



世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书·学术精品系列

Neorealism and Its Critics

新现实主义 及其批判

〔美〕罗伯特·基欧汉 编
Robert O. Keohane



北京大学出版社
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

新现实主义及其批判



〔美〕罗伯特·基欧汉 编



北京大学出版社
PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS

著作权合同登记 图字 01-2006-5175

NEOREALISM AND ITS CRITICS edited by Robert O. Keohane

Copyright © 1986 by Columbia University Press

English reprint copyright © (year)

by Peking University Press

Published by arrangement with Columbia University Press

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

新现实主义及其批判/(美)基欧汉编. —影印本. —北京:北京大学出版社,2007.9
(世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书·学术精品系列)

ISBN 978-7-301-12728-5

I. 新… II. 基… III. 国际关系理论—文集—英文 IV. D80-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2007)第 139387 号

书 名:新现实主义及其批判

著作责任者:[美]罗伯特·基欧汉 编

责任编辑:徐少燕

封面设计:常燕生

标准书号:ISBN 978-7-301-12728-5/D·1862

出版发行:北京大学出版社

地 址:北京市海淀区成府路 205 号 100871

网 址:<http://www.pup.cn>

电 话:邮购部 62752015 发行部 62750672 编辑部 62765016 出版部 62754962

电子邮箱: ss@pup.pku.edu.cn

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 24.5 印张 440 千字

2007 年 9 月第 1 版 2007 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

定 价:40.00 元

未经许可,不得以任何方式复制或抄袭本书之部分或全部内容。

版权所有,侵权必究

举报电话:010-62752024 电子邮箱: fd@pup.pku.edu.cn

内 容 简 介

本书辑录了国际关系理论史上“第三次论战”期间，肯尼思·沃尔兹、罗伯特·基欧汉、约翰·鲁杰、理查德·阿什利、罗伯特·考克斯、罗伯特·吉尔平等著名理论家最重要的文本，展示了新现实主义、新自由主义、社会建构主义、后现代主义、西方马克思主义等理论流派的学术精粹，集中探讨了当代国际关系理论的几个核心问题：如何建设国际关系理论学科？科学有效的国际关系理论模型如何建构？权力、利益与国际体系的本质是什么？社会力量与国家行动之间存在着何种关系？制度在国际关系中的作用是什么？霸权与合法性的关系？世界政治变动的动力是物质力量对比的变化，还是历史实践与观念变迁？可否及何以在国际政治理论领域贯彻理性主义、国家主义、实证主义、结构主义、功利主义？国际政治研究要不要注重“过程层次”的分析？国际关系研究要不要关注人本身的解放？等等。

作 者 简 介

罗伯特·基欧汉 (Robert O. Keohane)，哈佛大学政治学博士，曾执教于斯坦福大学、布兰代斯大学、哈佛大学等，曾任国际研究协会主席 (1988—1989年)、美国政治学会主席 (1999—2000年)，现为杜克大学“詹姆斯·杜克讲席”教授，著有《权力与相互依赖》(1977年、1989年、2001年，合著)、《霸权之后》(1984年)、《国际制度与国家权力》(1989年)、《局部全球世界中的权力与治理》(2002年)等，主编有重大影响的论文集多部，是世界著名关系理论权威、新自由制度主义理论集大成者，被誉为当代国际关系理论的泰斗。



世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书
学术精品系列·第二批书目

◆ 国家间政治：权力斗争与和平（第七版）

Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (by Hans J. Morgenthau, revised by Kenneth W. Thompson and W. David Clinton)

◆ 新现实主义及其批判

Neorealism and Its Critics (by Robert O. Keohane)

◆ 无政府社会：世界政治秩序研究

The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics (by Hedley Bull)

◆ 决策的本质：解释古巴导弹危机

The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (by Graham T. Allison, Philip Zelikow)

◆ 国家安全的文化：世界政治中的规范与认同

The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (by Peter J. Katzenstein)

◆ 生产、权力和世界秩序：社会力量在缔造历史中的作用

Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History (by Robert W. Cox)

《世界政治与国际关系原版影印丛书》

学术顾问

· (按姓氏笔画排序)

