.⁵⁴

Morality is demonstrated during times of peace by "affirming the sacredness of human life."⁵⁵ The influence of civilization has made some policies morally reprehensible and impossible to execute. Even during the times of war, moral limitations are placed on nations. However, the infliction of death and suffering may occur despite the moral or ethical restraints placed by the world community. Although war is conceived as a contest between armed forces, it does not always stay within those boundaries.

These humanitarian concerns for life and suffering of human beings have brought about international treaties that prohibit the use of certain weapons and the limited use of others. They try to "infuse into warfare a spirit of decency and of respect for the common humanity of all its prospective victims and to restrict violence to the minimum compatible with the goal of war."⁵⁶

War itself, or the attitude toward war, is reflected in the awareness of governments and their diplomats that certain moral limitations restrict the use of war as an

⁵⁴Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 220.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 225.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 230.

instrument of foreign policy.⁵⁷ As Morgenthau states, "modern war is not only a terrible thing to be avoided for reasons of expediency, but also an evil thing to be shunned on moral grounds."⁵⁸ Today, one nuclear warhead can destroy the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. Waltz agrees with Morgenthau when he states that "advancing technology makes war more horrible and presumably increases the desire for peace."⁵⁹

And yet, realists share Waltz's view that foreign policy, including war, is "neither moral nor immoral, but embodies merely a reasoned response to the world."⁶⁰ Carl Von Clausewitz states, "that war is not merely a political act but a real political instrument, a continuation of political relations, a carrying out of the same by other means."⁶¹ To the realist, war is a continuation of relations between nation-states. However, the world has been looking beyond this view in its continued negotiations and strongly supported treaties that have dealt with

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 231.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Waltz, Man, the State and War: a Theoretical Analysis, p. 235.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 238.

⁶¹Arend Lijphart, ed. World Politics (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p.223.

fundamental human issues as outlined by new thinking.

NEW THINKING

Novoe myshlenie, as prescribed by Mikhail Gorbachev and others, sets forth new and fundamentally different principles for international relations. The issues brought forth are human rights, the environment and the potential for nuclear catastrophes. When we look at the nation-states throughout the world, we find countless scientific and technological developments. However, beside these achievements, the world has uncovered an increase in global human problems.⁶²

These global human problems comprise of environmental issues including toxic pollution, ozone depletion, global warming and deforestation. Each of these threaten to change the ecological balance of our earth. More profound is the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. Utter destruction can result from just one nuclear explosion. Our human rights are fundamentally affected by these issues because they limit our fundamental right of freedom and security. Human rights are neglected in other ways as well--progress and development lie side by side with poverty and backwardness.⁶³

⁶²Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 121.

⁶³Ibid.

The solution to these global problems, as developed by the new thinkers, focuses on the interdependence of nation-states. This interdependence brings countries together affirming peace as the highest human value. Security and a "balance of interests" are developed under the auspices of the United Nations where each country works to resolve the world's global issues.⁶⁴

The following is a look into the development of new thinking which actually stems from the work on peace by Albert Einstein, and writings and lectures by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel as interpreted by Vladimir Il'ich Lenin and later Mikhail Gorbachev. Other Soviet thinkers have also influenced the development of new thinking in international relations.

Mikhail Gorbachev describes the precursors of new thinking as Einstein and Lenin. He believes, as do the other new thinkers, in the fundamental philosophy of Einstein, and his efforts to promote peace throughout the world. Einstein's ideas serve as a blueprint for new thinking regarding the devastation of nuclear weapons and the necessity of an international organization.

It was Albert Einstein who first proclaimed the need to think of humankind in the age of atomic weapons. He

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 122.

declared, "the time demands new thinking."⁶⁵ These words dated back to 1945 after the discovery of this destructive force.

Einstein emphasizes that "the creation of the atomic bomb has brought the constant threat of sudden annihilation into the life of every city dweller throughout the world. No one can deny that this situation must cease."⁶⁶ He states that the only way to prevent an atomic war is to prevent war itself, and to prevent war itself is to make peace law. This peace can only be achieved through the association of countries, and the compliance to a higher sovereignty.⁶⁷

An international organization must be established which guarantees that any disputes that may arise between nation-states will be resolved through international laws under international jurisdiction. Einstein continues by stating that this international organization must be empowered to prevent any country from using its military forces to wage war. Only if these conditions are met will humankind be

⁶⁵V. Kubalkova and A.A. Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking" (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1989), p. 27.

⁶⁶Otto Nathan and Heinz Norden, ed., Einstein on Peace (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 360.

⁶⁷Ibid.

able to escape the fate of an atomic catastrophe.⁶⁸

As a precursor to new thinking, Vladimir Il'ich Lenin maintained that "civilized cooperation" was necessary throughout the international arena.⁶⁹ He believed in the development of Hegel's dialectic, and he wrote about the "identity of opposites."⁷⁰ Opposites, according to Lenin, occur in all phenomena where the development of knowledge is the "unity of these opposites."⁷¹

To better understand Lenin's opposites, it is necessary to take a look at the political thought of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. One of Hegel's theories was the dialectic. Although its roots go back to Greek philosophy, Hegel applied this technique to the world. For Hegel, one thought, a thesis, leads to an opposing thought, the antithesis. These thoughts resolve into a synthesis, which is not a compromise but a higher understanding. The synthesis also serves as a new thesis from which a new antithesis and synthesis develop. In this way, one would eventually arrive at a successively higher understanding of

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 77.

⁷⁰Robert C. Tucker, ed., The Lenin Anthology, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975), p. 648.

⁷¹Ibid.

truth.⁷²

Gorbachev states that new thinking underscores the need for analysis using the dialectic. The dialectic uncovers the interconnection and interdependence that is created throughout the world. In practicing the dialectic, an understanding of the past, present and future is created as a measurement of the synthesis.

A number of Soviet writers have declared the need for new thinking. Most express similar views, however, a few have developed new schools of thought within the theory. Each believes that the potential for a nuclear, environmental or other catastrophe is evident. This unites humanity, upon our "common home," encouraging people to cooperate, and to use reason to resolve these global issues for the survival of humankind.

The Soviet new thinkers include, the former Soviet ambassador, Anatoli Adamishin, who sees "dozens, hundreds of problems...advancing to the forefront" of international affairs.⁷³ He emphasizes that "it is high time for mankind

⁷²Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Reason in History: a General Introduction to the Philosophy of History (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, Inc., 1953), p. ix.

⁷³Anatoli Adamishin, "Humanity's Common Destiny," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p.43.

to display reason if it simply wants to survive."⁷⁴ He continues by stating "that we people living today simply have no other choice than to bend every effort to guarantee the survival of humanity."⁷⁵ Adamishin knows the problems devastating the world community. Their resolutions will only come about through the use of reason, and it must come about for the survival of humankind.

Vladimir Kulistikov reiterates that the "world is on the threshold of nuclear, ecological and other catastrophes. For the first time ever mankind...[is finding] itself to be mortal."⁷⁶ As put forth by Kulistikov, mortality is the ultimate threat of our potential global catastrophes. As a common humanity, we must work together to resolve our common problems.

