

Taking SIDES

Clashing Views on
Controversial Issues in
World Politics

Sixth Edition

John T. Rourke



Taking SIDES

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



Sixth Edition

Edited, Selected, and with Introductions by

John T. Rourke
University of Connecticut

The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

For my son and friend—John Michael

Photo Acknowledgments

- Part 1 UN PHOTO 159207/S. Whitehouse
Part 2 The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.
Part 3 United Nations/Photo by Sygma
Part 4 Colorado Tourism Board

Cover Art Acknowledgment

Charles Vitelli

Copyright © 1995 by The Dushkin Publishing Group, 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 The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 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 The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Manufactured in the United States of America

Sixth Edition, Third Printing

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Taking sides: clashing views on controversial issues in world politics / edited, selected, and with introductions by John T. Rourke.—6th ed.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

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

D860.T357

1-56134-324-2

909.82—dc20

94-33209



Printed on Recycled Paper

The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

PREFACE

In 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 was gratifying to discover in the success of *Taking Sides* that so many of my colleagues share this belief in the value of a debate-format text.

The format of this edition is the same as the last. There are 20 issues on a wide range of topics in international relations. Each issue has two readings: one pro and one con. Each is also 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 continued to emphasize issues that are currently being debated in the policy sphere, and the authors of the selections are a mix of practitioners, scholars, and noted political commentators. In order to give the reader a truly international perspective on the issues of world politics, the authors of the selections represent many nations, including Bosnia, China, Egypt, France, Great Britain, Poland, and Singapore, as well as the United States.

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. Fifteen of the 20 issues are completely new: *Has the World Become a More Dangerous Place Since the End of the Cold War?* (Issue 1); *Should the West Give Massive Foreign Aid to Russia?* (Issue 2); *Should the Arms Embargo on Bosnia Be Lifted?* (Issue 4); *Is Africa Heading Toward Disaster?* (Issue 7); *Is the United States Unfairly Pressing Japan to Adopt Managed Trade?* (Issue 8); *Is Free Trade a Desirable International Goal?* (Issue 10); *Does Immigration Strain Society's Resources?* (Issue 11); *Should a Permanent UN Military Force Be Established?* (Issue 12); *Should the United States Forcefully Oppose North Korea's Nuclear Weapons Program?* (Issue 13); *Is It Time to Terminate the CIA?* (Issue 14); *Does the World Have to Have Nuclear Weapons at All?* (Issue 15); *Is There a Global Environmental Crisis?* (Issue 17); *Is the United Nations Advocating Objectionable Policies to Control World Population Growth?* (Issue 18); *Is Self-Determination a Right of All Nationalities?* (Issue 19); and *Are U.S. Efforts to Promote Human Rights Culturally Biased and Self-*

Serving? (Issue 20). Three other issues have been recast to reflect changing emphasis: *Should the United States Abandon Its Superpower Role?* (Issue 3); *Is Islamic Fundamentalism a Threat to Political Stability?* (Issue 5); and *Should the Developed North Increase Aid to the Less Developed South?* (Issue 9). Thirty-four of the 40 readings are new, and of the 40 readings, the majority are from publications dated 1992 or later.

For this edition I have redoubled my efforts to select lively articles and pair them in such a way as to show clearly the controversies of a given issue. (See, for example, Issue 12 on the military role of the United Nations.)

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 through The Dushkin Publishing Group.

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 objectively divergent views does not mean that you have to remain forever neutral. In fact, once you are informed, you ought to form convictions. More importantly, 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 issue that could be included in a future edition, please write to me in care of The Dushkin Publishing Group with your recommendations.

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

Caren Addis
Rutgers University

Paul Angelini
Sheridan College

Roger Crownover
Madonna University

Douglas M. Dent
Madonna University

Cheng Tian Kuo
University of
Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Wei-chin Lee
Wake Forest University

Timothy J. Lomperis
Duke University

Theodore Reller
Canada College

John W. Schmaltz
Northern Iowa Area
Community College

Kristine Thompson
Concordia College

I would also like to thank the publisher for the Taking Sides series, Mimi Egan, for her 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. That theme is echoed in a wonderful essay by Marshall Berman, "Have Sympathy for the Devil" (*New American Review*, 1973). The Stones and Berman's theme was 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, the issue on whether or not Islamic fundamentalism represents a threat to political stability or the issue on the population policies of the United Nations. Few would find fault with a commitment to ease population growth. How to get to that end is another matter, however, and we should take care not to confuse disagreement on means with disagreement on ends. In other cases, the debates you will read do diverge on goals. Two authors, for example, argue over whether or not complete nuclear disarmament is desirable. Another issue deals in part with whether or not the former opponents of the former Soviet Union should provide extensive foreign aid to the remaining republics. Two key issues here are whether or not funds would even help and whether or not democracy will survive in the former Soviet republics.

