



世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书



# 国际关系理论论争：现实主义与新自由主义的挑战

CONTROVERSIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY:  
REALISM AND THE NEOLIBERAL CHALLENGE

〔美〕 Charles W. Kegley, Jr. 主编



北京大学出版社  
Peking University Press



## 1985 年 8 月 1 日 星期一

1985 年 8 月 1 日 星期一

1985 年 8 月 1 日 星期一



1985 年 8 月 1 日 星期一

# **Controversies in International Relations Theory**

**Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge**

Charles W. Kegley, Jr.  
*University of South Carolina*

Peking University Press  
Beijing

**著作权合同登记 图字:01-2004-0258**

Keyley: *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*.

Copyright © 1995 Wadsworth, a division of Thomson Learning.

All rights reserved. Jointly published by Peking University Press and Thomson Learning. This edition is only for sale in the People's Republic of China (excluding Hong Kong, Macau SARs and Taiwan).

ISBN: 0-312-09653-4

本书英文影印版由北京大学出版社和汤姆森学习出版集团合作出版。此影印版只限在中国大陆地区销售(不包括香港、澳门、台湾地区)。未经出版者书面许可,不得以任何方式抄袭、复制或节录书中的任何部分。

版权所有,翻印必究。

**图书在版编目(CIP)数据**

国际关系理论论争:现实主义与新自由主义的挑战/(美)凯格利主编. —影印本. —北京:北京大学出版社, 2004.1

(世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书)

ISBN 7-301-06785-2

I. 国… II. 凯… III. 国际关系理论—高等学校—教材—英文 IV. D80

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2003) 第 110622 号

**书 名: 国际关系理论论争:现实主义与新自由主义的挑战**

(*Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*)

著作责任者: [美] Charles W. Kegley, Jr. 主编

责任编辑: 耿协峰

标准书号: ISBN 7-301-06785-2/D·0807

出版发行: 北京大学出版社

地 址: 北京市海淀区中关村北京大学校内 100871

网 址: <http://cbs.pku.edu.cn>

电 话: 邮购部 62752015 发行部 62750672 编辑部 62753121

电子信箱: [zpup@pup.pku.edu.cn](mailto:zpup@pup.pku.edu.cn)

排 版 者: 兴盛达打字服务社

印 刷 者: 北京大学印刷厂

经 销 者: 新华书店

787 毫米×960 毫米 16 开本 24.25 印张 698 千字

2004 年 1 月第 1 版 2004 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 41.00 元

# 《世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书》

## 学术顾问

(按姓氏拼音排序)

贾庆国(北京大学国际关系学院)

倪世雄(复旦大学公共事务与国际关系学院)

潘 维(北京大学国际关系学院)

秦亚青(外交学院)

时殷弘(中国人民大学国际关系学院)

宋新宁(中国人民大学国际关系学院)

王缉思(中国社会科学院美国研究所、中共中央党校战略研究所)

王逸舟(中国社会科学院世界经济与政治研究所)

王正毅(北京大学国际关系学院)

许振洲(北京大学国际关系学院)

阎学通(清华大学国际问题研究所)

袁 明(北京大学国际关系学院)

## 出版说明

引进和交流,是国际研究诸学科发展壮大所不可或缺的环节和纽带。没有引进和交流,学术就难以活跃,也不易创新。每一位从事世界政治与国际关系研究的学者、每一位学习世界政治与国际关系的学生,无不深感阅读外文原文文献的重要性,他们都深知,原文的报刊、教材和专著,是获取最新国际信息、最新理论论争、最新参考资料的必不可少的重要来源,而获得这样的原文文献的机会是不均等的,因此,他们极其渴望更为方便地直接接触到原文文献。而在目前不易直接在国内购买原版书籍的情况下,采取原版影印的方式引进国际上的优秀教材和专著是解决问题的一条捷径,如此就可以使国内普通读者方便地获得最有权威的原文读物,从而可以快速了解国外同行的教学和学术成果,为深入学习和研究、为开展有效的对外学术交流、也为国际关系诸学科在我国的发展打下更坚实的基础。

这套“世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书”,正是基于上述认识而组织出版的,并且得到了我国国际关系教学与科研领域最有权威的专家教授们的认可,他们分别来自于北京大学国际关系学院、复旦大学国际关系与公共事务学院、中国人民大学国际关系学院、外交学院、清华大学国际问题研究所、中国社会科学院世界经济与政治研究所、中共中央党校战略研究所等单位,作为本套丛书的学术顾问,他们愿意向我国该学科及相关领域的广大学者和学生共同推荐这套丛书。