As an assistant professor of history, Tatiana Matveyeva, states that "new thinking...[revives] humanist ideas...[where] every inhabitant of the earth is a dweller of a common home..."⁷⁷ She emphasizes "the common

⁷⁴Ibid.

⁷⁵Ibid., p.44.

⁷⁶Vladimir Kulistikov, "The Last Dispatch fro the Ideological Front," New Times 11 (1989), p. 15.

⁷⁷Tatiana Matveyeva, "Perestroika, Sixth Winter," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 78.

responsibility of all for the fortunes of civilization."⁷⁸ Matveyeva believes that we all must cooperate and share the responsibility of caring for our "common home."

Another new thinker, Alexander Pumpyansky, writes that "in this small world, indeed, everything bears relation to..." everything.⁷⁹ He continues by stating that "the idea of peaceful coexistence has led us to a much broader and humane idea of a common home for the human civilization,...[as well as] coexistence and common creation of a better world."⁸⁰ Pumpyansky sees our earth as a small world, a "common home" from which we may work together to create a "better world."

Finally, Konstantin Pleshakov, from the former Soviet Academy of Sciences, states that new thinking "should be comprehended as a method of leading the world away from confrontation and toward real cooperation."⁸¹ It is cooperation and negotiation that are fundamental to this theory of new thinking.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Alexander Pumpyanski, "Drama of an Idea," New Times 3 (January 1989), p. 6.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 9.

⁸¹Konstantin Pleshakov, "The Soviet Union in an Interdependent World," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 112.

However, there are issues of controversy among new thinkers which have created different schools of thought among these theorists. Igor Malashenko, from the former International Department of the Soviet Union, considers "how...to follow realistically universal values which aren't, in fact, accepted by most of humanity."⁸² Although it is true that not all of humanity accepts these "universal values," their acceptance is far more prevalent today throughout the world community. As the following will illustrate, humankind is uniting in their world view.

Sergei Lunev also argues that "new thinking will be able to bring out its potential in full only if it is embraced by other countries, too. It cannot be a one-way street."⁸³ And yet, the growing interdependence of the world community has demonstrated that countries do work together to resolve global issues.

Since the time of Nikita Khrushchev, there has been discussions of the need for "peaceful coexistence."⁸⁴

⁸²Igor Malashenko, "Perestroika, Sixth Winter," Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991) p. 80.

⁸³Sergei Lunev, "The Soviet Union in an Interdependent World," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 121.

⁸⁴Kubalkova, and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 24.

Based on an analysis of some of the publications completed by new thinkers, it is evident that all of these writers and more have contributed to the works of Mikhail Gorbachev and his international relations theory of new thinking. It is unusual, however, that the foundation of new thinking stems from Western as well as Soviet thought.

As put forth by V. Kubalkova and A.A. Cruickshank, it is evident that there are several fundamental principles which govern the theory of new thinking.⁸⁵ First, the existence of global human problems is evident in the issues of human rights, the potential for nuclear catastrophes, and in the environmental degradation that pervades our planet.

Eduard Shevardnadze, the former Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, sees ecological catastrophes resulting from a "conflict between [the] technosphere and biosphere."⁸⁶ These catastrophes make "transboundary international resistance to the environmental disintegration of the planet, a danger as terrible as that of nuclear war,...an absolute necessity."⁸⁷ Environmental catastrophes are seen by Shevardnadze as the result of technology upon earth's

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 6.

⁸⁶Eduard Shevardnadze, "Ecology and Politics," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 207.

⁸⁷Ibid.

natural resources. This makes international cooperation a necessity to reduce the environmental destruction of the planet.

Shevardnadze continues by stating that "there is a need for sound recommendations for the promotion of ecological education and improved system of international bodies working on environmental problems."⁸⁸ Although the issues have not been enumerated by the new thinkers, the following is an outline of some of these problems. The list of environmental problems include deforestation, global warming, ozone depletion, toxic pollution among many others.

Toxic pollution is an acute problem in its spread throughout the world. These toxic chemicals are present in every continent. This contaminated waste extracts a "high cost to human health and the natural environment."⁸⁹ Its causes range from "industry spewing toxic metals" to hazardous waste dump sites.⁹⁰

Ozone depletion has been evident since the 1970's. "Scientists suspected that the stratospheric ozone may be destroyed effectively by human-made chlorofluorocarbons used

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 213.

⁸⁹Joseph E. Daniel, ed., et al, 1993 Earth Journal: Environmental Almanac and Resource Directory (Boulder: Buzzworm Books, 1992), p. 121.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 119.

for refrigeration and as solvents, aerosol propellants and foam-blowing agents."⁹¹ The chlorofluorocarbon gases are decomposed by intense ultraviolet radiation which can destroy thousands of ozone molecules.⁹² These molecules are regenerated, but never to normal levels with the presence of chlorine atoms. This results in ultraviolet radiation that "penetrates to the surface of the Earth, threatening all forms of life."⁹³

Global warming is another environmental issue which has seen a critical shift as scientists evaluate the question of the greenhouse effect. The concern is of the emissions of "carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases produced by burning fossil fuels and forests."⁹⁴ If these emissions continue at the current rate, there is the risk that climate shifts will occur.

Deforestation is also a global problem in that forty-two million acres of tropical forests are being destroyed each year.⁹⁵ More than half of the Earth's plant and animal species dwell in these forests. The extinction rate of

⁹¹Ibid., p. 104.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 89.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 71.

these species is "unmatched in sixty-five million years."⁹⁶ The loss of forests is not limited to the tropics. In Europe, thirteen countries have damaged ten to twenty percent of their trees due to air pollution.⁹⁷ Actually, forests throughout the industrial world are damaged by smog and acid rain. In the United States, the Pacific Northwest forest growth has been cut back to thirteen percent of its original growth.⁹⁸

Besides ecological damage, Gorbachev states that it is necessary for "effective, fair international procedures and mechanisms which would ensure rational utilization of our planet's resources as the property of all mankind."⁹⁹ Resources are not limitless and we must be wise in our consumption of them.

The second global human problem is the prevalence of nuclear weapons. Adamishin states that "the overwhelming majority of nuclear charges on Earth is concentrated in...[the former Soviet Union] and American arsenals, as is the bulk of other mass-destruction weapons, the need to ensure the survival of humanity is one of the prime

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 123.

components of cooperation"¹⁰⁰ 1992 estimates confirmed that there were 21,322 "known strategic nuclear warheads worldwide."¹⁰¹ These warheads belong to the nation-states of the United States, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, France, China and Britain.¹⁰² There is also the potential of nuclear proliferation throughout the world. Today, the countries of Iraq, North Korea, India and Pakistan are countries suspected of having nuclear weapons or the potential of configuring such a weapon.

The devastation of a nuclear bomb is enormous. The detonation of a one-megaton bomb, at ground level, would leave a crater about one thousand feet wide and two hundred feet deep.¹⁰³ Debris would be piled as high as ten or twenty feet stretching over 1.7 miles.¹⁰⁴ However, the most devastating impact would be the impact on human life. Depending on the population density, tens of thousands would be killed and hundreds of thousands would be injured. The

¹⁰⁰Adamishin, "Humanity's Common Destiny," in Russia and the World: New View on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, p. 52.

