

# TAKING SIDES



Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in  
**World Politics**

TENTH EDITION

John T. Rourke

Student Web Site

**DUSHKIN ONLINE**



Northern Light

Free access

See inside front cover for details

# TAKING SIDES



---

Clashing Views on Controversial  
**Issues in World Politics**

TENTH EDITION

Selected, Edited, and with Introductions by

**John T. Rourke**  
*University of Connecticut*

**McGraw-Hill/Dushkin**  
A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies

---

*For my son and friend—John Michael*

Cover image: © 2002 by PhotoDisc, Inc.

Cover Art Acknowledgment  
Charles Vitelli

Copyright © 2002 by McGraw-Hill/Dushkin,  
A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., Guilford, Connecticut 06437

Copyright law prohibits the reproduction, storage, or transmission in any form by any means of any portion of this publication without the express written permission of McGraw-Hill/Dushkin and of the copyright holder (if different) of the part of the publication to be reproduced. The Guidelines for Classroom Copying endorsed by Congress explicitly state that unauthorized copying may not be used to create, to replace, or to substitute for anthologies, compilations, or collective works.

Taking Sides ® is a registered trademark of McGraw-Hill/Dushkin

Manufactured in the United States of America

Tenth Edition

23456789BAHBAH5432

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Taking sides: clashing views on controversial issues in world politics/selected, edited, and with introductions by John T. Rourke.—10th ed.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. World Politics—1989—. I. Rourke, John T., *comp.*  
909.82

0-07-248050-5

ISSN: 1094-754X



Printed on Recycled Paper



# Preface

**I**n the first edition of *Taking Sides*, I wrote of my belief in informed argument:

[A] book that debates vital issues is valuable and necessary. . . . [It is important] to recognize that world politics is usually not a subject of absolute rights and absolute wrongs and of easy policy choices. We all have a responsibility to study the issues thoughtfully, and we should be careful to understand all sides of the debates.

It is gratifying to discover, as indicated by the success of *Taking Sides* over nine editions, that so many of my colleagues share this belief in the value of a debate-format text.

The format of this edition follows a formula that has proved successful in acquainting students with the global issues that we face and generating discussion of those issues and the policy choices that address them. This book addresses 18 issues on a wide range of topics in international relations. Each issue has two readings: one pro and one con. Each is accompanied by an issue *introduction*, which sets the stage for the debate, provides some background information on each author, and generally puts the issue into its political context. Each issue concludes with a *postscript* that summarizes the debate, gives the reader paths for further investigation, and suggests additional readings that might be helpful. I have also provided relevant Internet site addresses (URLs) in each postscript and on the *On the Internet* page that accompanies each part opener. At the back of the book is a listing of all the *contributors to this volume*, which will give you information on the political scientists and commentators whose views are debated here.

I have continued to emphasize issues that are currently being debated in the policy sphere. The authors of the selections are a mix of practitioners, scholars, and noted political commentators.

**Changes to this edition** The dynamic, constantly changing nature of the world political system and the many helpful comments from reviewers have brought about significant changes to this edition. Of the 36 readings in this edition, 33, or 92 percent, are new, with only 3 readings being carried over from the previous edition.

The kaleidoscopic dynamism of the international system is also evident in the high turnover in issues from one edition to the next of this reader. Only 2 (11 percent) of the 18 issues are carried over in toto from the previous edition. In contrast, 10 issues (56 percent) are completely new. They are: *Should Greater Global Governance Be Resisted?* (Issue 2); *Will State Sovereignty Survive Globalism?*

(Issue 3); *Should the United States Seek Global Hegemony?* (Issue 4); *Is China an Expansionist Power?* (Issue 6); *Should Sanctions Against Iraq Be Continued?* (Issue 8); *Is the Capitalist Model for Third World Development Destructive?* (Issue 9); *Does the International Monetary Fund Do More Harm Than Good?* (Issue 10); *Is There a Great Danger From Chemical or Biological Terrorism?* (Issue 12); *Did the NATO Military Action Against Yugoslavia Violate Just War Theory?* (Issue 14); and *Is Violence as a Form of Protest on International Political Issues Always Wrong?* (Issue 17).

