

Contemporary International Issues

Contending
Perspectives

edited by
Steven L. Lamy

Lynne Rienner Publishers ♦ Boulder & London

Published in the United States of America in 1988 by
Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
948 North Street, Boulder, Colorado 80302

and in the United Kingdom by
Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
3 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London WC2E 8LU

©1988 by Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Contemporary international issues.

Bibliography: p.
Includes index.

I. World politics—1945- I. Lamy, Steven L.
D849.C583 1988 327'.09'04 88-18281
ISBN 1-55587-016-3 (alk. paper)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book
is available from the British Library.

Printed and bound in the United States of America

The paper used in this publication meets the requirements
of the American National Standard for Permanence of Paper
for Printed Library Materials Z39.48-1984. ⓧ

Worldviews Analysis of International Issues

STEVEN L. LAMY

This book explores thirteen international issues. These issues are complex, affecting both public and private actors throughout the international system, and are not easily resolved by the actions of a single government, private corporation, or individual. These same issues are controversial: Those affected by them often disagree over definitions of the problems, explanations of their origins, and how best to respond to the challenges they present.

Part 1 discusses wide-ranging and persistent policy issues, such as nuclear and conventional-arms races, international inequality, global resources and growth, human rights, and the ideological battle between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The mistrust and geopolitical competition that has shaped relations between the United States and the Soviet Union is a good example of this kind of policy issue. Each of the superpowers has devoted significant resources to efforts aimed at controlling and perhaps overcoming the other superpower. They have involved the entire world community in their strategic chess game for over forty years. Soviet and U.S. policy actions have had a significant impact on international and regional institutions established to maintain global order and stability. Additionally, in an effort to maintain positions as a friend or foe in this global struggle and to protect their national interests, both large and small states have allocated a substantial amount of their resources to defense and strategic policy programs.

Part 2 discusses tension areas or conflict regions in the international system. Most of the conflict situations discussed in this volume have significant geopolitical implications that directly involve the United States and the Soviet Union. The chapters on Southern Africa and Central America focus on areas in which both superpowers are providing diplomatic support, technical services, non-military goods, and military assistance to adversaries.

Not all conflicts in international affairs involve the use of military force. It

is important for students of international affairs to understand the political, economic, and cultural dimensions of conflict situations, as well as the military and geopolitical aspects. For example, this section of the volume includes a chapter that explores the conflict between rich and poor states over the control of information production and dissemination agencies. This conflict is not being played out on a battlefield. Diplomats, media experts, scientists, and corporate leaders debate this issue and explore possible solutions at conferences and seminars sponsored by the United Nations and by more specialized international institutions as well.

It is also important for students of international affairs to realize that conflicts over policy issues also cause problems among allies. A review of Canadian-U.S. relations illustrates some of the problems faced by traditional allies whose leaders are attempting to reconcile national interests with regional or international priorities in a competitive international environment.

Each author of the chapters in this book was asked to organize his or her assessment of a particularly controversial international issue or event within an analytical framework that encourages the comparisons of contending worldviews. These different worldviews offer divergent descriptions, competing explanations, contrast in predictions, and a wide range of policy solutions. For purposes of this analytical framework, a *worldview* is defined as a set of assumptions, core beliefs, and values, which individuals use to interpret the world around them. Individuals use their worldview as a lens to analyze and evaluate events, actions of other individuals or nation-states, and conditions having a long-term or passing effect on people or societies (e.g., a national disaster or the image one ethnic community has about a second ethnic community). It is important to note that this lens creates an image of reality that may not be universally shared. There are many ways of seeing the world around us, and it is extremely important for students of international relations to realize the limits of their interpretations.

In attempting to understand controversial international issues, a multiple-perspective or contending-worldviews analytical approach is critical. This approach does not assume that all actors in the system have similar policy goals and objectives. It does assume that cultural factors, ideology, and traditional processes of socialization (e.g., the media, schools, and the family) will create different values and priorities. Individuals in leadership positions will make decisions that are consistent with their worldviews. Not all political leaders will support policies aimed at maintaining the status quo, in terms of the distribution of power and influence in the international system. Those who want change in the system may seek incremental reforms or radical transformations. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of issues that affect societies throughout the world will require an examination of worldviews in three categories: those of *system maintainers*, *system reformers*, and *system transformers*.

This book is aimed at students, scholars, and teachers interested in exploring the views of the significant actors in a given international-issue area. The

worldviews-analytical framework provides the student of international affairs with a method for organizing research and the identification and analysis of contending theories and policy issues. This approach is particularly useful when an individual is trying to understand or teach about especially controversial international issues.

This is an introductory text that does not assume an in-depth awareness of the issues discussed in each chapter. The authors have sought to raise questions that might encourage further research. The text is not meant to stand alone. Each author encourages the reader to seek out additional empirical studies representing the theoretical and policy debates that define each worldview category.

The chapters presented in this volume do not present a single perspective or a particularly U.S. worldview. Clearly, the choice of issues and conflict areas that are addressed in this study reflects a U.S. foreign-policy agenda. However, the worldviews-analytical approach helps overcome the limits normally imposed by the cultural, ideological, and situational factors that usually influence the content of classes and the methods of instruction. The emphasis on encouraging a more pluralistic, in terms of worldviews, assessment of world issues makes this an important contribution to any discussion or lecture in which students are wrestling with complex and distant issues. Students often accept a specific explanation or analysis of an international event because of the difficulty associated with finding alternative interpretations of these same issues or events. The worldviews-analytical framework presented in this book is not foolproof, and its proper application requires careful and thoughtful research. Its strength is that it presents the reader with a way of thinking and teaching about world politics that recognizes the existence of multiple interpretations of reality. This method of analysis is essential for effective policymaking in the international system.

A WORLDVIEW AND ISSUE APPROACH

First, it is important to emphasize that any approach or method of analysis reflects a particular view of the world. The authors of this book were asked to examine international issues from three worldview categories: those of *system maintainers*, *system reformers*, and *system transformers*.¹ In these categories, "system" refers to the international system. The international system is defined by the interactions among state and non-state actors and the resulting processes of decisionmaking and arrangements of power and influence.