¹⁰¹Rodman D. Griffin, "Nuclear Proliferation," The CO Researcher, 2:21 (June 5, 1992), p.484.

¹⁰²Ibid.

¹⁰³Ground Zero, Nuclear War: What's in it for You?, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982), p. 131.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

area would be so full of radioactivity that it would be unusable for decades or even centuries. This is the destructive force of one-megaton bomb. We have more than 20,000 warheads available worldwide to totally obliterate city after city. The potential for destruction is too great. Mikhail Gorbachev declares, "mankind has lost its immortality."¹⁰⁵ Science and technology has given us the ability to utterly destroy ourselves.

"People want to live in a safer and more just world. Humanity deserves a better fate than being a hostage to nuclear terror and despair. It is necessary to change the existing world situation and to build a nuclear weapon-free world, free of violence and hatred, fear and suspicion."¹⁰⁶ The only course of action is political negotiations and disarmament. These will insure security.

Pumpyansky writes that the nuclear issue "is a problem of survival...as long as nuclear weapons are around the possibility of catastrophe will persist."¹⁰⁷ It is, however, necessary to "wipe out the need for these weapons."¹⁰⁸ We

¹⁰⁵Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 124.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 130.

¹⁰⁷Alexander Pumpyanski, "Drama of an Idea," New Times 3 (January 1989), p. 7.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

must resolve our differences through cooperation and negotiation and eliminate the need to solve our differences through war.

Nuclear weapons and environmental issues degrade the rights of the individual to live in peace and security. This affects ones human rights which is the third issue that exists as a global human problem. Although human rights have been recognized as a global issue, many injustices remain. In 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly. As a resolution, it did not have the force of law.

This declaration, however, proclaims the "inherent dignity" and "equal inalienable rights" of humankind.¹⁰⁹ These fundamental rights are the foundation of freedom, justice and peace throughout the world. Some of the rights put forth included life, liberty and security; freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom of expression; and the right to peacefully assemble and associate. The declaration also states that "everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well being of himself and his family."¹¹⁰ Unfortunately, many of these issues have not been upheld throughout the world.

¹⁰⁹Walter Laqueur and Barry Rubin, The Human Rights Reader (New York: New American Library, 1989), p. 197.

¹¹⁰Ibid., pp. 198-201.

Poverty devastates the human spirit and it runs rampant throughout the developing world; however, it is not unknown even in the most industrialized nations. Each year thousands die of malnutrition, and more are at the status of mere survival. The human rights that have been acknowledged through proclamation and declaration must continue to be addressed at the global level to insure the right of each individual to live in dignity.

It is interesting to note that Sergei Magaril states, "we should draw a clear-cut line between noninterference in the affairs of other countries and opposition to a policy violating human rights. Our approach to this problem must be principled and uniformed..."¹¹¹ Magaril emphasizes an important point: "noninterference in the affairs of other countries." However, global interdependence has been established between nation-states creating an environment in which their interaction will mandate cooperation. He is right in noting that any interference must be "principled and uniformed."¹¹²

As Pumpyansky observes, "we have come to realize [that] problems and solutions...should be tackled on a global

¹¹¹Sergei Magaril, "First Approach to a Multiparty System in Diplomacy," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 104.

¹¹²Ibid.

scale."¹¹³ Human rights, nuclear and environmental disasters affect every nation-state, and their resolutions are dependent on the global community. Individual nation-states cannot independently resolve these problems. These issues are not delineated by borders; they affect the world community as a whole. It will take global cooperation and negotiations to resolve these problems.

Cooperation and negotiation--these are realist terms--these terms have been used by Morgenthau, Kissinger and Waltz. It is not that realists are not aware of global human problems--it is only that they lack the vision to resolve these issues. Realists look at historical events; they do not look to the future.

This leads to the second principle of new thinking, which is the interdependence among nation-states. We live in an interconnected and interdependent world. Gorbachev asks, "wouldn't it be more correct to step over the things that divide us for the sake of the interests of all mankind for the sake of life on Earth?"¹¹⁴ Each nation searches for a more secure and reliable world. A world in which nations come together, but maintain their own "philosophic, political and ideological views and their own way of

¹¹³Pumpyanski, "Drama of an Idea," New Times, p. 7.

¹¹⁴Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 125.

life."¹¹⁵

The former Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Vladimir Petrovsky, states that we must find a "new level of cooperation, partnership and interaction of all states, by the availability of structures reflecting their growing interdependence, and the establishment of a world political order based on consensus."¹¹⁶ He believes that cooperation and negotiation are fundamental for an interdependent world.

The interests of the nation-state, in this interdependent world, has broadened. Petrovsky continues by stating that "the common interest of mankind" are merged with a country's highest interests.¹¹⁷ National interest must go beyond the finite needs of the nation-state to the overriding needs of the global community.

Sovereignty is at issue in an interdependent world--yet because of this dependence it has seldom been absolute. Common interests have been recognized and sovereign nation-states have in effect civilized their relations due to the obligations of global problems.

Pleshakov believes that "the world today is prepared

¹¹⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁶Vladimir Petrovsky, "New Thinking: Questions and Answers," PS: Political Science & Politics 23:1 (March 1990), p. 29.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

objectively for the concept of interdependence and integrality--in the economy, science, technology, and in military strategy."¹¹⁸ Aleksandr Medvedev, from the former Soviet Academy of Science, agrees that "it is common knowledge that the modern world...is characterized by greater economic, financial, political, ecological, scientific and technological, and informational interdependence of states."¹¹⁹ Both Pleshakov and Medvedev acknowledge the growing interdependence of nation-states.

This interdependence "highlights the basic mutuality of interests among all groups of societies within the contemporary world system."¹²⁰ It is based on a perception that sees a common threat. This threat may be ecological, nuclear or an abuse of human rights. These global human problems unite humanity or at least prompt people to come together to negotiate and resolve these issues. It is, however, peace which is the highest value in relations between nation-states. It is this ultimate goal that results from cooperation and negotiation in this interdependent world.

¹¹⁸Pleshakov, "The Soviet Union in an Interdependent World," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, p. 112.

¹¹⁹Aleksandr Medvedev, "The Soviet Union in an Interdependent World," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 117.

¹²⁰Kubalkova, and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 58.

Unfortunately, realists recognize interdependence only as a nation-state might measure its power. Morgenthau states, "no nation will agree to concede political advantages to another nation without the expectation...of receiving proportionate advantages in return."¹²¹ It is necessary to look beyond the element of power. We must face these common threats together; we must cooperate and negotiate to achieve a lasting peace.

The third issue of new thinking is the "renunciation of war."¹²² The fundamental principal of new thinking is very simple: "nuclear war cannot be a means of achieving political, economic, ideological or any other goals."¹²³ Nuclear war is senseless and irrational. There would be no winners or losers in a global nuclear conflict--our world civilization would perish.¹²⁴

As Petrovsky states, "the advent of a nuclear and space era has radically changed the view of war and peace. War has objectively lost its characteristics of rational politics."¹²⁵ Petrovsky declares that war cannot be fought

¹²¹Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, p. 174.