Another 6 issues have been recast to reflect changes in the specific concerns related to general topics that were included in the last edition. These “semi-new” debates are: *Is Economic Globalism a Positive Trend?* (Issue 1); *Is Russia Likely to Become an Antagonistic Power?* (Issue 5); *Should Israel Take a Hard Line With the Palestinians?* (Issue 7); *Should U.S. Military Spending Be Increased?* (Issue 11); *Should the United Nations Be Given Stronger Peacekeeping Capabilities?* (Issue 13); and *Is Dangerous Global Warming Occurring?* (Issue 18).

It is important to note that the changes to this edition from the last should not disguise the fact that most of the issues address enduring human concerns, such as global political organization, arms and arms control, justice, development, and the environment. Also important is the fact that many of the issues have both a specific and a larger topic. For instance, Issue 13 is about the specific topic of strengthening the UN’s peacekeeping (or peacemaking) ability, but it is also about more general topics. These include whether or not international organizations should be given supranational powers; the propriety of interventionism using UN, NATO, or international forces; and the argument by some small countries that there is a growing neocolonialism in the world today.

**A word to the instructor** An *Instructor’s Manual With Test Questions* (multiple-choice and essay) is available through the publisher for instructors using *Taking Sides* in the classroom. A general guidebook, *Using Taking Sides in the Classroom*, which discusses methods and techniques for integrating the pro-con approach into any classroom setting, is also available. An online version of *Using Taking Sides in the Classroom* and a correspondence service for *Taking Sides* adopters can be found at <http://www.dushkin.com/usingsides/>.

*Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in World Politics* is only one title in the *Taking Sides* series. If you are interested in seeing the table of contents for any of the other titles, please visit the *Taking Sides* Web site at <http://www.dushkin.com/takingsides/>.

**A note especially for the student reader** You will find that the debates in this book are not one-sided. Each author strongly believes in his or her position. And if you read the debates without prejudging them, you will see that each author makes cogent points. An author may not be “right,” but the arguments made in an essay should not be dismissed out of hand, and you should work at remaining tolerant of those who hold beliefs that are different from your own.



There is an additional consideration to keep in mind as you pursue this debate approach to world politics. To consider divergent views objectively does not mean that you have to remain forever neutral. In fact, once you are informed, ought to form convictions. More important, you should try to influence international policy to conform better with your beliefs. Write letters to policymakers; donate to causes you support; work for candidates who agree with your views; join an activist organization. *Do* something, whichever side of an issue you are on!

**Acknowledgments** I received many helpful comments and suggestions from colleagues and readers across the United States and Canada. Their suggestions have markedly enhanced the quality of this edition of *Taking Sides*. If as you read this book you are reminded of a selection or an issue that could be included in a future edition, please write to me in care of McGraw-Hill/Dushkin with your recommendations.

My thanks go to those who responded with suggestions for the tenth edition:

**Francis Adams**  
*Old Dominion University*

**Scott Bennett**  
*Pennsylvania State University*

**Lewis Brownstein**  
*SUNY College at New Paltz*

**Michael DeMichele**  
*University of Scranton*

**Gary Donato**  
*Three Rivers Community Technical College*

**June Teufel Dreyer**  
*University of Miami*

**Roger Durham**  
*Aquinas College*

**Timothy L. Elliot**  
*Brigham Young University*

**Kevin Ellsworth**  
*Arizona State University*

**Tahmineh Entessar**  
*Webster University*

**Marc Genest**  
*University of Rhode Island*

**Monir Saad Girgis**  
*Edinboro University of Pennsylvania*

**Donald Grieve**  
*Northwood University*

**Mark Griffith**  
*University of West Alabama*

**Kenneth Hall**  
*Ball State University*

**Dennis Hart**  
*Kent State University*

**Ngozi C. Kamalu**  
*Fayetteville State University*

**Wei-chin Lee**  
*Wake Forest University*

**Guioli Liu**  
*College of Charleston*

**Nelson Madore**  
*Thomas College*

**Timothy Nordstrom**  
*Pennsylvania State University*

**Arnold Oliver**  
*Heidelberg College*

**Peter Sanchez**  
*Loyola University*

**John Seitz**  
*Wofford College*

**Zhe Sun**

*Ramapo College of New Jersey*

**Christopher Van Aller**

*Winthrop University*

**Melvin M. Vuk**

*New Mexico State University*

**Jutta Weldes**

*Kent State University*

I would also like to thank Ted Knight, list manager for the Taking Sides series, and David Brackley, senior developmental editor, for their help in refining this edition.

**John T. Rourke**

*University of Connecticut*





# Introduction

## World Politics and the Voice of Justice

John T. Rourke

Some years ago, the Rolling Stones recorded “Sympathy With the Devil.” If you have never heard it, go find a copy. It is worth listening to. The theme of the song is echoed in a wonderful essay by Marshall Berman, “Have Sympathy for the Devil” (*New American Review*, 1973). The common theme of the Stones’ and Berman’s works is based on Johann Goethe’s *Faust*. In that classic drama, the protagonist, Dr. Faust, trades his soul to gain great power. He attempts to do good, but in the end he commits evil by, in contemporary paraphrase, “doing the wrong things for the right reasons.” Does that make Faust evil, the personification of the devil Mephistopheles among us? Or is the good doctor merely misguided in his effort to make the world better as he saw it and imagined it might be? The point that the Stones and Berman make is that it is important to avoid falling prey to the trap of many zealots who are so convinced of the truth of their own views that they feel righteously at liberty to condemn those who disagree with them as stupid or even diabolical.

It is to the principle of rational discourse, of tolerant debate, that this reader is dedicated. There are many issues in this volume that appropriately excite passion—for example, Issue 7 on whether or not Israel should follow a hard-line policy toward the Palestinians or Issue 12, which examines the degree of danger from chemical or biological terrorism. Few would deny, for example, that a danger from terrorism exists. But what is not clear is whether or not the degree of danger warrants a crash program to prevent chemical and biological (and nuclear) terrorism and to react to such an attack if it were to happen. Are scenarios such as those portrayed in the 1998 film *The Siege* in our future?

In other cases, the debates you will read do diverge on goals. In Issue 2 Mark Leonard argues that the world will be better off if countries accept greater governance from international organizations and law. Therefore, Leonard favors working toward the goal of greater global governance. Marc A. Thiessen disagrees vigorously and is dedicated to the goal of maintaining national sovereignty by resisting global governance.

As you will see, each of the authors in all the debates strongly believes in his or her position. If you read these debates objectively, you will find that each side makes cogent points. They may or may not be right, but they should not be dismissed out of hand. It is also important to repeat that the debate format does not imply that you should remain forever neutral. In fact, once you are informed, you *ought* to form convictions, and you should try to act on those



convictions and try to influence international policy to conform better with your beliefs. Ponder the similarities in the views of two very different leaders, a very young president in a relatively young democracy and a very old emperor in a very old country: In 1963 President John F. Kennedy, in recalling the words of the author of the epoch poem *The Divine Comedy* (1321), told a West German audience, "Dante once said that the hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintain their neutrality." That very same year, while speaking to the United Nations, Ethiopia's emperor Haile Selassie (1892–1975) said, "Throughout history it has been the inaction of those who could have acted, the indifference of those who should have known better, the silence of the voice of justice when it mattered most that made it possible for evil to triumph."

The point is: Become Informed. Then *do* something! Write letters to policymakers, donate money to causes you support, work for candidates with whom you agree, join an activist organization, or any of the many other things that you can do to make a difference. What you do is less important than that you do it.