Since the end of World War II, the international system has been shaped by significant transformations. Each has had some impact on the structure of the international system. These are not just changes that influence activities within units. These transformations are significant because they each have an impact at the international-system level. Many theorists concerned with understanding international relations suggest that change or transformation is insignificant un-

less the event changes the "arrangement of the parts of the system" or the order of the structure. For example, *an event or a series of decisions that move the international system from anarchy to a more centralized power structure is an example of a significant change or transformation.* (Waltz 1979, 88-97)

A second definitional characteristic of the international system relates to specific functions of actors within the system. According to Kenneth Waltz (1979), nation-states are like units and are not significantly different in the functions that each unit performs. While it is true that nation-states may have different resources, and thus different capabilities, they generally perform similar functions in the international system. Consequently, *a significant transformation in the international system would result in a differentiation of functions among state actors.* This could mean that larger, more powerful states would play a more custodial role in certain policy areas (e.g., the control of nuclear arms) and weaker states would be expected to play a role in regional affairs (e.g., New Zealand's role as a stabilizing force in the Pacific Islands region) or as leaders in multilateral policy organizations (e.g., the Netherlands as a major proponent of development-assistance programs in the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] and the United Nations [UN]).

One may also recognize the role played by non-state actors (e.g., the Roman Catholic Church, Amnesty International, and the Exxon Corporation) and international or regional governmental organizations (e.g., the UN and the Organization of African Unity) in the international-policy arena. However, these non-state actors are generally considered to be subservient to the policy interests of state actors.

The international system is defined also by the distribution of power and influence in that system. Accordingly, *any significant shift in power which changes the order of states in the system must be considered a delimiting transformation.* For example, the economic collapse of a major power or the emergence of a new nuclear military force would undoubtedly influence the distribution of power and influence throughout the international system. (Waltz 1979, 97)

These three characteristics describe the traditional view of the international system. From this viewpoint, the international system is seen as competitive and anarchic (i.e., no central authority exists to maintain order) with the principal powers being nation-states. Those states with power are the rule makers in the international system. Leaders in every state select policies aimed at furthering their national interests. The strategy of self-help is critical for survival in an international system with only minimal rules of behavior. Furthermore, a traditional view of the international system supports the notion that a nation-state's leaders must be prepared to use force or the threat of force in their efforts to promulgate policies aimed at securing the national interest.

Those political leaders and international-affairs experts who adhere to this traditionalist view recognize that changes have occurred within the system since 1945. For example, Japan has gone from a devastated and defeated Asian power

to a major global economic power. Most see these changes as part of the maturation of the system. Changes such as the increase in the number of nation-states and the increase in transactions between states are seen as influencing attributes within the countries; however, these changes or transformations are not recognized as having a major influence on the order within the system, the functions of nation-states, or the fungibility of certain capabilities, such as nuclear arms, in determining the rules in the international system.

Traditionalists maintain that although the priorities and actions of states may have to change because of the emergence of new states in Africa or the shift of economic power toward East Asian states, the basic rules of the international system remain the same. Those states with significant power, the ability to mobilize political, economic, and military resources to convince another country to act in a manner that supports their interests, continue to define the rules. Thus, in spite of new developments in the international system, the United States and the USSR remain as the directors of their respective spheres of influence.

The Contemporary International System

The authors contributing to this volume were asked to consider an alternative to this traditional view of the international system. This alternative interpretation of the contemporary international system recognizes the continuance of certain traditional characteristics, such as the persistence of conflict and the primacy of state actors. However, this alternative view accepts the notion that transformations since 1945 have created a less anarchic and more pluralistic international system. This view suggests that these transformations have changed the distribution of power and have resulted in the establishment of international rules and regulations that have moved the system further away from a system without governance. There are numerous transformations that have affected the structure and order of the international system. Perhaps the most significant transformations are:

1. The emergence of new state actors and the tremendous growth in the number and salience of non-state actors (e.g., transnational enterprises and international non-governmental actors)
2. Changes in the distribution of power and the increasing importance of non-force policy options (e.g., economic policies aimed at furthering national interests)
3. The exponential increase in international transactions linking public and private actors throughout the international system

These three transformations represent characteristics of the contemporary international system that differentiate it from a more traditional system. A closer examination of these three transformations suggests clear differences between the international system that existed prior to World War II and the contemporary

system. For one, it is quite clear that the contemporary system is still developing in terms of power distributions and the patterns of interaction between state and non-state actors within the system.

The Emergence of New Nation-States and Non-State Actors

The first major transformation that has played a role in shaping the international affairs agenda in the contemporary world is the emergence of new nation-states (i.e., state actors) and non-state actors. As a result of the decolonization process after World War II, over eighty new countries have joined the international community. These developing states have brought new interests, priorities, and needs to the economic- and security-policy debates at both bilateral (i.e., country-to-country) and multilateral (i.e., international organizations) levels. These countries enjoy equal legal status as sovereign states; however, few of these states have the economic, military, or political resources that would give them parity with the more advanced industrial states of the West. Thus, these states play a different role in the international system. The majority of new states is dependent upon political, economic, and security assistance from larger, more powerful states. These dependencies make new states vulnerable to superpower competition and increase the chances of instability within the international system. The "politics of survival" in many of these countries require that their leaders either accept the continuance of a dependency relationship with wealthier and more powerful states or support strategies aimed at disassociation from the present international system. A few of these leaders are seeking a more self-reliant path of development; however, most accept the need to reform or significantly change existing international economic and political structures. Consequently, the leadership in many of these states has willingly transferred sovereignty and authority to multilateral efforts aimed at restructuring the international economic system. Although the primary motivation is still self-interest, the weaker states in the international system seem to be supporting either collective unilateral policies (e.g., the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries' [OPEC's] oil embargo) or collective multilateral efforts, such as special sessions sponsored by the United Nations, which focus on global crises. Support for collective or multilateral organizations challenges the state-centric view of international politics. It may also suggest a differentiation of political strategies and policy orientations among state actors. Weaker states, unable to represent their interests unilaterally, have begun to look to international institutions and other multilateral forums as their primary political arena and as primary representatives of their national interests.