¹²²Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 6.

¹²³Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 126.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Petrovsky, "New Thinking: Questions and Answers," PS: Political Science & Politics, p. 29.

with nuclear armaments. The devastation makes such a proposition irrational. Adamishin agrees, emphasizing "the tremendous scientific, technological and industrial progress that has produced the most destructive means of warfare...[making] war deadly for the entire human race."¹²⁶

Unfortunately, our ability to destroy ourselves is not limited to nuclear weapons. Conventional weapons also possess great power and destructive forces. Gorbachev maintains that "there is the need for the renunciation of war in favor of peaceful coexistence."¹²⁷ Here peace is elevated to the highest of human values which is our fourth principle.

Once again, Adamishin asserts that "force must give way to reason, to collective efforts to create reliable security based on peaceful coexistence as a universal principal, on the primacy of law and freedom of choice. This is an unbelievable difficult task, but it is not a fruitless dream either."¹²⁸ Adamishin reiterates the importance of reason and cooperation in order to create security. However, this must be based on peaceful coexistence as a "universal principle" including "law and freedom of choice."

¹²⁶Anatoli Adamishin, "Doomed to Discord?" New Thinking 12 (1989), p. 14.

¹²⁷Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking, p. 21.

¹²⁸Adamishin, "Humanity's Common Destiny," in Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, p. 54.

The fifth principle brings forth this security as a global issue.¹²⁹ Security must be equal for each state or it will not exist for any state. Gorbachev states that "the only solid foundation for security is the recognition of the interests of all peoples and countries and of their equality in international affairs."¹³⁰ It is paramount that each nation-state unite to work on the issue of security.

The former Soviet ambassador, Boris Pyadyshev, asserts that "for decades,...the idea that military might was the main instrument to ensure security [was prevalent] while political means were pushed far to [the] sidelines."¹³¹ He continues by stating, "it will take sometime before the mechanism of ensuring security by political means, both at the regional and global levels, are created and become operative. During that period military means are called upon to back security."¹³² Pyadyshev writes about the importance of political means to ensure security, and yet, "military might" has been used and will continue to be used to "back security" until political means are operational.

Carsten Voigt writes that "security consists of a great

¹²⁹Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 6.

¹³⁰Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 128.

¹³¹Boris Pyadyshev, ed., Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991), p. 154.

¹³²Ibid.

many interrelated components. The security of each country is to a considerable degree determined by external [and internal] factors."¹³³ Even environmental destruction in one nation-state "may jeopardize lives in neighboring countries and even in other regions of the world."¹³⁴ Such occurrences has made it evident that resolutions must be obtained through negotiations by the global community.

Although the absence of war is ideal, it is not an end in itself. Provisions must be made for international security and that security should come from a stronger United Nations. We have the institutions necessary upon which to build security for our future. Shevardnadze states a new system of international security sets some nonmilitary guarantees. These are technical, political, economic, and humanitarian. These will elevate trust and peaceful coexistence in international relations.¹³⁵ In order to realize this goal, the United Nations must become "our house of peace."¹³⁶

This "house of peace" is the ideal entity to unite the many varied nation-states throughout the world.¹³⁷ It will

¹³³Carsten Voigt, "Five Reasons for Optimism," New Times 12 (1989), p. 13.

¹³⁴Ibid.

¹³⁵Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 77.

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 75.

¹³⁷Ibid.

disclose a balance of interests among these countries. As our sixth principle, the balance of interests will bring "stability to the world."¹³⁸ Although each nation will have interests of their own, a call must go forth for international cooperation.

Petrovsky asserts that new thinking "views world politics through searching a balance of interests of various states and ensuring the priority of common human values rather than through a balance of forces."¹³⁹ He continues by stating that when "interests are diametrically opposed, the question is how to 'channel' them into a common direction."¹⁴⁰ "Regional and international organizations can function as a regulator,...and this must be achieved through dialogue which would respect the opinion of each side."¹⁴¹ He states, "finding compromises is precisely what diplomacy is all about;...its original function [is as] an instrument of reaching agreement."¹⁴²

The concept of "balance of interests" highlights a "new international political order of coordination of interests

¹³⁸Gorbachev, Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World, p. 126.

¹³⁹Petrovsky, "New Thinking: Questions and Answers," PS: Political Science & Politics, p. 29.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁴¹Ibid.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 30.

of sovereign states."¹⁴³ Voigt states that "a balance of interest...should be oriented towards the maximum of political, economic, ecological, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation."¹⁴⁴ As an international body, the United Nations would coordinate these interests. States would voluntarily agree to discuss many different issues that may arise between nation-states.¹⁴⁵

The role of the United Nations is seen by Petrovsky as "a principal regulator of international relations, a guarantor of international peace and security, and an instrument for preventing conflicts and crises."¹⁴⁶ It is, however, evident that the United Nations does not yet have the power or ability to coordinate a "balance of interests" for the countries of the world.¹⁴⁷ What is critical is that the mechanism is in place for discussing common problems. These discussions are the foundation for international cooperation.

Power is essential for this international organization, and this power is derived from the cooperation and

¹⁴³Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 78.

¹⁴⁴Voigt, "Five Reasons for Optimism," New Times, p. 15.

¹⁴⁵Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 78.

¹⁴⁶Petrovsky, "New Thinking: Questions and Answers," PS: Political Science & Politics, p. 30.

¹⁴⁷Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking," p. 6.

negotiations of individual nation-states. There must be a willingness to negotiate and resolve these global human problems. There must be a vision that far surpasses the finite needs of the single nation. The world must be perceived as a whole.

Realists have always looked to power as their fundamental element. Ever since Thucydides, realists have maintained that a balance of power is the foundation of peace. However, such a peace can only be temporary because it resides on a mutual threat. The balance of interests resides on mutual respect which will foster a lasting peace.

Finally, the seventh principle states that a reduction in military arsenals is necessary to a state of "reasonable sufficiency" in order to "repel aggression."¹⁴⁸ While it is true that "national security cannot be divorced from mutual security," it is sufficiency that is the link between the two.¹⁴⁹ "Rather than matching the capabilities of each and every country whose arms could threaten [a country,]...meet [only] the threats that might be plausibly imagined."¹⁵⁰ Replace the stockpile of nuclear weapons "with a secure

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹Robert Legvold, "The Revolution in Soviet Foreign Policy," Foreign Affairs 68:1 (1988/89), p. 85.