本丛书第一批先行选入几本经典文献选读性质的国外优秀教材,内容主要在国际关系理论方面,也包括国际政治经济学方面的优秀教材。它们皆可称为原文中的精品,值得研读和收藏,不仅如此,由于它们本身在国外的大学课堂里都是应用较广的教材和读物,所以特别适合作为我国国际关系与世界政治专业大学教学中的参考读物,甚至可以直接作为以外文授课的课堂教材。在每本书的前面,我们都邀请国内比较权威的专家学者撰写了精彩的导论,以指导读者更好地阅读和使用这些文献。

今后,我们会陆续推出更新、更好的原版教材和专著,希望广大读者提出宝贵意见和建议,尤其欢迎更多的专家学者向我们推荐适合引进的国外优秀教材和专著,以帮助我们完善这套丛书的出版,并最终形成一套完整的世界政治与国际关系及其相关学科适用的原文教学研究参考书系。

最后也要特别提醒读者,我们引进这套丛书,目的主要在于推动学术交流、促进学科发育、完善教学体系,而其著作者的出发点和指导思想、基本观点和结论等,则完全属于由读者加以认识、比较、讨论甚至批评的内容,均不代表北京大学出版社。

# 导 读

秦亚青

20 世纪 90 年代中期美国出版了两本很有影响的国际关系理论教材,一本是戴维·鲍德温(David A. Baldwin)主编的《新现实主义和新自由主义》(*Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, 1993),另一本就是查尔斯·凯格利(Charles W. Kegley)主编的这本《国际关系理论论争:现实主义与新自由主义的挑战》(*Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*, 1995)。这两本书一前一后,反映了 20 世纪 70 年代开始、90 年代初发展到高峰的国际关系理论的第三次大论战,亦即现实主义和自由主义两大主流理论范式之间的论战。这一论战尤其反映在新现实主义和新自由主义之间,通称“新新之争”。鲍德温编的教材以争论焦点为主线,相当深入地讨论了新现实主义和新自由主义争论的核心问题:合作的可能与条件、相对收益和绝对收益等;凯格利的教材则较全面地讨论了争论的诸多方面,阐述了现实主义和自由主义的各种流派以及它们之间的主要分歧。正因为如此,凯格利的教材像是一个全面的总结,可以使读者从整体上把握 20 世纪 70 年代以来的现实主义和自由主义的不同流派及其观点。

为了使读者能够更好地理解本书所选的现实主义和自由主义代表人物撰写的文章,凯格利在导言中首先对两大理论流派的核心命题做了简明扼要的叙述,勾勒出两派理论的主线。当然,凯格利导言的重心放在了自由主义理论上。他用较大的篇幅重述了威尔逊主义,认为新自由主义是对威尔逊思想的重新发现和发掘。他对重新兴起的自由主义理论予以很大的重视,当然,他也没有否认现实主义作为国际关系理论的重大意义,希望现实主义和自由主义能够合理结合,并因之创造新的理论。

本书的第一部分是对现实主义和自由主义的综述。首先,霍尔斯蒂(Ole Holsti)介绍了自由主义对现实主义发起的挑战;然后就是新现实主义代表人物沃尔兹(Kenneth Waltz)对其结构现实主义理论的全面论述。沃尔兹讲述了他是怎样创立结构现实主义理论的,包括对微观经济学的借鉴、理论的科学构建和国际体系结构的意义。如果说沃尔兹的《国际政治理论》是新现实主义的里程碑,本书中收入的这篇文章则是这本重要著作的一个精练的压缩文本,也为自由主义的挑战提供了一个靶子。自由主义理论家多伊尔(Michael W. Doyle)的文章讨论了三种自由主义倾向——自由和平主义、自由帝国主义、自由国际主义。多伊尔是民主和平论的主要作家,所以,这篇文章更多地讨论了民主和平论的理念。在这一部分,非常值得一读的是扎切尔(Mark W. Zacher)和马修(Richard A. Mathew)的论文。他们在这篇论文里将自由主义的思想渊源和发展历程做了全面的总结,同时也将当今的自由主义梳理成为五个派别:共和自由主义(民主和平论)、相互依赖自由主义、认知自由主义、社会自由主义、制度自由主义。这是目前对自由主义内部流