A second aspect of this "actor" transformation in the international system is the increase in the number of and the commensurate acceleration of activities of non-state actors such as transnational enterprises (TNEs) and not-for-profit organizations within and between nation-states. Minimally, this means increased involvement with state actors; maximally, this means an increase in the power of non-state actors vis-à-vis nation-states. There have always been non-

state actors participating with nation-states in the international system. These non-state actors work as pressure groups in the international-affairs policy arena, and as the interests and concerns of domestic groups become more international, the activities of these groups increase commensurately. To date, these groups have not replaced nation-states as centers of power and authority or the focus of citizen identity and loyalty. Corporations such as IBM and private organizations such as Church World Services must abide by the laws of local and national governments. Their activities are usually controlled by states; if these non-state actors pursue policies that challenge the interests of indigenous elites who control power, they will be asked to leave. However, these non-state actors do play a very important role in the policymaking processes of most states. For example, the leaders of the Catholic Church continue to advocate political change in those Latin American countries where dictators persist in their support of policies aimed at denying basic human rights within their societies. TNEs provide local employment, loans, technology, and other economic resources. These large corporations can make or break a government with their decision to invest or build a new production facility. It is obvious that the economic resources and investment capabilities held by TNEs could challenge the traditional authorities of the state.

This is not to say that TNEs will supplant the nation-state. Instead, these actors might work with states with similar interests, challenge those they cannot afford to leave or those they feel can be influenced, and exit from those states who push them too far. The role of U.S.-based corporations in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile provides an example of the flag and the dollar working to influence domestic and foreign policy. As countries continue to compete for markets and resources, the role of TNEs is bound to increase. Likewise, if citizens find their government to be ineffective or unconcerned about a problem or issue, they may work with a non-governmental organization to represent their interests. A brief glimpse at a current debate in U.S. foreign policy provides a useful example of this point.

A traditional view of the international system suggests that when confronted with challenges to its national interests, a state will use its power to counter those challenges. Leaders act rationally in these situations, selecting policies that maximize benefits and minimize costs. Thus, a powerful state could easily discourage the activities of less powerful states encroaching on its interests by using or threatening force. In the traditional view, leaders of states are rarely challenged in the foreign-policy arena. To illustrate: U.S. foreign-policy leaders, acting rationally, should be free to use the power of the United States to deter and counter Soviet-backed aggression in Central America. However, many U.S. citizens belong to groups opposed to U.S. military action in Central America. As the U.S. congressional debates on Contra funding have shown, these groups do have some influence on U.S. foreign-policy activities. If these interest groups opposed to U.S. military activity in Central America succeed in their efforts to change the direction of U.S. foreign

policy, their success will have an effect on other conflict situations (e.g., South Africa) where the United States has been directly or indirectly involved. Furthermore, any change in the foreign-policy priorities of the United States will have an immediate impact on other actors in the system.

Thus, the activities of non-state actors could result in more formal and informal rules governing the behavior of both state and non-state actors. More importantly, as the non-state actors provide citizens with access to decision-makers, they will be more frequently used by individuals interested in shaping the policy agenda. Loyalty once reserved for national governments could be shifted to private non-state actors. This "privatization" of foreign-policy activities has the potential to influence significantly the structure of the international system by challenging the primacy of states and by changing the rules of the game. Consequently, the reliance on international and regional fora and the support for multilateral organizations by new states, and the dramatic increase of non-state-actor policy activity has moved the international system further away from an anarchic environment. |

Changing Options for Power and Influence

A second major transformation defining the contemporary system relates to the changes in the distribution of power and influence in the system. This involves the increasing salience of non-force options and the inappropriateness of military tools of statecraft for resolving many international disputes. The countries of the world spend over \$300 billion a year on both nuclear and conventional arms and related military programs. There are at present five major nuclear powers—the United States, China, the Soviet Union, France, and Great Britain. An additional six countries are thought to possess nuclear power capabilities—Brazil, South Africa, Argentina, Israel, Pakistan, and India. The global arms culture also includes an extensive proliferation of conventional arms, which has increased superpower involvement throughout the world. The United States and the Soviet Union use arms-trade and military-assistance programs to further their political and security interests among their allies and in many developing countries. In a similar fashion, regional powers or adventurist weak states often use military advantages to control or coerce other states in their efforts to extend their power and prestige or divert attention from major domestic problems. The proliferation of both conventional and nuclear arms has dramatically increased the chances for a regional conflict or war occurring and developing into a major global confrontation. This situation has changed the nature of international statecraft and certainly has changed public attitudes toward war. Leaders are confronted with policy dilemmas that require non-military responses (e.g., trade wars) or situations in which the use of force might cause a major escalation of the conflict.

These changes in military dimensions of power are accompanied by significant shifts in economic capacities of power and influence. The United States no longer enjoys a predominant position in the world economy. Japan, the "newly

Industrializing" countries of Taiwan, Brazil, and South Korea, and the European Economic Community (EEC) have effectively used trade, investment, and assistance programs and processes, initiated by the United States after World War II, to build viable and extremely effective economic systems. U.S. trade deficits reflect the increasing number of U.S. product, service, and commodity dependencies in the international economy.

The shift from a world in which the United States was the economic hegemon, immediately following World War II, to a more pluralistic world in which it is a major actor, is seen by some theorists to be the result of the proper development of the political and economic system designed and implemented by the United States. (Calleo 1982) However, these changes in the dimensions both of political power and influence and of economic strength have created new dependencies for the United States and other wealthy states, unaccustomed to the restrictions and frustrations which accompanying a shift in status and power. For example, U.S. dependence on strategic minerals imported from South Africa clearly influenced the Reagan administration's choice to pursue a policy of "constructive engagement," which encourages the maintenance of trade linkages, rather than a policy of economic divestment. Trade dependencies affect the independence and flexibility of weak and strong states alike.