¹⁵⁰Robert Legvold, "The Revolution in Soviet Foreign Policy," eds. Soviet Foreign Policy: Classic and Contemporary Issues, ed. Frederic J. Flernon, Jr., Erik P. Hoffmann, and Robbin F. Laird (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1991) p. 361.

retaliatory force capable of ensuring some essential, but minimal level of deterrence."¹⁵¹

Pyadyshev writes that "we need, if it comes to it, a big, but civilized 'stick' to protect our common order against dangerous escapades of adventuristic regimes. To be on the safe side we have to have a certain amount of super weapons, which may remain in the possession of some leading powers. A UN nuclear force may be set up for this purpose. It is hardly possible to do without such a force in the coming era, which is already pregnant with a lot of regional conflicts and crisis."¹⁵² "Of course...[this] nuclear arsenal to guarantee security should be as small as possible."¹⁵³ Pyadyshev shares the new thinking belief that some reasonable level of force is necessary to protect nation-states from "dangerous...adventuristic regimes." However this small force should be established under the United Nations.

Fundamentally, there is a need to "search for political rather than military solutions to international problems, and the renunciation of force in the pursuit of political

¹⁵¹Legvold, "The Revolution in Soviet Foreign Policy," Foreign Affairs, p. 88.

¹⁵²Pyadyshev, ed., Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, p. 153.

¹⁵³Ibid.

objectives..." is necessary.¹⁵⁴ This is illustrated through "the pursuit of arms control agreements...and deployments to the level of 'reasonable sufficiency.'"¹⁵⁵

Realists, by contrast, maintain that the nation-state is the primary actor and as such it must possess all power at its disposal. Historically speaking this is what has occurred. However, now it is time to reassess what is actually necessary for a nation's security. We must move beyond realism toward a goal of reasonable defense.

Gorbachev believes that all of the principles can be achieved through the "rediscovery" of the United Nations. He envisions its activities ranging from ecology to nation-state security. This security includes the resolution of regional conflicts and disarmament issues.

In short, Gorbachev sees that "the United Nations will remain a forum for political strife and for the competition of disparate ideas, even as its members seek to find common ground and to resolve armed conflict."¹⁵⁶ Petrovsky agrees that "the UN role is [to be] first and foremost...a principal regulator of international relations, a guarantor of international peace and security, and an instrument of

¹⁵⁴Alexander Dallin, "New Thinking in Soviet Foreign Policy," in New Thinking in Soviet Politics, ed. Archie Brown (New York: St Martin's Press, 1992), p. 73.

¹⁵⁵Ibid.

¹⁵⁶Luck and Gati, "Gorbachev, the United Nations and U.S. Policy," The Washington Quarterly, p. 34.

preventing conflicts and crises."¹⁵⁷ However, other international organizations have also contributed to the global efforts designed to alleviate many international concerns. Progressively nations have established the ability to coordinate and negotiate their interdependent global problems.

Mikhail Gorbachev and other new thinkers, have brought forward the works of Albert Einstein and Vladimir Il'ich Lenin, in an effort to find solutions to our global human problems. Solutions to these problems are indispensable for "assuring a lasting and just peace."¹⁵⁸ There is a need to break from the pre-nuclear age paradigm where armed conflict is acceptable. "Humanity is united by the shared realization that it has lost its immortality as a species, and that all-human values--essentially peace--are the sole guarantors of its survival."¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷Petrovsky, "New Thinking: Questions and Answers," PS: Political Science & Politics, p. 30.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 129.

¹⁵⁹Kubalkova and Cruickshank, Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking", p. 60.

CONCLUSION

The theory of realism is the current focal point in international relations. The proponents of the theory, from Morgenthau to Kissinger to Waltz, have outlined relations between nation-states through empirical data. However, this realist theory of international relations lacks vision. These theorists are preoccupied--they look at the world as it actually is--they do not look to what might be. This theory lacks direction--future direction.

We must look back once again to the precursors of realist thought. We must look to the writings of Thucydides and Machiavelli. Although their works illustrated their world as it actually existed, they looked beyond the examination and ventured forward by carefully outlining what might be. They both wrote about goals that should be developed--teaching us well how to work toward the future.

Thucydides envisioned the importance of freedom and equality. In particular, he outlines the democratic system of government as the most outstanding form of government. In "Pericles' Funeral Oration," Thucydides writes that Athens is a model in that "everyone is equal before the law."¹⁵⁹ He also states that "political...and...day-to-day

¹⁵⁹Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, p. 145.

life" is free.¹⁶⁰ These are ideal goals which are held up by Thucydides, and the same can be seen in Machiavelli's work.

Niccolo Machiavelli taught the prince how to rule and how to live. He tells his prince to take into account the "state of such resources as will enable him to stand on his own feet in case of need or whether he must always have the assistance of others."¹⁶¹ Machiavelli warns the prince about the need for alliances. This is a lesson that looks to the future through instruction of the prince.

While the precursors of realism had vision, modern realists do not. In assessing our world, it is evident that the time has come to move beyond realism to new thinking. We live in an interdependent world that has been realizing the political vision of the new thinkers for generations.

Although realists maintain that they look at the world as it actually is, they have overlooked the successful negotiations and cooperation that have marked international relations as envisioned by the new thinkers. Realists rely on empirical evidence; they look for historical events to analyse relations between nation-states. However, empirical and historical evidence is present for analysing relations between states as established by the new thinkers.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹⁶¹Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1947), p. 29.

Both realism and new thinking acknowledge the common interests that unite nation-states. Realists accept alliances developed throughout the international community due to diplomacy, negotiations and cooperation. These alliances are necessary to strengthen the power of the nation-state--its survival is paramount. New thinkers view such negotiations and cooperation as fundamental to the survival of humankind.

Realists see the world as it is, and say that treaties and international laws, although signed and ratified, are dependent on the nation-states that made the agreement. New thinkers envision such negotiations as resolutions to common interests and common threats. Historically and empirically it is evident that treaties and international laws have resulted in negotiated agreements that have been upheld internationally.

Sovereignty is an issue for independent nation-states--especially for the realists. However, the interdependence between states has created negotiations and cooperation that have resulted in shared responsibilities for many global issues as envisioned by the new thinkers.

Realists view war as a "reasoned response" to the world, a continuation of relations between nation-states. New thinkers see a world beyond war. Our limitless ability for utter destruction has made war unacceptable. It is time

to move beyond realism.

Although there are difficulties that arise from coexistence, there is a need to regulate relations between nation-states. New thinking unfolds the complexity of these international relations through international organizations. Each international agency varies in its size, scope and structure. These organizations may range from global to regional, specialized to multipurpose groups. The issues include aspects of war and peace to very technical problems--all in an effort to resolve international issues.¹²⁵

"With each passing year, international organizations such as the United Nations...become more essential to serving the vital requirements of states and...[their] goals of security and well-being for their central interests."¹²⁶ "Common interests and reciprocal obligations" have led nations to recognize the need for negotiations that culminate into treaties and agreements for international concerns.¹²⁷

"In our interdependent world, the duty to co-operate is

¹²⁵Inis L. Claude, Jr., Swords into Plowshares: the Problems and Progress of International Relations (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 4.

¹²⁶John S. Gibson, International Organizations, Constitutional Law, and Human Rights (New York: Praeger, 1991), p. ix.