派最为全面的一种分类方法,虽然其准确程度仍然值得商榷,但确实给读者一个全景式的自由主义图像。这一部分的最后一篇文章是现实主义理论家格里科(Joseph Grieco)的著名论文,他通过对相对收益和绝对收益的缜密分析,指出了新自由制度主义的缺失,强调了国际体系的无政府状态对国家合作意愿的制约。这是现实主义对新自由制度主义相当有力的一篇批判文章,被收入多种文集之中,成为新现实主义和新自由主义论战期间的经典论文。

本书的后面三个部分的论文主要是讨论了现实主义和自由主义的几个重大争论问题。首先是制度与合作,这是第二部分的主题。现实主义强调制度的工具性作用和制度在促成合作方面的局限性;自由主义则强调制度在决定行为和促成合作方面的重要意义。应该说,20世纪80—90年代的争论主要集中在国际制度上面。现实主义认为国际制度只不过是强国实现国家利益的工具,最近米尔斯海默和我进行了一场对话,其间,这位进攻性现实主义大师仍然一再强调强国对联合国的态度是有利时则用,无利时则弃。而新自由制度主义的代表人物基欧汉则认为制度对合作有着决定性的作用。本部分的三篇论文,除了第一篇是讨论国内制度和体制对国家对外行为的作用之外,其他两篇都是讨论国际制度的,强调了联合国和欧洲一体化中产生的超国家和非国家行为体的重要作用,核心内容也是制度促进合作。其次是战争与和平,这是第三部分的主要内容。现实主义认为武器的扩散会有利于和平,因为这样会创造实力均衡的国际体系结构,从而导致体系稳定。自由主义的观点却截然相反,认为武器越多,和平的机会越少。约翰森(Robert C. Johanson)的文章批判了“要和平,首先需要准备战争”的现实主义论点,支持了军备竞赛加大安全隐患的自由主义思想。另外,在贸易是否促进和平的问题上,现实主义认为贸易和经济属于低级政治领域的内容,与政治影响力和军事实力等高级政治领域问题比较起来无足轻重。自由主义则认为经济活动与政治军事活动密切相关。理查森(Neil Richardson)的文章就强调了国际贸易促进和平这一自由主义观点。第三是国际政治中的法律和道德问题。现实主义认为国际体系中没有可执行的法律,更没有普世性道德。自由主义认为国际体系不仅仅是一个简单的体系,也是一个复杂的国际社会,法律和道德都有着不可忽视的作用。这在第四部分的论文中得到了比较详细的阐述。

作为教材,这本书的最大特点是全面地论述了现实主义和自由主义在理念上的差异和在重大国际政治问题上的分歧。凯格利除了导论之外,在每一部分的开始也对该部分的内容做了概述性讨论。凯格利以编著教材著称,他编的多部教材因结构清晰合理和重点明确突出而多次再版,深受广大师生的欢迎。当然我们在阅读这本教材的时候,也需要注意以下几个特征。

首先,这本教材是讨论现实主义和自由主义的。虽然它所包含的内容超出了新现实主义和新自由制度主义之间的所谓“新新之争”,但从大的方面仍然没有摆脱美国主流学者的理念范畴。非美国的国际政治理论没有涉及,非主流的国际政治理论也没有涉及。所以,这本书反映的是国际关系理论论争的一个方面。虽然这是过去二十多年里一个十分重要的方面,但它毕竟不是国际关系理论的全图。



其次,编者有着比较明显的自由主义倾向。本书中大部分文章是自由主义对现实主义的批判文章,尤其是第二、三、四部分的论文,集中抨击了现实主义的一些核心命题。这一方面说明了冷战后现实主义在学理上处于守势、自由主义重新崛起的客观状态,另一方面也说明了编者自己的理论偏好。理论家是有偏好的,理论家的观念和信念也是重要的。

再次,这本书中提出的法律道德等属于规范范畴的问题现在已经越来越成为国际政治理论的研究内容。从这本教材出版以来,对国际规范的研究已经有了迅速的发展,无论在内容的广度和深度上都远远超出了这本教材的讨论范围。在这方面,中国的哲学思想和文化理念有可能发挥重大作用。这是我们在为创立中国学派的努力过程中应该重视的问题。

## Preface

The rationale for the book is simple: To come to grips with contemporary theoretical inquiry in world affairs, it is worthwhile to begin with an appreciation of the factors that promote revisions in the ways international phenomena are interpreted. There are controversies about everything; struggles for "hegemony" among contending traditions in the study of international relations are no exception. Most recently, in the aftermath of the Cold War, students of international relations have begun to explore the formerly heretical idea that the study of international affairs now warrants, in place of realism and neorealism, a reconstructed paradigm inspired by the ideas associated with the liberal legacy. Hence, it is important for students and scholars to be provided with readings that can allow them to understand the discourse this challenge has provoked, the issues over which theoretical debate centers, and the prospects for adjusting the theoretical lens through which contemporary international events are perceived.