The complexities of international affairs in the contemporary system have also limited the effectiveness of many traditional tools of foreign policy; namely, the implementation of military solutions in crisis situations. Conflicts with Japan about trade issues or boycotts by commodity cartels (e.g., OPEC's oil embargo) are not effectively resolved by bombs or military invasions. Non-force options seem to be more effective in an international system in which economic and sociocultural issues are now defined and accepted as national-security concerns. This suggests a need to rethink the traditional view of how states represent their interests in a competitive and anarchic international system. A traditional geopolitical view emphasizes military strength as the guarantor of sovereignty. Although military strength is certainly still an important tool of statecraft, changes in power distributions suggest a need for states to develop more effective non-force tools aimed at securing a state's interest in a more pluralistic international system.

The need for new tools of statecraft is also emphasized by the expansion of the international-policy agenda. Foreign-policy experts must now carefully consider public-policy issues that were previously considered local or national problems or were simply non-issues. As governments have extended their responsibilities into private-sector areas, the list of "public issues" has expanded. Coincidentally, and in part because of the tremendous increase in international linkages, domestic-policy concerns such as pollution, labor laws, banking regulations, zoning rules, criminal-justice activities, educational policies, and consumer-protection laws are affected by international issues and events. In turn, these policy areas are now addressed by both foreign and domestic policymakers. These relatively new areas of international concern are not usu-

ally recognized as major national-security issues. Thus, there is a tendency to place these issues on a secondary or "low-politics-issue" agenda. However, it is clear that each of these issues has some bearing on the quality-of-life conditions and the protection of a way of life. To many individuals and groups, these are national-security issues.

The increasing salience of these new national-security issues has resulted in more public pressure for government intervention. The worse things get, the more citizens turn to government to do something about the problem. Many of these issues, such as air pollution, require cooperative responses. Dirty air does not stop at a country's boundary; thus, governments must work together and, in some cases, transfer policymaking authority to a potentially more effective supranational authority. Incrementally, these policy challenges are threatening the traditional notion of state sovereignty and the monopoly states have had in the area of public authority. In addition, in many policy areas, the international system now operates much like a domestic-policy arena, in which public and private organizations bargain and compete for public goods and services. As suggested earlier, more and more interest groups are now operating locally, nationally, and internationally to influence the actions of governments. A recent study on "local foreign policies" indicated that over \$18 million was spent by individual states in the United States in an effort to promote exports, and an additional \$8.5 million was allocated to programs aimed at encouraging foreign investment in their areas. (Shuman 1986-87)

In summary, changes in the distribution of power and influence and the expansion of the public-policy domain have had some impact on how nation-states interact with each other. Powerful states, in the traditionalist view, find themselves competing with and at times "losing out" to weaker states in the international system. Coalition politics (e.g., the use of cartels), trade restrictions and incentives, development assistance, and communication and technological resources are becoming important tools of statecraft. In some cases, these policies can be used in lieu of military force and are more effective. These tools have enabled small and middle states, and great powers to share policymaking roles in many issue areas. This challenges the traditional view, which suggests that the international-policy arena will be controlled almost exclusively by the major powers, more specifically the United States and the USSR.

Increased Interstate and Intrastate Transactions

The third area of transformation that differentiates the contemporary international system from those of previous eras involves the substantial increase in the volume of interstate and intrastate transactions. It is true that states have always traded products, exchanged art and music, and maintained political-security alliances. However, the depth and breadth of these economic, political, and cultural transactions have increased dramatically since the end of World War II. These linkages have increased the dependencies of nation-states; that usually results in an increase in a country's vulnerability. It is clear that nation-states

have become more dependent on other countries and on various non-state actors to provide essential goods and services. When countries are bound together in either symmetrical or asymmetrical interdependent relations, there will inevitably be national-security implications. Similarly, these connections will have a measurable impact on foreign-policy behavior. For example, a country may be limited in its capacity to define and implement an independent foreign-policy agenda. Likewise, a dependent state could be constrained in its ability to maintain order and prosperity at home if supplies of these strategic goods (e.g., oil) cannot be obtained from external suppliers.

There are costs and benefits associated with increasing economic, political, and cultural linkages. It would be difficult to identify a single country that has the capacity to produce domestically all of the goods and services essential for the maintenance of the "way of life" its society aspires to provide. The interdependent and dependent relations these linkages create have transformed how states behave with friends and enemies. The United States and the Soviet Union are ideological and military rivals, yet the Soviet Union trades for grain from the United States and the United States depends on the Soviet Union for strategic minerals and as a market for its agricultural surpluses.

These three transformations are examples of systemwide changes which serve to define the contemporary international system. These conditions have had an impact on the functions of actors, the power distribution, and the status of order within the international system. The existence of multilateral organizations with specific authority to regulate international transactions and to enforce certain rules suggests a change from anarchy. The existence of regulatory and enforcement regimes in some policy areas, and the increasing linkages between nation-states have changed the status of order within the system. National interests may still motivate the actions of policymakers; however, the complex nature of problems facing national leaders and the dramatic increase in international activities linking state and non-state actors has increased the cost and reduced the benefits of unilateral action.

The Distribution of Power

These significant transformations in the international system have had an impact on the functions of states. The distribution of power and influence has shifted rather significantly since the end of World War II. Consequently, many states considered weak or small in military terms have emerged as powerful actors in economic areas (e.g., Japan and South Korea) or influential forces due to their level of activity and normative behavior in international institutions like the UN (e.g., the Netherlands or Scandinavian countries). Power has also shifted to nation-states which support change-oriented policies (e.g., the members of OPEC). These policies threaten the advantages enjoyed by the dominant nation-states as rule makers in the international system. Consequently, middle-power nation-states have found themselves playing a major role as conciliators

or bridge builders in the system. Countries such as Canada and the Netherlands are playing important mediating roles in arms and security debates between the superpowers and in discussions between rich and poor states. As the international system matures and becomes more complex, nation-states seem to be assuming different roles and responsibilities.