¹²⁷Claude, Jr., Swords into Plowshares: the Problems and Progress of International Relations, p. 23.

already a firmly entrenched principal of international relations."¹²⁸ The following are three outlines of international issues and how international organizations and agencies have dealt with each problem. The first to be reviewed is human rights and the issue of hunger. The second to be examined is the environment and the issue of the depletion of the ozone layer. The third issue to be discussed is the problem of nuclear weapons and how negotiations have limited their use. Although there have been some struggles internationally, here are some of the successes that have helped alleviate part of the trouble that has been found throughout the world community.

It is interesting to note that realists have been very aware of the global human problems that have occurred upon our earth. However, as long as we keep the resolutions of these problems at the individual nation-state level, we will not overcome these troubles. We must cooperate and negotiate within our interdependent world to resolve our global problems. We must look beyond realism; we must begin new thinking.

The first issue to be uncovered is the basic human right to food. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered his

¹²⁸United Nations. Centre for Human Rights, Right to Adequate Food as a Human Right (New York: United Nations Publication, 1989), p. 43.

"Four Freedoms" speech in 1941, he outlined four fundamental freedoms of humankind including the "freedom from want."¹²⁹ Later, in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was established. Article 25 stipulates that "everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food..."¹³⁰ Even Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights declares freedom from hunger a fundamental right.¹³¹

Statistics are difficult to gather, however, "the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that 550 million people around the world suffer from chronic hunger."¹³² This figure translates into one in ten people throughout the world going hungry. This persistent hunger remains although we have technological advances and improved agricultural productivity.

"Most...nations affected by hunger fall into the more common pattern of poverty, underdevelopment, and poor growing conditions that have destroyed their ability to feed

¹²⁹Ibid., p.1.

¹³⁰Ibid., p. 17.

¹³¹Patricia L. Kutzner, World Hunger: a Reference Handbook (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1991), p. 76.

¹³²Mary H. Cooper, "World Hunger," The CO Researcher 1:24 (October 25, 1991), p. 803.

their populations."¹³³ Fortunately, nations have come together to deal with this fundamental human right--the freedom from hunger.

In 1943, the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture planned for a permanent organization to deal with this issue--it was named the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This organization defined the first cause of hunger as poverty.¹³⁴

Even with the establishment of the FAO, food aid remained an initiative of individual governments. However, in 1961 the Food and Agriculture Organization established the World Food Program. This program collected surplus food and cash from member countries of the United Nations "to provide relief in food emergencies."¹³⁵

In 1963, FAO convened the First World Food Congress, it was here that President John F. Kennedy challenged the world by stating:

So long as freedom from hunger is only half achieved, so long as two thirds of the nations have food deficits, no citizen, no nation can afford to be satisfied... We have the means, we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the

¹³³Ibid., pp. 804-805.

¹³⁴Kutzner, World Hunger: a Reference Handbook, p. 61.

¹³⁵Cooper, "World Hunger," The CO Researcher, p. 808.

earth...¹³⁶

In 1974, the United Nations General Assembly created the World Food Council. It was established as part of the relief effort for a widespread crop failure in the early 1970s. It coordinated food assistance and helped governments in long-term efforts to eliminate hunger.¹³⁷

The 1980s witnessed famine throughout much of Africa, and "half of the world's total food aid" was distributed to the continent.¹³⁸ Many organizations contributed to relief of the crisis including the United Nations. Today a challenge stems from the Bellagio Declaration which declares that we should overcome hunger in the 1990s.¹³⁹

Unfortunately, the hunger situation continues, but these efforts to resolve this issue have benefited the people of each affected nation-state. It is through these negotiations, in particular, through the help of the United Nations, that relief from hunger has been evident. The next area to be examined will be the environment and the issue of ozone depletion.

The ozone is a protective layer of gas that surrounds

¹³⁶Kutzner, World Hunger: a Reference Handbook, p. 73.

¹³⁷Cooper, "World Hunger," The CQ Researcher, p. 808.

¹³⁸Kutzner, World Hunger: a Reference Handbook, p. 111.

¹³⁹Ibid.

the earth's surface at an altitude of about fifteen miles. "It shields humans and other organisms from the most harmful effects of the sun's ultraviolet radiation."¹⁴⁰ A hole, or highly depleted section in this layer of gas, was discovered over the area of Antarctica in 1985.

It was thought to be confined over Antarctica, but in 1992 scientists at the United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) raised concerns about a thinning layer over the Northern Hemisphere including New England, Canada, Northern Europe, Russia, and China.¹⁴¹

The environmental effects of ozone depletion was investigated by a United States government organization whose findings showed that 50 percent ozone depletion would cause a number of devastating effects. They include skin "blistering after one hour of exposure."¹⁴² This would result in the required need of protective clothing for any activity done outside during daylight hours. Livestock would have to graze at dawn and dusk. The yield of crops including rice and soybeans would be reduced. These crops are essential for feeding much of the developing world. "Excessive ultraviolet radiation is also thought to disrupt

¹⁴⁰Mary H. Cooper, "Ozone Depletion," The CO Researcher 2:13 (April 3, 1992), p. 291.

¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 298.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 293.

photosynthesis the process by which green plants use the sun's radiant energy to produce carbohydrates."¹⁴³

The chemicals which have done so much damage to the ozone layer are chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). They are a synthetic chemical that is used as a coolant "in refrigerators and air conditioners, propellants in aerosol spray cans, blowing agents in the manufacture of plastic and rubber foam products and as solvents in the production of electronic equipment."¹⁴⁴

Once these chemicals are released into the atmosphere, they drift upward to the ozone layer.¹⁴⁵ "Intense ultraviolet radiation can break the CFC molecule apart, producing chlorine monoxide and setting off a series of reactions that destroy"¹⁴⁶ the ozone gases.

"International reaction to the proof that CFCs were destroying the ozone layer was swift."¹⁴⁷ The 1987 discovery of the hole above Antarctica resulted in unprecedented international support to protect the environment. Nine months after formal negotiations began, twenty-four nations

¹⁴³Ibid.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 291.

¹⁴⁵Ibid.

¹⁴⁶Ibid.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., p. 299.

signed the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. The nations that ratified the treaty accounted for ninety-nine percent of the world's production of CFCs and ninety percent of their consumption.¹⁴⁸

The Montreal Protocol called for reducing CFC emissions by fifty percent by 1998, and reducing CFC production and importation by fifty percent by 1999.¹⁴⁹ With the news that ozone depletion was intensifying over the Northern Hemisphere, the Montreal Protocol nations were quick to respond.¹⁵⁰ The agreement was amended to accelerate the phaseout of ozone depleting chemicals. "Under the new guidelines, all production and importation of CFCs...must stop by the year 2000."¹⁵¹

The response to this threat has provided a model for global cooperation. It is evident that nations can and do work together to resolve issues that affect each country internationally. This can even be seen with the international negotiations that have taken place regarding nuclear weapons.

The first atomic bomb was developed by the Manhattan

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹Ibid.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 300.

¹⁵¹Ibid.