- 王正毅(北京大学国际关系学院)
王逸舟(中国社会科学院世界经济与政治研究所)
王缉思(北京大学国际关系学院、中共中央党校战略研究所)
朱 锋(北京大学国际关系学院)
许振洲(北京大学国际关系学院)
宋新宁(中国人民大学国际关系学院)
张睿壮(南开大学国际问题研究院)
时殷弘(中国人民大学国际关系学院)
庞中英(中国人民大学国际关系学院)
金灿荣(中国人民大学国际关系学院)
倪世雄(复旦大学国际关系与公共事务学院)
秦亚青(外交学院)
袁 明(北京大学国际关系学院)
贾庆国(北京大学国际关系学院)
阎学通(清华大学国际问题研究所)
楚树龙(清华大学公共管理学院、战略研究所)
潘 维(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创新和发展,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了一些经典文献选读性质的国外优秀教材,也包括美国大学中的一些知名国际关系学教员所编著的教材,内容主要在国际关系理论方面,也包括国际政治经济学和比较政治学方面的优秀教材。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。

根据读者的反映和我国建设中的国际关系学科的发展需要,我们决定在上述影印图书的基础上,开辟一个《学术精品系列》,以让我国国际关系专业的学者和学生有机会更方便地接触到那些堪称“精品中的精品”的学术书籍,比如摩根索的《国家间政治》、沃尔兹的《国际政治理论》和基欧汉的《权力与相互依赖》等等。这些作品大都已经有了中文译本,而且有的还不止一种中译本,它们的学术和学科地位是不言而喻的,在中国读者心目中也已有着持久深入的影响,正因如此,在这个新系列的每一种图书前面我们没有再烦请学术顾问们撰写导言。我们相信,如此有生命力的作品,当它们以新的面目出现在中国读者面前时,一定会引发新的阅读感受、新的理论遐思和新的战略决策思考。至少,

它们可以带给我们真正原汁原味的享受,让我们更加贴近当代的国际关系理论和国际关系理论家。

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。

Acknowledgments

THIS VOLUME would not have been possible without the cooperation of a large number of people and institutions. The authors are grateful to Columbia University Press for seeing the scholarly potential in a book that includes a number of previously published articles—and for encouraging us to include a substantial amount of original material as well. Kate Wittenberg has been an efficient and supportive editor. Credit is due to Howard Silverman for preparing a unified bibliography and to Nicholas Humez for the index.

We are also grateful to a number of publishers and academic journals for permission to reprint material that originally appeared elsewhere. Random House gave permission for reprinting of chapters 1, and 4–6 from *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979) by Kenneth Waltz, which appear as articles 2–5 of this volume. Article 6, “Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis,” by John Gerard Ruggie, is reprinted with permission by Princeton University Press, publisher of *World Politics*, where it originally appeared in January 1983, volume 35(2):261–285. “Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond,” by Robert O. Keohane, which constitutes article 7, appeared first in Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, pp. 503–540 (Washington: American Political Science Association), and is reprinted with the permission of the American Political Science Association.

Robert W. Cox’s “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory” (article 8) is reprinted with permission from *Journal of International Studies: Millennium* (Summer 1981), 10(2):126–155. An edited version of “The Poverty of Neorealism,” by Richard K. Ashley, which constitutes article 9, is reprinted with permission from *International Organization* (Spring 1984) 38(2):225–261; 275–281. Robert G. Gilpin’s response, “The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism”

(article 10) is reprinted from the same issue of *International Organization*, pp. 287–304, also with permission.

The other material in this volume is published here for the first time: Robert O. Keohane's introduction, "Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics" (article 1); Robert W. Cox's postscript to his article (included in article 8); and Kenneth N. Waltz's concluding essay, "Reflections on *Theory of International Politics: A Response to My Critics*" (article 11).

The participants in this enterprise have sought to create a volume that is coherent in style as well as in argument. Hence we have standardized our references and created a unified bibliography. Some editing of the previously published articles has been done to eliminate confusing references to material not included here. The new contributions—the introduction by Keohane, the postscript by Cox to his earlier article, and the conclusion by Waltz—refer to the other articles by page number in this volume rather than in the original, to facilitate analysis of competing arguments by our readers.

We hope that this volume will make more people aware of the importance and liveliness of contemporary theories of international relations, and that some of our readers will respond by making contributions to the debate themselves in the future. Perhaps, eventually and indirectly, our thoughts will exert a constructive impact on practice as well.

Let me conclude with a personal note. The penultimate version of this preface was completed on the same day, September 10, 1985, on which my mother was involved in an automobile accident that caused her death at the age of 81. I wish to dedicate my contributions to this volume to her memory. Mary P. Keohane was a remarkable person—teacher, author, lover of nature, deep thinker. Her spirit lives on in those who knew her.