As you will see, each of the authors in all the debates strongly believes in his or her position. If you read these debates with an objective attitude, 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. Write letters to policymakers,

donate money to causes you support, work for candidates with whom you agree, or join an activist organization.

On the subject of lethargy and evil, Ethiopia's emperor Haile Selassie (1892–1975) told the United Nations in 1963:

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!

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 7) begins with a question about the future of the international system, currently an emphasis of many scholars. Beginning with Issue 2, the focus of Part 1 shifts to regional issues and actors. Debates here deal with Russia, the United States, Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. Part 2 (Issues 8 through 11) focuses on international economic issues, including Japan's international economic strength, North-South development, the desirability of free trade, and the economic impact of immigration. Part 3 (Issues 12 through 15) examines issues surrounding the use of force in international relations, including whether or not countries can give up their nuclear weapons and remain secure, the utility of the CIA in the post-cold war world, and the future of the United Nations' military activities. Part 4 (Issues 16 through 20) examines values and the future operation of the global system. Issues here concern whether or not morality should be a centerpiece of foreign policy formation, whether or not there is an environmental crisis, the UN's population policies, the wisdom of promoting unfettered self-determination, and whether or not Asia's human rights standards are acceptable.

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 these debates.

DYNAMICS OF WORLD POLITICS

The action on the global stage today is also vastly different from what it was a few decades ago or even a few years ago. Directly related to this condition is the first issue, which asks whether the new world order is a cause for pessimism or optimism. *Technology* is one of the causes of world changes. Technology has changed communications, manufacturing, health care, and many other aspects of the human condition. Technology has also led to the creation of nuclear weapons and other highly sophisticated and expensive conventional weapons. One debate is over whether or not, having created and armed ourselves with these weapons, we can and should reverse the process and disarm. 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 Warsaw Pact has collapsed as an axis of world politics, many new questions have surfaced, particularly with regard to the primary successor state to the Soviet Union, Russia. One issue is whether or not billions of dollars in foreign aid should be extended to Russia; would it benefit the country? Even if the answer is yes, will that mean a friendly, democratic Russia or a reinvigorated opponent? Insofar as containing communism and the Soviet Union were the mainstay of U.S. post-World War II policy, the end of the Soviet threat also brings the United States to a pivotal choice about future foreign involvement. As the issue on the superpower role of the United States explains, there is a growing tide of isolationist sentiment in the United States, but there are also those who argue that abandoning internationalism would be foolhardy.

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.

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, such as the United Nations, are global actors, and in one issue, the secretary-general of the UN and a U.S. army lieutenant debate one aspect of the UN's current and future role. Other actors are regional. There is a debate on whether or not China will become a regional superpower. Then two analysts address sub-Saharan Africa and debate whether or not the region is heading toward disaster.

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 of radical actions by Islamic fundamentalists. As the issue on Islamic fundamentalism illustrates, 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 most 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 at least represent only part of the picture. Perceptions are also formed by the value system of a decision maker, which is based on his or her experiences and ideology. The way in which such an individual thinks and speaks about another leader, country, or the world in general is called his or her *operational code*. There is an issue, for example, that explores the United States' role in the world. How U.S. presidents and other Americans define their country's role creates an operational code governing relations. Thus far, President Bill Clinton has shown himself to have more of an internationalist operational code than the public does. Clinton, for example, wanted to launch a military intervention into Bosnia and Herzegovina to assist the Muslims who were under attack by Serbian forces there. The American public was opposed to intervention in this civil war, showing much less willingness than the president to cast their country in the role of defender of democracy, of human rights, or of what President George Bush called the "new world order."

Another aspect of perception is the tendency to see oneself as peacefully motivated and one's opponent as aggressive. This can lead to perceptual distortions such as an inability to understand that your actions, perceived by you as defensive, may be perceived as a threat by your opponent and, indeed, may cause your opponent to take defensive actions that, in turn, seem aggressive to you. One issue, for example, focuses on relations with Japan and how Japan's recent economic rise is perceived by some as a prelude to world domination. Such perceptions could lead to economic conflict.