## Approaches to Studying International Politics

As will become evident as you read this volume, there are many approaches to the study of international politics. Some political scientists and most practitioners specialize in *substantive topics*, and this reader is organized along topical lines. Part 1 (Issues 1 through 3) features a series of related debates on the evolution of the international system in the direction of greater globalization. The most pronounced changes have been in the economic sphere, and the staff of the International Monetary Fund and Scott Marshall engage in a debate about whether or not increasing global economic interdependence is a positive trend. Issue 2 takes up the relatively less advanced but still important aspect of globalization represented by the growth in the importance of international organizations and international law. The final topic in Part 1 engages Stephen D. Krasner and Kimberly Weir in a debate over whether countries will continue to maintain their sovereignty in the future or become at least partially subordinate to regional and global organizations.

Part 2 (Issues 4 through 8) focuses on country-specific issues, including the role of the United States in the international system, the future diplomatic postures of Russia and China, relations between Israel and the Palestinians, and UN sanctions on Iraq. Part 3 (Issues 9 and 10) deals with specific concerns of the international economy, a topic introduced more generally in Issue 1. With the United States and other wealthy capitalist countries dominating the international system, there is great pressure on less developed countries to follow the capitalist model in trying to better their economies. In Issue 9, Vandana Shiva, an analyst in India, maintains that the capitalist model of development is often destructive. Bill Emmott, who edits the well-known British publication *The Economist*, takes the opposite point of view and says that capitalism is the surest and fastest path to development for the Third World. Then, in Issue 10, the debate turns to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), one of the international

financial institutions that, among other things, strongly promotes the capitalist model. In this issue, a trio of authors condemn the IMF for doing more harm than good, while the former head of the IMF defends the institution's policies.

Part 4 (Issues 11 and 12) examines military security. Defense expenditures by the United States far outstrip those of any other country, yet both Al Gore and George W. Bush, the primary candidates for president in 2000, advocated increased military spending. Issue 11 debates whether current and projected threats warrant increased spending or, alternatively, might allow significant cuts in the U.S. defense budget. This debate is followed by the focus in Issue 12 on the growing concern over what is known as "asymmetrical" warfare, or the use of terrorism to attack countries that are relatively invulnerable to conventional military attack, such as the United States. The use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons of mass destruction is of particular concern. James Campbell and Jonathan Tucker both recognize the threat, but they disagree on how acute the danger is.

Part 5 (Issues 13 through 15) addresses controversies related to international law and organizations. The ability of the United Nations to deploy effective peacekeeping forces is severely constrained by a number of factors, and in Issue 13, Lionel Rosenblatt and Larry Thompson contend that enhancing the strength of UN peacekeepers would represent progress. John Hillen disputes this view, arguing that the UN was never intended to have a powerful military arm and that it would be an error to create such a capability. There are also a number of important controversies surrounding the application of international law in world politics. Issue 14 takes up one of these, exploring whether the U.S.-led NATO intervention in Yugoslavia was just. The two authors, one a colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps, the other the president of the United States, disagree over whether or not both the reasons for the intervention and the manner in which the war was waged met the test of just war theory. The issue on the law of war flows into the debate in Issue 15, which evaluates the wisdom of establishing a permanent international criminal court to punish those who violate the law of war. It is easy to advocate such a court as long as it is trying and sometimes punishing alleged war criminals from other countries. But one has to understand that one day a citizen of one's own country could be put on trial.

Part 6, which includes Issues 16 through 18, takes up global moral, social, and environmental issues. There can be little doubt that national and international politics have historically been dominated by males. There can also be little doubt that women are more frequently playing larger roles in the world by, among other things, holding such positions as president, prime minister, and foreign secretary. Issue 16 considers the potential impact of the growing role of women on the level of violence in the world. Certainly, equity demands that women have the same opportunity as men to achieve leadership positions. But will that equity also promote a decrease in world violence? Therein lies the debate. The focus in Part 6 then switches to political activism. One would be hard-pressed to find any serious analyst today who would disagree with the proposition that political activism by citizens is good, even necessary to the survival of democracy. The boundaries of that activity are debated in Issue 17,

with Satish Kumar and Jake Bowers differing over whether or not there is a legitimate role for political violence. Finally, the environment is addressed in Issue 18, which focuses on the degree of danger posed by global warming.