Robert O. Keohane
Wellesley, Massachusetts
December 1985

Neorealism and Its Critics

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	i
1. ROBERT O. KEOHANE: Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics.	1
2. KENNETH N. WALTZ: Laws and Theories.	27
3. KENNETH N. WALTZ: Reductionist and Systemic Theories.	47
4. KENNETH N. WALTZ: Political Structures.	70
5. KENNETH N. WALTZ: Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power.	98
6. JOHN GERARD RUGGIE: Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis.	131
7. ROBERT O. KEOHANE: Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond.	158
8. ROBERT W. COX: Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory.	204
9. RICHARD K. ASHLEY: The Poverty of Neorealism.	255
10. ROBERT G. GILPIN: The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism.	301
11. KENNETH N. WALTZ: Reflections on <i>Theory of International Politics</i> : A Response to My Critics.	322
<i>Bibliography</i>	347
<i>Index</i>	367

ONE

Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics

ROBERT O. KEOHANE

WORLD POLITICS today is a matter of life and death—not just for soldiers or citizens caught in the path of war, but for the whole human race. Nuclear holocaust remains a continual threat. At a less apocalyptic level, world politics has a daily impact on the lives of people throughout the globe: political forces and decisions affect patterns of international trade, investment, and production. Whether OPEC oil will be cheap or dear; whether China will export textiles to the United States; how many Americans will work in the auto industry: all depend as much on political decisions as on patterns of comparative costs and efficiencies.

The complexities of security in a nuclear age, and of economic viability in an era of interdependence and rapid technological change, have created demands by policymakers for expertise on a myriad of international political issues. Thousands of experts, in and out of governments around the world, analyze the relative military forces of the superpowers, fluctuations in supply and demand in oil markets, or shifts in international patterns of comparative advantage. These observers interpret the significance of changes in policies of governments and nongovernmental actors such as transnational corporations and international organizations, and they seek to determine their impact—on Soviet or American security, Saudi or Mexican oil revenues, inflation in the United States, or the viability of high-tech industry in Europe.

Little of this immense application of brainpower to world affairs takes any explicit account of theories about world politics. Indeed, a naïve

Note: For comments on earlier drafts of this essay I am indebted to Nannerl O. Keohane, Andy Moravcsik, Joseph S. Nye, John Gerard Ruggie, and Howard Silverman.

observer might conclude that all of the relevant theories come from other disciplines: physics, laser engineering, petroleum geology, electronics, the economics of comparative advantage or exchange-rate determination. Foundations and governments display little interest in supporting theoretical work in international relations, compared with their zest for "policy-relevant" research or the incorporation into international relations of findings from other fields.

In view of this widespread lack of interest, the reader may well ask: "Why should I care about theoretical debates among scholars of international relations? If I want to understand world politics or make policy, shouldn't I devote my efforts directly to studying nuclear deterrence, OPEC, or the international financial system?" In other words, is the enterprise represented by this volume—abstract discussion of theoretical issues in international relations—relevant to the practical tasks of interpreting the world and seeking to change it? Does the theory of international relations have implications for practice? Should it be studied by practitioners or by those who seek to become policymakers in the future?

The contributors to this volume believe that theory does have implications for practice and that it should be studied by those who seek to influence events. In the first section of this introductory essay I present my reasons for holding such beliefs. After making my argument, I will turn to the issues raised by the tradition of political realism and its contemporary offshoot, "neorealism," and then conclude with a brief overview of the contributions that constitute this volume.

I. THEORY AND PRACTICE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

One reason for an aspiring practitioner to learn international relations theory would be to absorb valuable maxims or propositions that would prove useful in specific situations. If the conditions for applicability of these maxims are sufficiently well understood, and if the practitioner knows enough history to be able to place them in context, they can furnish useful guides to the interpretation of events. Even a limited, partial theory—with only a few propositions and a number of interpretive guides—can be useful. For instance, the realist theory of the balance of power, discussed by Waltz, could have alerted American policymakers in

the 1950s (who were excessively imbued with an ideological view of world politics) to the likelihood of an eventual Sino-Soviet split. Realist maxims would have counseled the United States to be in a position to make an alliance, or at least an accommodation, when feasible, with the weaker Chinese to counterbalance the Soviet Union—as Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon eventually did.

Theory can therefore be useful: it is often better than unconscious adherence to the prejudices of the day. Nevertheless, it is necessary for any practitioner using international relations theory to remain skeptical; indeed, the more seriously the maxims are taken, the more important is the task of critical analysis. If the maxims apply only under certain conditions, or if the theory underlying them is fundamentally erroneous in its understanding of the forces affecting cooperation and discord, peace and war, they will be dangerously misleading. For example, the popular maxim in Western foreign policy after World War II, that appeasement (making concessions to others' demands) should be avoided since it breeds aggression, is by no means universally valid. Whether making concessions to others' demands breeds aggression depends, among other things, on the nature of the demands, the capabilities of the demander, and the willingness of the responding power to use force effectively, in a sustained way, as an alternative to making concessions. A policy of appeasement, disastrous when pursued by Britain and France toward Hitler, would not necessarily have been inappropriate for those two countries in their relations with Egypt in the mid-1950s or even for the United States in its relations with North Vietnam in the 1960s.