Project, a top secret United States organization. The nuclear age was ushered in on August 6, 1945 when the A-bomb was dropped at Hiroshima by the U.S. during World War II. It killed more than 142,000 people and three days later another bomb was dropped on Nagasaki killing more than 79,000 people. In an instant, thousands of people were killed by a raging firestorm. The Japanese surrendered two weeks later--this ended World War II.¹⁵²

The first nuclear weapons brought with them the issue of national security. It was evident that their destructive power would enable a nation to overcome many threats against their nation's security. This lead nations, which possessed the technical and financial means, to construct a nuclear arsenal.¹⁵³ It also lead to the development of treaties to limit the misuse of the technology and the proliferation of the weapons themselves.

In 1957, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established with a mission to prevent the misuse of nuclear technology. It also was established to promote the peaceful use of nuclear power.¹⁵⁴

1963 witnessed the first limitation of nuclear weapons.

¹⁵²Rodman D. Griffin, "Nuclear Proliferation," The CO Researcher 2:21 (June 5, 1992), p. 487.

¹⁵³Ibid., p. 489.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 491.

The United States and the Soviet Union signed the Limited Test Ban Treaty restricting atmospheric testing. In 1968, sixty-two nations signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). These nations pledged not to develop nuclear weapons in exchange for security guarantees.¹⁵⁵ Today, one-hundred-forty-three countries have signed and agreed to the limitations of this treaty.

Nuclear proliferation has also been limited by export regulations. The Nuclear Suppliers Group was established in 1976 by the United States, Canada, West Germany, France, Japan, the Soviet Union and Great Britain.¹⁵⁶ The group currently has twenty-seven members that "endorse a uniform code for conducting international nuclear sales."¹⁵⁷

The Soviet Union and the United States have also signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) treaties which limit defensive and offensive nuclear strikes. SALT I was signed in 1972 and is known as the Anti-Ballistic Missile or ABM treaty and the Interim Agreement on Offensive Weapons. "It limits defensive systems designed to intercept and destroy attacking missiles."¹⁵⁸ The treaty also "prohibits

¹⁵⁵Ibid.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 489.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 489-490.

¹⁵⁸Teena Karsa Mayers, Understanding Weapons and Arms Control: a Guide to the Issues (Washington: Brassey's (US),

development, testing and deployment of sea-based, air-based, space-based, and mobile land based ABM systems and their component parts."¹⁵⁹ The Interim Agreement stopped the construction of new [InterContinental Ballistic Missile] ICBM silos and placed ceilings on weapon launchers."¹⁶⁰

In 1979, President Jimmy Carter and President Leonid Brezhnev signed SALT II. It was very detailed and among its limitations it ban the construction of any additional fixed ICBM launchers.¹⁶¹ It also ban deployment of new types of ICBMs, and ban an increase in the number of warheads on existing land-based ICBMs. The number of cruise missiles were also limited.

The Cold War is now over and along with it the arms race that led to the accumulation of thousands of nuclear weapons by the two superpowers.¹⁶² However, negotiations continue--the United States and the republics of the former Soviet Union have signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (START) which drastically cuts their arsenals. This treaty "will reduce their stockpile by forty percent over

Inc., 1991), p. 109.

¹⁵⁹Ibid.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 112.

¹⁶²Griffin, "Nuclear Proliferation," The CQ Researcher, p. 483.

the next five years."¹⁶³

As the realist examines history and evaluates what is, the new thinker looks to the future to develop what can be. The preceding examples demonstrate that cooperation and negotiation, for elements other than a nation-states power, have been established and must continue to be our global goal. This is why it is time to move beyond realism to new thinking.

It is evident that nuclear weapons, the environment, and human rights are all global issues which are dealt with by international organizations. These three problems demonstrate the ability of nation-states to come together, to negotiate and to work to resolve these issues that affect the international community. Mikhail Gorbachev and other new thinkers put forth a new theory of international relations. It's a theory that looks at the world as it is with all its efforts to come together and resolve issues that protect the security of nation-states throughout the world by ensuring the survival of humankind.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 483.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamishin, Anatoli. "Doomed to Discord?" New Times. 12 (1989): 14-16.
- Adamishin, Anatoli. "Doomed to Discord? Ideology and Foreign Policy." New Times. 13 (1989): 8-10
- Adamishin, Anatoli. "Humanity's Common Destiny." In Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, 43-54. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Art, Robert J. and Jervis, Robert. International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992.
- Barracclough, Solon L. An End to Hunger? The Social Origins of Food Strategies. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1991.
- Batygin, Gennady. "Towards Perpetual Peace." New Times. 46 (November 1988): 15.
- Belikov, Igor and Razpopov, Inko. "The Fate of an Idea." New Times. 25 (1989): 30-31
- Benedick, Richard Elliot. Ozone Diplomacy: New Directions in Safeguarding the Planet. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Bradly, Bill; Genscher, Hans-Dietrich; Ott, Harry; Whitehead, John C. Implications of Soviet New Thinking. New York: Institute for East-West Security Studies, 1987.
- Brown, Archie, ed. New Thinking in Soviet Politics. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Claude, Jr., Inis L. Swords into Plowshares: the Problems and Progress of International Organization. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Cleveland, Harlan. Birth of a New World: an Open Moment for International Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993.

- Cooper, Mary H. "Ozone Depletion." CO Researcher. 2:13
(April 3, 1992):289-312.
- Cooper, Mary H. "World Hunger." CO Researcher. 1:24
(October 25, 1991):801-824.
- Cross, Sharyl, "Gorbachev's Policy in Latin America:
Origins, Impact, and the Future." Communist and Post-
Communist Studies 26 (September 1993) 315-334.
- Dallin, Alexander, "New Thinking in Soviet Foreign Policy."
In New Thinking in Soviet Politics, ed. Archie Brown,
71-85. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Daniel, Joseph E., ed., et al. 1993 Earth Journal:
Environmental Almanac and Resource Directory. Boulder:
Buzzworm Books, 1992.
- Danopoulos, Constantine. Interview held at San Jose State
University, San Jose, California. August 1994.
- Deutsch, Karl W. The Analysis of International Relations.
Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Dougherty, James E., ed. and Pfaltzgraff, Jr., Robert L.,
ed. Contending Theories of International Relations: a
Comprehensive Survey. New York: Harper & Row,
Publishers, 1990.
- Fleron, Jr., Federic J., Hoffmann, Erik P., and Laird,
Robbin, eds. Soviet Foreign Policy: Classic and
Contemporary Issues. New York: Aldine de Gruyter,
1991.
- Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). "M.S.
Gorbachev's United Nations Address." Daily Report
Central Eurasia. (December 8, 1988): 11-19.
- Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). "The Military
Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact is the Doctrine of the
Defense of Peace and Socialism." Daily Report Soviet
Union (July 27, 1987): BB1-BB7.
- Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). "The
Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World." Daily
Report Soviet Union (September 17, 1987): 23-28.