The essays in this anthology introduce the rich diversity of thought within both the realist/neorealist and the liberal/neoliberal perspectives. They are written to illuminate the differences and commonalities that exist about the ways theoreticians are now interpreting contemporary international developments from these perspectives. As such, they help define the range of viewpoints associated with each orientation. The book therefore allows the current manifestation of the realist-liberal debate to be understood, without violating the eclectic nature of the intellectual sources from which both traditions spring or masking the many ways in which realist/neorealist and liberal/neoliberal approaches overlap.

If this book succeeds in its primary goals, it will (1) introduce the major assumptions underlying the two major theoretical traditions in international relations inquiry, (2) stimulate thoughtful discussion about the future direction of international relations theorizing, (3) help to identify the research questions and principal global issues that will command attention in the twilight of the twentieth century, (4) suggest why a synthesis of realist and liberal theories is needed and possible given their shared concerns, and (5) provoke analysis of how such an integration might be approached.

Many people contributed to the development of this volume, and their contribution should be acknowledged. In particular, I would like to thank Hayward R. Alker, W. Ladd Hollist, Steven W. Hook, Pamela R. Howard,

Gregory A. Raymond, Neil R. Richardson, Harvey Starr, John A. Vasquez, and Eugene R. Wittkopf for their helpful advice on an earlier version of the Presidential Address to the International Studies Association from which this project emanated. David P. Forsythe, University of Nebraska; Eric Mlyn, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Patrick M. Morgan, University of California, Irvine; Neil R. Richardson, University of Wisconsin, Madison; John A. Rothgeb, Miami University; Randolph M. Silversen, University of California, Davis; Herbert K. Tillema, University of Missouri, Columbia; and John A. Vasquez, Vanderbilt University, also provided insightful commentary and constructive criticism on earlier versions of the manuscript; the contributors are to be thanked for the professional response they made to these recommendations in revising their chapters. Shannon Lindsey Blanton, Jean A. Garrison, and Pamela R. Howard also provided valuable research assistance, and the supportive environment provided the editor by Linda S. Schwartz was instrumental to the book's completion. So, too, was the production management provided by Russ Till and the editorial work of Suzanne Mieso. And this book could not have been produced without the dedicated and professional word processing of Christina J. Payne, whose patience with me and my compulsions knows no limit. I also wish to thank my friends at St. Martin's Press, Don Reisman, senior editor, and Mary Hugh Lester, associate editor, for their faith in this venture and their support for its production.

# Contents

1. **The Neoliberal Challenge to Realist Theories of World Politics:  
An Introduction** 1  
*Charles W. Kegley Jr.*

## PART I

- The Foundations of International Relations Theory and  
the Resurrection of the Realist–Liberal Debate** 25
- 

2. **Theories of International Relations and Foreign Policy:  
Realism and Its Challengers** 35  
*Ole R. Holsti*
3. **Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory** 67  
*Kenneth N. Waltz*
4. **Liberalism and World Politics Revisited** 83  
*Michael W. Doyle*
5. **Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent  
Strands** 107  
*Mark W. Zacher and Richard A. Matthew*
6. **Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of  
the Newest Liberal Institutionalism** 151  
*Joseph M. Grieco*

## PART II

- Reevaluating Institutions in the Post–Cold War World** 173
- 

7. **Peace in the Liberal World: Does Democracy Matter?** 179  
*Nicholas G. Onuf and Thomas J. Johnson*