Political scientists also approach their subject from differing *methodological perspectives*. We will see, for example, that world politics can be studied from different *levels of analysis*. The question is, What is the basic source of the forces that shape the conduct of politics? Possible answers are world forces, the individual political processes of the specific countries, or the personal attributes of a country's leaders and decision makers. Various readings will illustrate all three levels.

Another way for students and practitioners of world politics to approach their subject is to focus on what is called the realist versus the idealist debate. Realists tend to assume that the world is permanently flawed and therefore advocate following policies in their country's narrow self-interests. Idealists take the approach that the world condition can be improved substantially by following policies that, at least in the short term, call for some risk or self-sacrifice. This divergence is an element of many of the debates in this book.

## Dynamics of World Politics

The action on the global stage today is vastly different from what it was a few decades ago, or even a few years ago. *Technology* is one of the causes of this change. Technology has changed communications, manufacturing, health care, and many other aspects of the human condition. Technology has given humans the ability to create biological, chemical, and nuclear compounds and other material that in relatively small amounts have the ability to kill and injure huge numbers of people. Issue 12 frames a debate over whether or not we humans have created a monster that constitutes a dire threat. Another negative byproduct of technology may well be global warming, which is caused by the vastly increased discharges of carbon dioxide and other "greenhouse" gases into the atmosphere that have resulted from industrialization, the advent of air conditioning, and many other technological advances. These effects are taken up in Issue 18.

Another dynamic aspect of world politics involves the *changing axes* of the world system. For about 40 years after World War II ended in 1945, a bipolar system existed, the primary axis of which was the *East-West* conflict, which pitted the United States and its allies against the Soviet Union and its allies. Now that the cold war is over, one broad debate is over what role the United States should play. A related issue is whether or not there are potential enemies to the United States and its allies and, if so, who they are. The advocates on either side of Issue 4 disagree about whether or not the United States should try to dominate international politics. As for potential rivals to U.S. hegemony, Issues 5 and 6 deal with Russia and China, two cold war antagonists of the United States. Some people believe that one or both of these countries, or even both of them in alliance, could pose a threat in the future. As such, the two debates, beyond the specific issues involved in them, also deal with how to interact with former and potential enemies. Issue 11 takes an even broader look at the future

of U.S. security, with two analysts debating whether the approximately \$300 billion the United States spends annually on its military should be increased or decreased.

Technological changes and the shifting axes of international politics also highlight the *increased role of economics* in world politics. Economics have always played a role, but traditionally the main focus has been on strategic-political questions—especially military power. This concern still strongly exists, but it now shares the international spotlight with economic issues. One important change in recent decades has been the rapid growth of regional and global markets and the promotion of free trade and other forms of international economic interchange. As Issue 1 on economic interdependence indicates, many people support these efforts and see them as the wave of the future. But there are others who believe that free economic interchange undermines sovereignty and the ability of governments to control their destinies. One topic related to control, which is taken up in Issue 9, is whether or not the developed countries should insist that less developed countries follow a capitalist development model. That topic is addressed in even greater depth in Issue 10, which examines the policies of the International Monetary Fund and asks whether the IMF is making a contribution or using the desperation of needy countries to impose alien and often destructive standards on those countries.

Another change in the world system has to do with the main *international* actors. At one time states (countries) were practically the only international actors on the world stage. Now, and increasingly so, there are other actors. Some actors are regional. Others, such as the United Nations, are global actors. At the broadest level, Issue 2 takes up the governance role of these actors. This is followed by Issue 3, which examines the future of countries as the principal and sovereign actors in the international system. Turning to the most notable international organization, Issue 13 examines the call for strengthening the peacekeeping and peacemaking capability of the United Nations by establishing a permanent UN military force. And Issue 15 focuses on whether or not a supranational criminal court should be established to take over the prosecution and punishment of war criminals from the domestic courts and ad hoc tribunals that have sometimes dealt with these cases in the past.