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 differing 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 World War II's end, 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 faded. Some political scientists argue that it is now 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. The debate about the future of China as a regional, perhaps global, power affects considerations of how to deal with China over trade disputes, the suppression of democracy by China's government (symbolized by the 1989 massacre at Tiananmen Square), and many other issues.

State-level analysis is the middle, and the 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 (as in the issue on the CIA), the role of interest groups, and the effect of public opinion. There are a number of issues in this reader that are subject to strong domestic pressure on political leaders, such as the issue on immigration.

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. Political scientists who take this approach contend 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 the nature of humans.

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 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 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 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 claim 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 possible nuclear warfare, environmental disaster, or 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.

Several of the issues address the realist-idealist split. For example, in one issue, Cyrus Vance contends that human rights represent a fundamental principle and should strongly influence policy, while George Shultz contends that morality must be balanced with other factors to determine policy. There is also an idealist-realist element to the issue regarding the degree of aid that the economically developed countries should give to the less developed countries. The debate over intervention in Bosnia, and by extension other troubled countries and places in which modern conflicts may arise, also involves realist-idealist considerations.

THE POLITICAL AND ECOLOGICAL FUTURE

Future world alternatives are discussed in many of the issues. The first issue, for example, debates whether or not the current world situation portends anarchy. The debate on the North providing aid to the South is not just about humanitarian impulses; it is about whether or not the world can survive and be stable economically and politically if it is divided into a minority of wealthy nations and a majority of poor countries. Another, more far-reaching, alternative, is if an international organization were to take over some (or all) of the sovereign responsibilities of national governments. To explore this alternative, another issue focuses on the authority of the UN Security Council to assume much more power in the area of peacekeeping. Another possibility for governance falls between current countries (each governed independently) and the possibility of a single global government, represented by the United Nations.

The global future also involves the availability of natural resources, the condition of the environment, and the level of world population, which are addressed in the issues on UN population policy and the environment.

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, the issue on Russia is related to the question of whether or not, in a nonideological context, this axis might be reconstituted by an ultranationalist, hostile Russia.

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. This is evident in the issue that explores these differences and debates whether or not the North should significantly increase economic aid to the South.

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 Western Europe. There are also those who argue that the European Community, an Asia organized and dominated by Japan or China, and a North American region that is based on the United States-Canada-Mexico free trade agreement could form the basis of a new split.

INCREASED ROLE OF ECONOMICS

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

However, political scientists are now focusing increasingly on the international political economy, or the economic dimensions of world politics. International trade, for instance, has increased dramatically, expanding from an annual world total of \$20 billion in 1933 to \$3.8 trillion in 1992. 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. This is related to the debate on Japan's international trading practices.

Another economic issue is whether or not the environment can withstand current and increased economic activity. For people in industrialized countries, the issue is whether or not they can sustain current standards of living without continuing to consume unsustainable levels of energy and other resources and while lowering levels of pollution and other forms of environmental degradation. For people in less developed countries, the issue is whether or not they can develop their economies and reach the standard of living enjoyed by people in wealthy countries without creating vast new drains on resources and vast new amounts of pollution. This concern is a major aspect of the debate on the global environmental crisis.

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 dictatorship or sparing the sword and saving lives that will almost inevitably be lost in the dictator's overthrow? Further, 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 to 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.

CONTENTS IN BRIEF

PART 1 REGIONAL ISSUES AND ACTORS 1

- Issue 1. Has the World Become a More Dangerous Place Since the End of the Cold War? 2
- Issue 2. Should the West Give Massive Foreign Aid to Russia? 18
- Issue 3. Should the United States Abandon Its Superpower Role? 36
- Issue 4. Should the Arms Embargo on Bosnia Be Lifted? 56
- Issue 5. Is Islamic Fundamentalism a Threat to Political Stability? 68
- Issue 6. Will China Become an Asian Superpower? 88
- Issue 7. Is Africa Heading Toward Disaster? 104

PART 2 ECONOMICS AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 123

- Issue 8. Is the United States Unfairly Pressing Japan to Adopt Managed Trade? 124
- Issue 9. Should the Developed North Increase Aid to the Less Developed South? 138
- Issue 10. Is Free Trade a Desirable International Goal? 156
- Issue 11. Does Immigration Strain Society's Resources? 172