<b>8. The United Nations in a New World Order: Reviving the Theory and Practice of International Organization</b>	<b>199</b>
<i>J. Martin Rochester</i>	
<b>9. Evolving Patterns of European Integration and Governance: Implications for Theories of World Politics</b>	<b>223</b>
<i>Barry B. Hughes</i>	
 <b>PART III</b>	
<b>The Problematic Future Peace: Arms and Commerce as Contributing Factors?</b>	<b>245</b>
<hr/>	
<b>10. Swords into Plowshares: Can Fewer Arms Yield More Security?</b>	<b>253</b>
<i>Robert C. Johansen</i>	
<b>11. International Trade as a Force for Peace</b>	<b>281</b>
<i>Neil R. Richardson</i>	
 <b>PART IV</b>	
<b>Normative Constraints on International Conduct? Law and Morality in International Affairs</b>	<b>295</b>
<hr/>	
<b>12. International Law and International Order</b>	<b>299</b>
<i>Harvey Starr</i>	
<b>13. Rethinking the Moral Dimensions of Foreign Policy</b>	<b>317</b>
<i>Joel H. Rosenthal</i>	
 <b>PART V</b>	
<b>International Relations Theory and the Global Future</b>	<b>331</b>
<hr/>	
<b>14. Promise or Peril? Neorealism, Neoliberalism, and the Future of International Politics</b>	<b>335</b>
<i>James Lee Ray</i>	
 Index	 <b>357</b>
About the Contributors	<b>369</b>

# The Neoliberal Challenge to Realist Theories of World Politics: An Introduction

CHARLES W. KEGLEY JR.

*I would rather be defeated in a cause that will ultimately triumph,  
than to win in a cause that will ultimately be defeated.*

—WOODROW WILSON

This book is designed to provide an introduction to the contemporary state of theoretical activity in international relations. To that end, it proceeds from a basic assumption: Since its advent as a discipline, theoretical debate has ranged primarily within the boundaries defined by the discourse between the realist and liberal visions. To a large degree, this division encompasses most of the other theoretical variants that have arisen at one time or another (Holsti, 1974; Ferguson and Mansbach, 1988; Kauppi and Viotti, 1992). The debate between these traditions “has permeated the last four centuries” (Banks, 1986: 9), and now continues to do so more animatedly than ever.

*Controversies in International Relations Theory* is not meant to provide a broad, comparative overview of international relations theory. It does not try to cover every unfolding intellectual movement, or even introduce an overarching sampling of the many issues that are of interest to international relations scholars. It therefore does not purport to examine every controversy. Instead, it focuses selectively on what is arguably the hottest topic in international relations theory today: the challenge to the dominant realist paradigm that is currently being mounted from diverse perspectives grounded in the liberal—or its subset, the so-called “idealist”—theoretical orientation. Without apologies, the book pursues the current state of theorizing activity within a confined parameter.

To introduce contemporary international relations theory by juxtaposing the field's two major conceptual approaches thus is not to suggest that this prism is adequate for capturing all the controversies in contemporary theoretical discourse. It is merely meant as a way of capturing the key cleavage in which that activity is centered, while also showing how the two most popular theoretical perspectives overlap and reinforce each other by speaking to common concerns and issues (Kegley, 1994b; Palan and Blair, 1993). The presentation does so without claiming to achieve a perfect balance between these contending schools, leaning toward an examination of neoliberalism because it is much less developed and known.

The need for such a book is rationalized by several concerns. Foremost is the question of whether the international relations discipline as currently configured is "an asset or a liability." Arguing on behalf of the latter, Michael Banks frames the issue by contending that

The realist-idealist debate is the most significant because it gave us structures and institutions which still operate. It has also endowed us with a durable vocabulary, some of which has become extremely damaging. Such notions as reason of state, balance of power, and national security dominate our thinking and cripple our creativity. It is unfortunate that we seem to have retained the worst of the realist-idealist argument and lost the best part of it. (Banks, 1986: 11)

If Banks is correct in arguing that the "entire set of liberal-progressive-idealist ideas has been neglected in our own time," rendering the discipline "intellectually totalitarian, dominated by one school of thought," then the theoretical study of international relations is, indeed, in trouble, and a need exists to redress the balance. Putting recent efforts to do so into perspective is a need which this book seeks to meet.

This goal is related to the book's secondary objective—to make available theoretical writings about contemporary international trends that can facilitate an "exchange between the liberals on the one hand, and the realists on the other." The readings and reflections are designed to provoke consideration of whether a "full-scale criticism of [realism] from a liberal perspective" (Banks, 1986: 11, 13) might provide the necessary medicine to free realism from the intellectual closure that was prevalent during the frigid Cold War.