## Perceptions Versus Reality

In addition to addressing the general changes in the world system outlined above, the debates in this reader explore the controversies that exist over many of the fundamental issues that face the world.

One key to these debates is the differing *perceptions* that protagonists bring to them. There may be a reality in world politics, but very often that reality is obscured. Many observers, for example, are alarmed by the seeming rise in radical actions by Islamic fundamentalists. However, the image of Islamic radicalism is not a fact but a perception; perhaps correct, perhaps not. In cases such as this, though, it is often the perception, not the reality, that is more important because policy is formulated on what decision makers *think*, not necessarily on what *is*. Thus, perception becomes the operating guide, or *operational reality*,

whether it is true or not. Perceptions result from many factors. One factor is the information that decision makers receive. For a variety of reasons, the facts and analyses that are given to leaders are often inaccurate or represent only part of the picture. The conflicting perceptions of Israelis and Palestinians, for example, make the achievement of peace in Israel very difficult. Many Israelis and Palestinians fervently believe that the conflict that has occurred in the region over the past 50 years is the responsibility of the other. Both sides also believe in the righteousness of their own policies. Even if both sides are well-meaning, the perceptions of hostility that each holds means that the operational reality often has to be violence. These differing perceptions are a key element in the debate in Issue 7.

A related aspect of perception is the tendency to see oneself differently than some others do. The tendency is to see oneself as benevolent and to perceive rivals as sinister. This reverse image is partly at issue in the debates over U.S. defense expenditures (Issue 11) and China's future (Issue 6). Most Americans, especially those who favor increased defense expenditures, see U.S. policy as benign and the U.S. military as purely defensive. Americans are apt to see the recent changes in China, which include a more active regional role and increased military spending, as threatening. Most analysts in China see a reverse image, picturing themselves as arming to defend China against a United States with hegemonic intentions. Perceptions, then, are crucial to understanding international politics. It is important to understand objective reality, but it is also necessary to comprehend subjective reality in order to be able to predict and analyze another country's actions.

## Levels of Analysis

Political scientists approach the study of international politics from different levels of analysis. The most macroscopic view is *system-level analysis*. This is a top-down approach that maintains that world factors virtually compel countries to follow certain foreign policies. Governing factors include the number of powerful actors, geographic relationships, economic needs, and technology. System analysts hold that a country's internal political system and its leaders do not have a major impact on policy. As such, political scientists who work from this perspective are interested in exploring the governing factors, how they cause policy, and how and why systems change.

After the end of World War II, the world was structured as a *bipolar* system, dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union. Furthermore, each superpower was supported by a tightly organized and dependent group of allies. For a variety of reasons, including changing economics and the nuclear standoff, the bipolar system has faded. Some political scientists argue that the bipolar system is being replaced by a *multipolar* system. In such a configuration, those who favor *balance-of-power* politics maintain that it is unwise to ignore power considerations.

*State-level analysis* is the middle and most common level of analysis. Social scientists who study world politics from this perspective focus on how countries, singly or comparatively, make foreign policy. In other words, this

perspective is concerned with internal political dynamics, such as the roles of and interactions between the executive and legislative branches of government, the impact of bureaucracy, the role of interest groups, and the effect of public opinion. The dangers of global warming, which are debated in Issue 18, extend beyond rarified scientific controversy to important issues of public policy. Should the United States and other industrialized countries adopt policies that are costly in economic and lifestyle terms to significantly reduce the emission of greenhouse gases? This debate pits interest groups against one another as they try to get the governments of their respective countries to support or reject the Kyoto Treaty and other efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To a large degree, it is the environmentalists versus the business groups.