Practitioners cannot judge the validity of theories offered to them, or the conditions under which theoretical maxims might apply, without studying theory. It may appear, however, that practitioners could avoid the pitfalls of misguided or misapplied theory simply by shunning theory altogether; and indeed, most commentators on international relations avoid explicit discussion of theories of world politics. Yet to purge oneself of all traces of theory would be impossible, since even our intuitions about world politics are deeply affected by how the subject has been thought about in the past. For over 2000 years, thinkers have sought to understand, more or less systematically, the most basic questions of world politics: the sources of discord and of war and the conditions of cooperation and of peace. As Keynes said in another context, practitioners

are prisoners of "academic scribblers," whose views of reality profoundly affect the contemporary actions of practical people. The choice for practitioners is not between being influenced by theory or examining each case "on its merits": it is rather between being aware of the theoretical basis for one's interpretation and action, and being unaware of it.

Even if one could eradicate theory from one's mind, it would be self-defeating to try. No one can cope with the complexities of world politics without the aid either of a theory or of implicit assumptions and propositions that substitute, however poorly, for theory. Reality has to be ordered into categories, and relationships drawn between events. To prefer atheoretical activity over theoretically informed practice would be to seek to be guided by an unexamined jumble of prejudices, yielding conclusions that may not logically follow from the assumptions, rather than by beliefs based on systematic attempts to specify one's assumptions and to derive and test propositions.

The inescapability of theory in studying world politics suggests a second reason for exploring what are labeled here political realism and neorealism. Whatever one's conclusion about the value of contemporary neorealism for the analysis of world politics in our time, it is important to understand realism and neorealism because of their widespread acceptance in contemporary scholarship and in policy circles. Political realism is deeply embedded in Western thought. Without understanding it, we can neither understand nor criticize our own tradition of thinking about international relations. Nor could we hope to change either our thinking or our practice. All people who are interested in having a sustained professional impact on world affairs should study international relations theory at some time, if only to examine prevailing assumptions and evaluate the basic propositions that they might otherwise take for granted.

The danger that one will become the prisoner of unstated assumptions is rendered particularly acute by the value-laden nature of international relations theory. This does not mean that observers simply see what they want to see: on the contrary, virtually all serious students of world politics view it as a highly imperfect realm of action in which wrongdoing is common and unimaginable evil is threatened. Nevertheless, it is hard to doubt that scholars' values, and their own personal experiences and temperaments, affect which aspects of world politics they emphasize and

how strenuously, or desperately, they search for ways to mitigate the injustice and cruelty that is so evident. For this reason, as well as those mentioned above, interpretations of world politics need to be scrutinized critically—a task for which a certain degree of sophistication about the subject is essential.

An objection could be raised to the above argument. If a theory provides sufficiently accurate guidance about cause-effect relationships, and if its propositions about these relationships remain valid over time and under different conditions, practitioners may not need to study it deeply. They can learn its major theorems without being too concerned about how they were derived, or about the range of their theoretical application. A structural engineer, engaged in building bridges, can assume the validity of Newtonian physics and can apply its propositions without being able to derive them from basic premises. It is of no concern to the engineer that this same assumption would be terribly misleading for a scientist trying to understand black holes in outer space or the behavior of quarks at the subatomic level. Similarly, if the theories of world politics on which policymakers and commentators rely provided powerful, value-free explanations of outcomes in world politics, which were sure to remain valid throughout the time-horizon of policymakers, it would be unnecessary for interpreters of contemporary world politics to concern themselves with theoretical controversies. The methodological presuppositions of international political theories would be of no more concern to practitioners than are investigations of quarks or black holes to the bridge-building engineer.

But theories of world politics are not at all like those of physics. No careful analyst believes that our theories of world politics have attained either the explanatory quality or the practical usefulness of Newton's system, much less of quantum mechanics; and there is general skepticism that they will ever approximate the rigor and accuracy even of seventeenth-century physics. Furthermore, since both world politics and our values keep changing, there is no guarantee that even a well-tested theory will remain valid in the future. Each proposition of any theory of world politics should therefore be scrutinized carefully to ascertain the range of its applicability, its robustness under different conditions, and the likelihood of its being overtaken by events.

What this suggests sounds paradoxical. The problematic character of