PART 3 INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND WORLD POLITICS 187

- Issue 12. Should a Permanent UN Military Force Be Established? 188
- Issue 13. Should the United States Forcefully Oppose North Korea's Nuclear Weapons Program? 212
- Issue 14. Is It Time to Terminate the CIA? 230
- Issue 15. Does the World Have to Have Nuclear Weapons at All? 254

PART 4 VALUES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS 271

- Issue 16. Should Morality and Human Rights Strongly Influence Foreign Policy Making? 272
- Issue 17. Is There a Global Environmental Crisis? 288
- Issue 18. Is the United Nations Advocating Objectionable Policies to Control World Population Growth? 308
- Issue 19. Is Self-Determination a Right of All Nationalities? 328
- Issue 20. Are U.S. Efforts to Promote Human Rights Culturally Biased and Self-Serving? 350

CONTENTS

Preface	i
Introduction: World Politics and the Voice of Justice	xiv
PART 1 REGIONAL ISSUES AND ACTORS	1
ISSUE 1. Has the World Become a More Dangerous Place Since the End of the Cold War?	2
YES: Patrick Glynn, from "The Age of Balkanization," <i>Commentary</i>	4
NO: Francis Fukuyama, from "Against the New Pessimism," <i>Commentary</i>	10
Patrick Glynn, a former official in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, contends that post-cold war political and social fragmentation is making the world a more dangerous place. Francis Fukuyama, a consultant at the RAND Corporation, argues that the current period of post-cold war instability does not necessarily mean that we face a more dangerous future.	
<hr/>	
ISSUE 2. Should the West Give Massive Foreign Aid to Russia?	18
YES: Rex A. Wade, from "The United States, Russia and the Republics," <i>The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review</i>	20
NO: Karen LaFollette, from "Massive Aid to Russia Won't Help," <i>USA Today Magazine</i>, a publication of the Society for the Advancement of Education	28
Rex A. Wade, a professor in the history department at George Mason University, contends that because the policies and actions of the West will help determine the nature of the political regime in Russia, the United States and other industrialized countries should extend massive aid to Russia and to the other former Soviet republics. Karen LaFollette, a research associate at the Institute for Political Economy in Washington, D.C., argues that the West should resist the urge to pour aid into Russia.	
<hr/>	
ISSUE 3. Should the United States Abandon Its Superpower Role?	36
YES: Doug Bandow, from "Keeping the Troops and the Money at Home," <i>Current History</i>	38
NO: Anthony Lake, from "A Quartet of Foreign Policy Speeches," <i>Foreign Policy Bulletin</i>	48

Doug Bandow, a former special assistant to U.S. president Ronald Reagan, argues that the United States should bring home its military forces and curtail expensive foreign aid programs. Anthony Lake, special assistant for national security affairs in the Clinton administration, maintains that U.S. national interests make full international engagement imperative.

ISSUE 4. Should the Arms Embargo on Bosnia Be Lifted? 56

YES: Ejup Ganic, from "Statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee," *Congressional Record* 58

NO: Jean Claude Mallet, from "Statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee," *Congressional Record* 62

Ejup Ganic, the vice president of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, contends that in order to allow the Bosnian army to more evenly match the weaponry of the rebel Bosnian Serb forces, and thereby permitting the "legitimate and recognized government to defend itself," U.S. leaders should lift the arms embargo on Bosnia. Jean Claude Mallet, testifying on behalf of the French Ministry of Defense, argues that lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia would only escalate the fighting and further endanger the United Nations forces in the country.

ISSUE 5. Is Islamic Fundamentalism a Threat to Political Stability? 68

YES: Judith Miller, from "The Challenge of Radical Islam," *Foreign Affairs* 70

NO: John L. Esposito, from "Political Islam: Beyond the Green Menace," *Current History* 78

Political researcher and writer Judith Miller argues that the radical Islamic movement in the greater Middle Eastern region threatens domestic and international political stability. John Esposito, director of the Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, holds that it is wrong to view Islam as an organized whole whose adherents are mostly dangerous fanatics.

ISSUE 6. Will China Become an Asian Superpower? 88

YES: Zhao Xiaowei, from "The Threat of a New Arms Race Dominates Asian Geopolitics," *Global Affairs* 90

NO: Samuel S. Kim, from "China as a Regional Power," *Current History* 97