Finally, these transformations have resulted in a change in the distribution of power within and between nation-states. The stability in the system that has been guaranteed by the nuclear-power balance, and facilitated by the emergence of both formal and informal rules of economic behavior, has contributed to the emergence of new economic powers such as Japan, Taiwan, and West Germany. The persistence of inequality within Third World nation-states and the continuing power struggle between the United States and the USSR, which is played out in the developing areas of the world, have also had a profound impact on power dimensions. Obviously, as citizens and their leaders accept a broader definition of national security, including military, economic, political, and socio-cultural dimensions, the definitions of power and influence will also change. This will also mean a change in the hierarchical structure of the system.

The need for international awareness is greatly increased in this more pluralistic contemporary international system. With an expanded policy agenda, a greater number of actors competing for resources and opportunities, and a more extensive decisionmaking process, the chances for controversy and disagreement increase appreciably. An informed decision in a policy area requires a more comprehensive understanding of the issues. In the case of the United States, it is very difficult for leaders and citizens alike to accept the change in status from that of hegemon to that of one of several principal powers. One reaction is to continue acting like a hegemon, disregarding changes in the international system and acting unilaterally to further U.S. interests over the interests of others. This policy attitude will not benefit the United States in the long run. A long-term strategy suggests the need to develop an informed response, which carefully and critically assesses the arguments presented by actors throughout the system. This is the basis for advocating a *worldviews approach* to the analysis and evaluation of controversial international issues. The assumption is that there is not only a U.S. or Soviet perspective on the issues. A thoughtful student of international affairs must consider the interests and ideas of weak and powerful actors alike. Similarly, political leaders will find it increasingly difficult to represent their constituencies and secure their national interests without reference to competing interests and alternative perspectives. It is in this spirit that the authors of this volume have been asked to develop their chapters around the dimensions of the worldviews analytical framework.

THE WORLDVIEWS ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Earlier in this introductory chapter, a worldview was defined as a set of values, assumptions, and core beliefs that individuals use to interpret the world around them. This is the lens that individuals use to *describe* and *explain* issues, events, and conditions within the international system. Understanding worldviews also plays a major role in *predicting* how an individual might *respond* in a crisis situation or the type of program he or she might advocate in response to a social problem. When applied to international issues, the worldviews analytical framework encourages the student to compare and contrast descriptions, explanations, predictions, and policy prescriptions from three worldview categories. An outline of the analytical framework is provided in Exhibit 1. The three worldview categories, from which more specific worldviews emerge, are described more completely in the following pages.

The System-Maintainer Worldview

Out of civil states, there is always war of everyone against everyone.

—Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Chapter 13

The core assumptions of the traditional "realist" perspective in international affairs best describe the core beliefs of the system-maintainer worldview. Individuals who share this worldview see the state as the principal actor in world affairs. The international system is seen as anarchic and competitive. If men live in this international society without a common power or state to control their activities, war and violence is a constant condition. Leaders of states must therefore always prepare for war as a means of preventing war. A state that is strong militarily and possesses the will to use its force if necessary is the best deterrent against aggressive behavior.

System maintainers believe there are only minimal rules governing state behavior in the international system. Self-interest is the primary motivation in the international system. State leaders who act in a rational manner always attempt to select policies that further their national interests. A simple cost-benefit analysis, rather than morality and reason, often motivates policies.

System maintainers are generally skeptical about the chances for reform in the international system. Their Hobbesian view of humankind and the role of the state suggests that humans are by nature imperfect and competitive. The state, if properly endowed with power and authority, will provide order and stability in the international system. States use or threaten force to achieve their interests. Other tools of statecraft, such as development assistance, trade policies, and cultural activities, are also used to further a state's interests. Since there is no reliable and effective means for resolving interstate rivalries in an anarchic system, foreign policies tend to emphasize self-help options. The

Exhibit 1.1 Outline of the Worldviews Analytical Framework

Descriptions

1. What does this worldview define as the basic characteristics of the problem or issue?
2. What kind of world does this worldview see being created under present conditions?
3. What actors does this worldview see playing critical roles in a particular issue area?
4. How do these actors participate?
5. What priorities does this worldview assume actors have?
6. What structures and processes of decisionmaking does this worldview see as being involved?

Explanations

1. What relevant theories does this worldview advance to explain the development of this issue or problem?
2. How does this worldview account for persistence of this problem or issue?
3. How does this worldview explain the behavior of state or non-state actors in this policy arena?

Predictions

1. What does this worldview posit as possible scenarios for the future?
2. What will a future policy agenda governed by the assumptions and values of this worldview look like?
3. In this issue area, does this worldview predict that states will act unilaterally or multilaterally?
4. What role does this worldview predict that non-state actors will play?
5. Does this worldview predict that problems will persist?
6. What does this worldview predict will prevent the resolution of conflicts or policy disagreements in this issue area?

Prescriptions

1. What policy strategies does this worldview believe should be advocated by different actors involved in this situation?
 2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each set of solutions prescribed by this worldview?
-

realist view of the international system recognizes a general lack of commitment to a common good—a multilateral agenda for improving the system. Essentially, a system maintainer believes that no state can make its survival dependent upon the potential goodwill of other states.

The system-maintainer perspective is generally supportive of the status quo. This worldview embraces the belief that the present state-centric system provides opportunities for all states, rich and poor. The success of a nation-state depends upon how well a state's leaders use the present system to further their national interests. The system maintainer believes that those who seek changes in the system, either reforms or major transformations, have simply failed to use properly the opportunities that the major powers provide by maintaining order and stability in the international system. System maintainers see advocates of reform or transformation as leaders who want to change the rules rather than spend the time to develop the capacities to further their interests under the present rules of international behavior.

In summary, the core beliefs of the system-maintainer worldview are:

1. The international system is not defined by enforceable rules of behavior, rather it is an anarchic system.
2. Conflict is endemic among actors in the system.
3. Nation-states are the major actors in the system.
4. State leaders act rationally—selecting policies that maximize benefits and minimize costs. Codes of morality governing individual behavior cannot be used to judge states.
5. War is an inevitable feature of a system in which power is emphasized. States seek power to further their national interests and extend their influence over other state and non-state actors.
6. There is only minimal commitment to a common good in the international system.