- Gibson, John S. International Organizations, Constitutional Law and Human Rights. New York: Praeger, 1991.
- Gorbachov, M.S. Speeches and Writings. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1968.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail. At the Summit. New York: Richardson, Steirman & Black, 1988.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail. "Gorbachev Suggests Wider Role for U.N." The Current Digest of the Soviet Union 39:38 (October 21, 1987) 16-18.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail. Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail. "Time Interviews Gorbachev (Per Pravda)" The Current Digest of the Soviet Press 37:35 (September 25, 1985) 15-22.
- Griffin, Rodman D. "Nuclear Proliferation." The CQ Researcher 2:21 (June 5, 1992) 482-503.
- Ground Zero. Nuclear War: What's in it for You? New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982.
- Harding, H.F. The Speeches of Thucydides. Lawrence, Kansas: Coronada Press, 1973.
- Harris, Errol E. One World or None: Prescription for Survival. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1993.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. Reason in History: a General Introduction to the Philosophy of History. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, Inc. 1953.
- Holloway, David. "Gorbachev's New Thinking." Foreign Affairs 68:1 (1988/89) 66-81.
- Houlgate, Stephen. Freedom Truth and History: an Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy London: Routledge, 1991.
- The Hunger Project. Ending Hunger: an Idea Whose Time Has Come. New York: Praeger, 1985.

- Keohane, Robert O. International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory. Boulder: Westview Pres, 1989.
- Keohane, Robert O., ed. Neorealism and its Critics. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Kissinger, Henry A. A World Restored. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957.
- Korey, William. "Helsinki, Human Rights, and the Gorbachev Style." Ethics and International Affairs 1 (1987) 113.
- Kubalkova, V. and Cruickshank, A.A. Thinking New About Soviet "New Thinking." Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1989.
- Kulistikov, Vladimir. "The Last Dispatch from the Ideological Front." New Times. 11 (1989): 14-15.
- Kull, Steven. Burying Lenin: the Revolution in Soviet Ideology and Foreign Policy. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.
- Kutzner, Patricia L. World Hunger: a Reference Handbook. Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 1991.
- Kuznetsov, Vladlen. "Incompatible Ideologies, but..." New Times. 32 (August 1988): 11-12.
- Laqueur, Walter. "Glasnost Abroad: New Thinking in Foreign Policy." The Washington Quarterly 11:4 (Autumn 1988) 75-93.
- Laqueur, Walter and Rubin, Barry. The Human Rights Reader (New York: New American Library, 1989).
- Legvold, Robert. "The Revolution in Soviet Foreign Policy." Foreign Affairs 68:1 (1988/89): 82-98.
- Legvold, Robert. "The Revolution in Soviet Foreign Policy." In Soviet Foreign Policy: Classic and Contemporary Issues, ed. Frederic J. Fleron, Jr., Erik P. Hoffmann, and Robbin F. Laird, 357-369. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1991.
- Lerche, Jr., Charles O. and Said, Abdul Aziz. Concepts of International Politics in Global Perspective. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.

- Lijphart, Arend, ed. World Politics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Luck, Edward C. and Gati, Toby Trister. "Gorbachev, the United Nations and U.S. Policy." The Washington Quarterly 11:4 (Autumn 1988) 19-35.
- Lynch, Allen. Gorbachev's International Outlook: Intellectual Origins and Political Consequences. New York: Institute for East-West Security Studies, 1989.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli. Vol. 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Prince. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1947.
- Magaril, Sergei. "First Approach to a Multipart System in Diplomacy." In Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, 93-110. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Malashenko, Igor. "Freedom of Choice." New Times. 29 (July 1988): 11-12.
- Malashenko, Igor. "Ideals and Interests." New Times. 45 (November 1988): 26-28.
- Malashenko, Igor. "Washington Takes Time Out." New Times. 18 (1989): 10-11.
- Matveyeva, Tatiana. "Perestroika, Sixth Winter." In Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, 73-92. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Mayers, Teena Karsa. Understanding Weapons and Arms Control: a Guide to the Issues. Washington: Brassey's (US), Inc., 1991.
- Medvedev, Aleksandr. "The Soviet Union in an Interdependent World," In Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, 111-125. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

- Nathan, Otto and Norden, Heinz, ed. Einstein on Peace. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960.
- Nichols, W. Gary., ed. and Boykin, Milton L., ed. Arms Control and Nuclear Weapons: U.S. Policies and the National Interest. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Olson, William Clinton. The Theory and Practice of International Relations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987.
- Organski, A.F.K. World Politics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.
- "Ozone Depletion: All Together Now." The Economist, (November 16, 1991):109.
- Parkinson, F. The Philosophy of International Relations: a Study in the History of Thought. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Petrovsky, Vladimir. "New Thinking: Questions and Answers." PS: Political Science & Politics. 23:1 (March 1990): 29-32.
- Pleshakov, Konstantin. "The Soviet Union in an Interdependent World." In Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed. Boris Pyadyshev, 111-125. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Pumpyansky, Alexander. "Drama of an Idea." New Times. 3 (January 1989): 6-9.
- Pyadyshev, Boris, ed. Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Sakwa, Richard. Gorbachev and His Reforms 1985-1990. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1990.
- Scientific American. Arms Control and the Arms Race. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1985.
- Scientific American. Progress in Arms Control? San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1979.

- Shevardnadze, Eduard. "Ecology and Politics," In Russia and the World: New Views on Russian Foreign Policy, ed Boris Pyadyshev, 206-219. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Silin, Evgeny. "Elephants, Grass and Prejudice." New Times. 35 (August 1988): 14.
- Simes, Dimitri K. "Gorbachev: a New Foreign Policy?" Foreign Affairs 65:3 (1986) 477-500.
- Smith, Michael Joseph. Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986.
- Somerville, John, ed. and Santoni, Ronald E., ed. Social and Political Philosophy. New York: Anchor Books Doubleday, 1963.
- Strauss, Leo, ed. and Cropsey, Joseph, ed. History of Political Philosophy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War. New York: Penguin Books, 1980.
- Tucker, Robert C., ed. The Lenin Anthology. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975.
- United Nations. "UNICEF Pushes Efforts to Cut Child Deaths, Hunger." UN Chronicle: a Quarterly Magazine 28:2 (June 1991): 71-71.
- United Nations. United Nations Action in the Field of Human Rights. New York: United Nations, 1983.
- United Nations. "The World Food Programme at 30: Fighting Hunger, Feeding Hope." UN Chronicle: a Quarterly Magazine 30:3 (September 1993): 72.
- United Nations. Centre for Human Rights. Right to Adequate Food as a Human Right. Geneva: United Nations, 1989.
- U.S. Congress. Joint Committee Print. Committee on Foreign Affairs and Committee on Foreign Relation. Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1992. S. Prt. 103-7, 103d Congress, 1st Session, 1993.

- U.S. Congress. Senate. Weapons Proliferation in the New World Order. 102d Congress., 2nd Session, 1992.
- U.S. Council on Environmental Quality. Environmental Quality. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1992.
- Viotti, Paul R. and Kauppi, Mark V. International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1987.
- Viotti, Paul R. and Kauppi, Mark V. International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1993.
- Voigt, Carsten. "Five Reasons for Optimism." New Times 16 (1989): 13-15.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "Political Structures," In Neorealism and its Critics, ed. Robert O. Keohane, 70-97. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. Man, the State and War: a Theoretical Analysis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.