A third level of analysis, which is the most microscopic, is *human-level analysis*. This approach focuses, in part, on the role of individual decision makers. This technique is applied under the assumption that individuals make decisions and that the nature of those decisions is determined by the decision makers' perceptions, predilections, and strengths and weaknesses. Human-level analysis also focuses on average citizens, and Issue 17 explores whether or not those who disagree with policy and who find that they cannot change it through peaceful means are ever justified in resorting to violence as a political tool.

## **Realism Versus Idealism**

Realism and idealism represent another division among political scientists and practitioners in their approaches to the study and conduct of international relations. *Realists* are usually skeptical about the nature of politics and, perhaps, the nature of humankind. They tend to believe that countries have opposing interests and that these differences can lead to conflict. They further contend that states (countries) are by definition obligated to do what is beneficial for their own citizens (national interest). The amount of power that a state has will determine how successful it is in attaining these goals. Therefore, politics is, and ought to be, a process of gaining, maintaining, and using power. Realists are apt to believe that the best way to avoid conflict is to remain powerful and to avoid pursuing goals that are beyond one's power to achieve. "Peace through strength" is a phrase that most realists would agree with.

*Idealists* disagree with realists about both the nature and conduct of international relations. They tend to be more optimistic that the global community is capable of finding ways to live in harmony and that it has a sense of collective, rather than national, interest. Idealists also maintain that the pursuit of a narrow national interest is shortsighted. They argue that, in the long run, countries must learn to cooperate or face the prospect of a variety of evils, including nuclear warfare, environmental disaster, and continuing economic hardship. Idealists argue, for example, that armaments cause world tensions, whereas realists maintain that conflict requires states to have weapons. Idealists are especially concerned with conducting current world politics on a more moral or ethical plane and with searching for alternatives to the present pursuit of nationalist interests through power politics.



Many of the issues in this volume address the realist-idealist split. Realists and idealists differ over whether or not states can and should surrender enough of their freedom of action and pursuit of self-interest to cooperate through and, to a degree, subordinate themselves to international organizations. This is one basis of disagreement in Issue 13, which contemplates a permanent UN military force. Realists and idealists also disagree on whether or not moral considerations should play a strong role in determining foreign policy. What constitutes morality is the focus of debate between realist William DeCamp III and Bill Clinton in Issue 14. Issue 15 then takes up who should sit in judgment of those accused of violating just war theory and other standards of international law and morality. The Lawyer's Committee for Human Rights argues that the proposed International Criminal Court is the proper vehicle to dispense justice; John Bolton rejects that view.

## **The Political and Ecological Future**

Future *world alternatives* are discussed in many of the issues in this volume. Abraham Lincoln once said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." One suspects that the 16th president might say something similar about the world today if he were with us. Issue 1, for example, debates whether or not growing economic interdependence is a positive or negative trend. The debate in Issue 2 on whether increased global governance should be encouraged or resisted is about how we establish laws and norms and at what level (international, national, or local) policies should be implemented. There can be little doubt that the role of global governance is growing; that reality is the spark behind the debate in Issue 3 over whether or not the traditional sovereignty of states will persist in a time of increasing globalization. More specific debates about the future are taken up in many of the selections that follow this triad of debates in Part 1. Far-reaching alternatives to a state-centric system based on sovereign countries include international organizations taking over some (or all) of the sovereign responsibilities of national governments, such as peacekeeping and peacemaking (Issue 13) or the prosecution of international war criminals (Issue 15). The global future also involves the ability of the world to prosper economically while, at the same time, not denuding itself of its natural resources or destroying the environment. This is the focus of Issue 18 on global warming.

## **The Axes of World Division**

It is a truism that the world is politically dynamic and that the nature of the political system is undergoing profound change. As noted, the once-primary axis of world politics, the East-West confrontation, has broken down. Yet a few vestiges of the conflict on that axis remain.

In contrast to the moribund East-West axis, the *North-South axis* has increased in importance and tension. The wealthy, industrialized countries (North) are on one end, and the poor, less developed countries (LDCs, South) are at the other extreme. Economic differences and disputes are the primary dimension of this axis, in contrast to the military nature of the East-West axis.