The System-Reformer Worldview

The system-reformer perspective recognizes the need for some modifications in the international system, partially because of the increasing interdependence and dependence in economic relations, political affairs, communications, and human ambitions. Reformers also realize that injustices and other problems persist and that those who are disadvantaged are demanding changes. Rather than accept a radical transformation in the system, reformers seek *cooperative multilateral* efforts aimed at responding to inequities in the system.

An appropriate model for cooperation is provided by the gradual integration of public-policymaking authority in Western Europe, which resulted in the EEC. The EEC began as a cooperative effort between the coal and steel industries, then moved toward a customs union, and now provides a forum for cooperation in a variety of social, economic, and political areas. The best strategy for resolving international problems, in a system-reformer worldview, is to in-

vest resources in multilateral institutions (such as the various functionally oriented organizations of the UN and other international or regional organizations). If these cooperative efforts are successful, system reformers believe that national leaders will be more inclined to support additional multilateral actions and might eventually accept a multilateral strategy as the most effective means of achieving their national objectives.

System reformers see the world quite differently than do system maintainers. An essential difference is the system reformers' view of the role of the state and their rejection of the anarchic view of the international system. First, system reformers recognize that both state and non-state actors are connected or linked in a "web of interdependence." Secondly, system reformers believe that individuals and groups who seek to influence public policy nationally or internationally have a variety of avenues open to them. In short, individuals or groups have numerous options for participating in the international system. This suggests that the state is not the only representative of individuals or interest groups working to secure resources and opportunities in the international system. A third characteristic of the system-reformer worldview is the attitude toward power in the international system. Power, according to system reformers, is defined in terms of power over outcomes and not as the use of force to subjugate, control, or coerce others. Nation-states are thus required to use a variety of tools of statecraft—not just military tools. A fourth system-reformer view recognizes that nation-states have established rules of behavior and regulatory institutions in an effort to manage their international interactions. These rules of behavior and the corresponding institutions do not fade away. As these *regimes* develop, according to a system reformer, patterns of practice encouraging cooperative behavior begin to define the interactions between-state and non-state actors in the international system. The existence of regulatory and enforcement regimes suggests that states do not act in an anarchic system. Instead, these regimes operate to regulate activities and enforce certain rules of behavior.

A fifth characteristic of the system-reformer worldview is the support for transferring national authority or sovereignty to multilateral institutions in certain policy areas. Successful cooperative endeavors will create an atmosphere of support for additional multilateral activities. The system reformer believes that state leaders will realize that the most appropriate method for securing national interests in a complex and interdependent world is to work with other states in either regional (e.g., the Organization of American States) or international institutions (e.g., the UN) that have been established to manage and regulate international transactions. If leaders of states are able to maintain their power at home and more efficiently respond to the demands of their citizenry, their commitment to multilateralism and cooperative strategies will spill over into other policy areas. Eventually, the system reformer contends, the international system will be composed of a variety of multilateral policy institutions or regimes.

The system reformer suggests that the contemporary international system is defined by "common crisis" situations which threaten global stability (e.g., the world debt crisis, poverty, and environmental deterioration). Nation-states acting unilaterally will not be as successful as those working with other nation-states, international organizations, and TNEs to manage the linkages within and between societies and to set the agenda for future cooperative policymaking situations. (Keohane and Nye 1985) System reformers are not utopians advocating the establishment of a world government. The state will not wither away; however, the ability of leaders to respond to the needs of their citizens will require some rethinking about how states define their policy agenda and how these same states go about implementing policies. For example, many states seem to maintain a competitive zero-sum attitude (i.e., what is mine is mine and what is yours is mine) in their relations with other states and in their responses to policy problems.

The "trade wars" between states present an example of the policy attitude of system reformers. Countries often respond to their inability to compete with other producing countries by initiating protectionist policies (e.g., quotas or tariffs). The state that is the target of these actions usually responds with restrictions of its own. The conflict spiral created by the actions and reactions of the two states benefits few, and usually contributes to animosities in other policy areas. The system reformer prescribes policies aimed at encouraging joint economic ventures (e.g., Toyota's and General Motors' cooperative production of cars) and economic planning between states aimed at benefitting workers and owners throughout the international market. It is generally believed that in responding to a wide range of common crises, unilateral policies are less effective and, in an age of nuclear weapons, potentially catastrophic.

The essential beliefs of the system-reformer worldview are summarized below:

1. The international system is comprised of state and non-state actors linked in a complex web of interdependence.
2. Conflict is inevitable; however, most conflict situations are manageable through international institutions and regimes.
3. Nation-states are not the only actors participating in international affairs. Citizens may gain access to policy arenas through international or regional organizations and non-state actors such as TNEs and not-for-profit organizations.
4. National security interests cannot always be secured by military force. In many issue areas, the interdependence of actors prevents the use of military force. Thus, nation-states must use other tools of statecraft (e.g., economic or humanitarian assistance).
5. Power is broadly defined in terms of control or power over policy outcomes.

6. The majority of the issue areas which threaten global stability are common crisis situations. Nation-states must cooperate by sharing resources and expertise and, when appropriate, reform existing international institutions to increase their effectiveness. This reform might include the actual transfer of policymaking authority to regional or international institutions.
7. There is a momentum to this collaborative activity. As multilateral institutions become more effective, support for this type of response will increase and spill over into other policy areas.

The System-Transformer Worldview

The system transformer represents the third worldview category in the analytical framework. There are three very different categories of system transformers. Each will be explained in some detail in the next few pages. It is important for the reader to note that there are diverse opinions within each of these worldview categories. The differences, in terms of core beliefs and assumptions, are most obvious in the system-transformation category. There is very obvious disagreement over the preferred strategy for transformation and the view of the ideal state of affairs.