Thus, *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge* presents original or especially revised essays by leading scholars that probe prevailing developments in light of the realist and liberal theoretical debate that has recently ignited with renewed heat. These contributions describe the realist principles and theories to which the new liberal theorists are reacting, as well as realists' responses to their challenge. Hence, the neoliberal challenge is placed against the backdrop of the realist tradition,

so that the controversies in the discourse can be identified and the dialogue can be broadened.

## DEFINING REALISM AND LIBERALISM

It is axiomatic that for this book's pedagogical goals to be serviced, readers need to be exposed to the assumptions underlying both the realist and liberal-idealist theoretical heritage. The readings in this anthology provide that background, which broadens the kind of definitions some texts provide (see Box 1.1).

However, as the authors of these summaries make clear, and as shall be elaborated in the Introduction to Part I, the definition of both realist and liberal theory is itself a subject of considerable controversy and contention. Agreement on the core premises that underlie either of these traditions, or international relations theory generally, does not exist. As any entrant to the formal study of international relations soon discovers, a consensus does not even exist about what a theory is or what objectives theoretical inquiry should primarily pursue. Disagreements about the nature, types, and appropriate objectives of theory abound. The study of world politics is as much a contest about the politics of meaning as it is a conflict about politics within the world. This is a barrier to communication and understanding. To overcome it, students need to begin with appreciation of the differences that divide scholars about the definition of the theories in their field.

In order to help reduce these semantic problems, *Controversies in International Relations Theory* frames the contemporary realist and liberal theoretical debate and the diversity of opinion extant about the purpose of theoretical inquiry by breaking these traditions into their discrete component varieties. Realism and neorealism, as well as liberalism and its idealist derivative and neoliberal reformulations, and other theoretical challengers, will be distinguished (see Part I in particular).

To make the relevance of these theoretical movements to real-world events clear, the contributors rely on them and the definitions they prescribe to interpret some of the principal issues and substantive problems in today's world. The book thus takes as its point of departure the propensity for the themes and postulates emphasized by theoreticians to change over time in conjunction with changes in international circumstances. This, we can confidently assert, is now occurring again.

To introduce the current phase of the continuing realist-liberal controversy, we need to look briefly at the thinking that now motivates realism's challengers. As a preface to the essays that follow, in this introductory chapter we will describe the current climate of international theoretical activity. Let us suggest why debate about whether it is time to revise, reconstruct, or, more boldly, reject orthodox realism has become so intense and why this controversy preoccupies so many theoreticians.



**BOX 1.1****What Are Liberal Idealism and Realism?****The Liberal/Idealist World View**

Idealists hold divergent views of world politics. What joins them is their shared assumptions about reality and the homogeneity of their conclusions. Collectively, idealists embrace a world view based on the following beliefs:

1. Human nature is essentially “good” or altruistic and people are therefore capable of mutual aid and collaboration.
2. The fundamental human concern for the welfare of others makes progress possible (that is, the Enlightenment’s faith in the possibility of improving civilization was reaffirmed).
3. Bad human behavior is the product not of evil people but of evil institutions and structural arrangements that motivate people to act selfishly and to harm others—including making war.
4. War is not inevitable and its frequency can be reduced by eradicating the anarchical conditions that encourage it.
5. War and injustice are international problems that require collective or multilateral rather than national efforts to eliminate them.
6. International society must reorganize itself institutionally to eliminate the anarchy that makes problems such as war likely.
7. This goal is realistic because history suggests that global change and cooperation are not only possible but empirically pervasive.

**The Realist World View**

As applied to twentieth-century world politics, realism views nation-states as the principal actors in world politics, for they answer to no higher political authority. Moreover, conflicts of interests among them are assumed to be inevitable. Realism also emphasizes the way the (perceived) realities of international politics dictate the choices that foreign policymakers, as rational problem solvers, must make. States are the superordinate actors on the world’s stage. The purpose of statecraft is national survival in a hostile environment. No means is more important to that end than the acquisition of *power*. And no principle is more important than *self-help*—the ultimate dependence of the state on its own resources to promote its interests and protect itself. State *sovereignty*, a cornerstone of international law, enshrines this perspective, giving heads of state the freedom—and responsibility—to do whatever is necessary to advance the state’s interests and survival. Respect for moral principles is a wasteful and dangerous interference in the rational pursuit of national power.

To the realist, therefore, questions about the relative virtues of the values within this or that *ism* (ideological system) cannot be allowed to interfere with sound policy making. The ideological preferences of states are neither good nor bad; what matters is whether one’s self-interest is served. Accordingly, the game of international politics takes place under conditions of permanent anarchy and