Issues 9 and 10 explore these differences and debate the terms under which the North should give economic aid to the South.

The North-South division is one of the outstanding issues in the debate over global warming and the Kyoto treaty in Issue 18. The poorer countries of the South have won an exemption from the requirement to cut down greenhouse gas emissions. Their argument is that they give off much less of such gases than the industrialized countries do. Moreover, the countries of the South say that they will not be able to achieve industrialization if they are required to curtail their economic activity. Some in the North, especially in the economic sector, argue that saddling the North with restrictions and not applying them to the South will not solve the problem (because increased emissions in the South will offset declining emissions in the North) and will also result in unacceptable economic burdens to the North.

Then there is the question of what, if anything, will develop to divide the countries of the North and replace the East-West axis. The possibility for tension is represented in several issues. Some believe that the remnants of the USSR, especially Russia, will one day again pose a threat to the rest of Europe. That concern is the backdrop to Issue 5. A provocative idea of political scientist Samuel Huntington is that cultures will be the basis of a new, multiaxial dimension of global antagonism. If that comes to pass, then it might be that most of what Huntington calls the Western countries will be one step in the formation of one part of the axis. One cultural group that Huntington projects to be an antagonist of the West centers on China, as discussed in Issue 6.

## **Increased Role of Economics**

As the growing importance of the North-South axis indicates, economics are playing an increased role in world politics. The economic reasons behind the decline of the East-West axis is further evidence. Economics have always played a part in international relations, but the traditional focus has been on strategic-political affairs, especially questions of military power.

Political scientists, however, are now increasingly focusing on the international political economy, or the economic dimensions of world politics. International trade, for instance, has increased dramatically, expanding from an annual world exports total of \$20 billion in 1933 to \$6.5 trillion in 1997. The impact has been profound. The domestic economic health of most countries is heavily affected by trade and other aspects of international economics. Since World War II there has been an emphasis on expanding free trade by decreasing tariffs and other barriers to international commerce. In recent years, however, a downturn in the economies of many of the industrialized countries has increased calls for more protectionism. Yet restrictions on trade and other economic activity can also be used as diplomatic weapons. The intertwining of economies and the creation of organizations to regulate them, such as the World Trade Organization, is raising issues of sovereignty and other concerns. This is a central matter in the debate in Issue 1 over whether or not the trend toward global economic integration is desirable.

## Conclusion

Having discussed many of the various dimensions and approaches to the study of world politics, it is incumbent on this editor to advise against your becoming too structured by them. Issues of focus and methodology are important both to studying international relations and to understanding how others are analyzing global conduct. However, they are also partially pedagogical. In the final analysis, world politics is a highly interrelated, perhaps seamless, subject. No one level of analysis, for instance, can fully explain the events on the world stage. Instead, using each of the levels to analyze events and trends will bring the greatest understanding.

Similarly, the realist-idealist division is less precise in practice than it may appear. As some of the debates indicate, each side often stresses its own standards of morality. Which is more moral: defeating a dictatorship or sparing the sword and saving lives that would almost inevitably be lost in the dictator's overthrow? Furthermore, realists usually do not reject moral considerations. Rather, they contend that morality is but one of the factors that a country's decision makers must consider. Realists are also apt to argue that standards of morality differ when dealing with a country as opposed to an individual. By the same token, most idealists do not completely ignore the often dangerous nature of the world. Nor do they argue that a country must totally sacrifice its short-term interests to promote the betterment of the current and future world. Thus, realism and idealism can be seen most accurately as the ends of a continuum—with most political scientists and practitioners falling somewhere between, rather than at, the extremes. The best advice, then, is this: think broadly about international politics. The subject is very complex, and the more creative and expansive you are in selecting your foci and methodologies, the more insight you will gain. To end where we began, with Dr. Faust, I offer his last words in Goethe's drama, "*Mehr licht*," ... More light! That is the goal of this book.