The Alternative Left

The first worldview within this transformation category believes that conflicts and policy problems that plague societies within the international system will continue unless the priorities of nation-states change and the international state-centric system is transformed. These system transformers have been described as idealists or utopians because of their desire to create a world in which national interests succumb to more universal human interests. Historically, the prescriptions from individuals holding this worldview have advocated the establishment of more decentralized decisionmaking authorities within an international or regional federalist structure. This would involve giving individuals more power locally and nationally, while simultaneously providing a structure to resolve regional (e.g., North American) or international problems. Representation and participation in these newly created decisionmaking units would not necessarily be determined by traditional rules of citizenship. For example, educators might vote for a delegate to a North American assembly to represent their interests and work for more spending on education and less on defense. This type of representative political system would challenge the status quo in many states.

For the purposes of this study this worldview will be called an alternative-left perspective. "Alternative" refers to the presentation of a set of goals that challenges the status quo. "Left" suggests a strong bias toward a government that is social-welfare oriented; it is assumed that government will intervene in the private sector to provide resources and opportunities for those who may be disadvantaged. Furthermore, alternative-left transformers seek to establish gov-

ernments that provide a general environment of stability and prosperity for all. Some alternative-left transformers advocate an international system that will work to make everyone equal and others advocate the creation of an international "caring society." The caring society would provide public support for those who are in need and programs aimed at providing resources and opportunities for those more able to participate and contribute to the global society.

Usually those who represent the alternative left advocate the restructuring of the system based on specific values and priorities. These might include values such as peace, social justice, ecological balance, and cultural identity. The significant contributions made by the scholars who work within the World Order Models Project (WOMP) represent the best of the prescriptive literature in the field of international relations. Essays on inequality, disarmament, human rights, and theoretical treatises outlining and supporting plans for a new international order have been produced by WOMP scholars from around the world. Their goal is to convince citizens and their leaders to work toward the creation of a world where human interest, not national interest, motivates policymaking.

Generally, alternative-left system transformers see human nature as basically good. They believe that conflicts and other problems emerge from inappropriate and ineffective governmental institutions. Furthermore, those who hold this position feel that war and inequality should not be accepted as an inevitable by-product of the interactions of states. This idealist or utopian version of system transformation suggests that when individuals are left to their own devices, they will create decentralized and democratic institutions locally, and multilateral institutions that encourage cooperation and power sharing at regional and international levels. These system transformers see value in creating regional and international institutions with the authority to intervene and respond to crises that may threaten stability or adversely affect the quality of life in a specific geographic region. The alternative-left worldview believes that collective-security mechanisms and sophisticated arms-control policies are essential for global peace. Those with this worldview suggest that emphasis on national interest rather than human interest is the major cause of conflict within and between states. The nationalism and parochialism that accompany the present structure of the international system can only be overcome by educational programs and a commitment to restructuring decisionmaking institutions. From this worldview perspective, a new power structure that gives all citizens access to decisionmaking, and is *not* designed to unfairly advantage or disadvantage any individual, interest group, or state, is the anodyne.

The Alternative Right

A second transformation worldview must also be considered an "idealist" perspective. Individuals who adhere to this worldview have a view of world affairs similar to that of the system maintainer. However, these supporters of systemic transformation seek to create a more powerful authoritarian system of governance. The advocates of this position go beyond the Hobbesian view that gov-

ernment is the protector of individuals and should be endowed with sufficient power. Advocates of the alternative-right ("right" referring to the centralization of power) transformation worldview seek to establish a paternalistic and non-democratic system, which is built around an ideal state in which an individual's freedoms are limited and behavior challenging the views of those who hold power is proscribed by the state. The values and assumptions defining the core beliefs of this worldview usually reflect specific religious principles or an individual's evangelical interpretations of life. Hitler's fascism provides an appropriate example of this type of system-transformation model. The creation of an authoritarian system and the congruence of very prescriptive values with the interests of the state are the objectives of individuals who ascribe to this worldview. The nation-state plays a critical role in the socialization of citizens. Divergent worldviews are not openly tolerated in this sort of system. Once in control, these religious zealots or ideological purists often support an adventurous foreign policy, in which they seek to extend their influence by actual territorial expansion or the conversion of other nation-states to their evangelical ideals.

The Dependencia Worldview

The third worldview within the system-transformation category generally reflects the interests and priorities of the most disadvantaged nation-states. Some leaders and citizens in these poor states have given up on the present system because of the persistence of poverty in their societies and their inability to end their dependency on the rich and powerful actors in the international system. Those who ascribe to this worldview see the present international system as highly stratified; relations between rich and poor nation-states are based on exploitation, not mutual interest. These transformation advocates do not interpret interdependence as being beneficial or as creating a global community bound together in a symmetrical web of complex interdependence. The web of interdependence is seen as providing more advantages to the rich nation-states. In addition, the "free-trade" system established by the United States and its Western allies at the end of World War II is seen as a system that provides only limited opportunities for the poor states. The system is seen as neocolonial, one in which the poor states are considered suppliers of cheap labor, raw materials, and markets for manufactured goods and investments from the rich countries. The economic system is seen as unequal and inequitable. Furthermore, those with wealth use their military power and their economic resources to co-opt elites within the poor states. This usually means that elites within rich states support authoritarian regimes in poor states, and discourage democratic reforms in an effort to increase their profits in these countries and maintain their power in the international system.

Those who seek radical changes in the international system as a solution to these injustices and patterns of maldistribution recognize that this dependency condition is more than economic. The poor states find themselves politically and culturally dependent on the rich or core states. This *dependencia* worldview

advocates a system transformation that will result in a more equitable distribution of global resources and opportunities. The *dependencia* worldview recognizes the need for more public (i.e., government) intervention in the international free market to reduce inequality and to promote social justice. Furthermore, advocates of this position support the creation of new regional and international institutions, in which voting power will be determined by the one-state-one-vote principle and not by a system of quotas based on economic or political power. Their general goal is the creation of an international system in which all citizens have the opportunity to live with dignity, and will be protected against any attempt to abridge their inalienable rights as citizens of a state and members of the global community.

All three worldview categories present ideal types. In their application in real world politics, there is often a significant gap between theory and reality. For example, those individuals who advocate the creation of interventionist political systems (e.g., social-welfare states) as a solution to the persistence of debilitating dependencies in the poor states, often fail to create effective and democratic social-welfare systems. Instead, many transformers who work to effect radical change in unequal systems and are successful in their efforts to gain power never follow through with their promises to change the structures of power. Once in power, they either continue their predecessors' policies or become even more authoritarian. Unless these transformers are successful in their efforts totally to dissociate from the present international system and create an alternative to the status quo, the new leaders' survival might necessitate rejoining the system. The transformer then becomes a junior member of the palace guard (a system maintainer) or an advocate of incremental reform.

The pragmatics of politics suggest that mere survival in a competitive international system requires flexibility as one attempts to translate ideals into policy actions. The student of international relations should be aware of how individuals from each worldview category see the world and how their assumptions about the world translate into policy actions. A summary of the general assumptions of each worldview category is presented in Exhibit 1.2.

THE ISSUES

The choice of issues to be examined in this volume reflects the interests of U.S. scholars. However, it would not be unfair to assume that most international-relations scholars are convinced of the importance of the issues discussed in this book. In his important study, *Theory of International Politics* (1979), Kenneth Waltz suggests that the international-policy agenda is defined by four critical issues—pollution, poverty, population, and proliferation. These seem to be issues that relate to the primary problems of war and inequality in the international system.

Exhibit 1.2 General Assumptions of the Three Worldviews

	System Maintainer	System Reformer	System Transformer (WOMP)	System Transformer (<i>Dependencia</i>)
Principal actors in world affairs	Nation-states (the more powerful, the more important)	Nation-states, international and regional organizations, and non-governmental organizations	Nation-states, international and regional organizations, and non-governmental organizations	Nation-states, regional and international organizations based upon the principle of one state, one vote
Primary concern of leaders	Maintaining power relative to other states	International security broadly defined to include economic, political, and sociocultural concerns	The implementation of policies generally reflective of specific human-centric ideals, such as social justice, economic well-being, and ecological balance	Addressing the problem of inequality and human misery by changing the world's economic system and finding a way out of the power struggle between the United States and the USSR
Policy behavior used to secure policy goals	Self-help (unilateral policies)	Cooperative (multilateral) behavior through international or regional institutions	Locally, decentralized power structures with an emphasis on individual participation and the promotion of human-centric goals and ideals; internationally, multilateral institutions where participation is not limited to states	Multilateral efforts aimed at pressuring the rich states with an impression that the poor states are united and cooperate to create a more equitable system
Source of power and influence	Military, economic, and political resources and capabilities	Expenses and capabilities within regional and international institutions (e.g., agenda setting); specific strength in a particular issue area (e.g., trade)	Ability to gain confidence of citizens by providing for their basic human needs and insuring order and stability	Ability to use international fora to influence the policy actions of rich states; control of commodities (e.g., oil)
View of relations with other states	Zero-sum competition is the norm; cooperative behavior possible but national interest still rules	Nation-states coordinate their activities and cooperate in specific policy areas; the challenge of common crisis situations requires multilateral efforts	Nation-states act according to specific international norms guaranteed by multilateral enforcement institutions	Poor states are exploited by rich states. The core states control the international policy agenda and use the poor states to enhance their position in the international hierarchy. The poor states must work together to change the international system. This cooperation is hindered by the tendency for the global powers to create spheres of influence and encourage regional differences.
Preferred world future	The best the world can hope for is a balance of power where stability is guaranteed by deterrence and numerous alliances	A community of nation-states, not unlike the European Community, where state members encourage the integration of policymaking authority in specific issue areas; these institutions would encourage cooperative behavior and multilateral efforts aimed at protecting the welfare of citizens throughout the world	A global federation based on human-centric interests, not national interests	A more equitable international economic system and a global political system in which all countries, regardless of size, cultural composition, or ideological orientation enjoy equal access to decisionmaking institutions

This book also includes several studies of regional tension areas. These chapters focus on a system of relationships within a particular region. It is important to note that the power and position of relevant political actors might be different in regional-problem areas. For example, the United States is generally a supporter of the status quo—a system maintainer—in world affairs. Yet, in some policy arenas the United States might support a change-oriented position because a change in a particular region might strengthen the international position of the United States vis-à-vis its principal adversary, the Soviet Union. This suggests that a student of international affairs must take care not to apply these worldview categories broadly without a thorough consideration of various dimensions of an issue area. Similarly, students of international affairs should not reify these categories by suggesting that particular individuals represent “ideal types,” though these individuals might appear consistently to select policies that reflect a given worldview. The policy outcomes in most societies reflect the interests, priorities, and values (i.e., worldviews) of a variety of individuals. These policy interests are influenced by national attributes (e.g., societal traditions, the characteristics of a country’s political and economic system, and its resource base) and conditions that define the international system (e.g., level of conflict, number of actors, and the policies of those actors). All of these variables must be considered in an analysis of international issues.

What follows is an application of the worldviews analytical framework in seven international issue areas and five regional tension or conflict areas. The authors have done their best to demonstrate how the model can be used effectively as a method for comparing contending images of complex and controversial issues. The worldviews analytical model is particularly useful for scholars and teachers concerned with encouraging their students to think critically about the issues that will shape their futures. Most of the authors have used their chapters in the classroom. Most of them have learned that as a teaching and discovery approach the analytical model is quite effective. Perhaps more importantly, the contributors continue to discuss the intellectual strengths and weaknesses of this approach. It is in this spirit of building knowledge that this book is presented for critical review by students of international affairs.

NOTE

1. The terms system-maintainer, system-reformer, and system-transformer were first used extensively by Richard Falk and his colleagues involved in the World Order Models Project (WOMP). Professor Falk used the concepts to distinguish three distinctive approaches to world order. For further discussion, see his chapter, “Contending Approaches to World Order,” in Falk, Kim, and Mendlovitz, *Toward A Just World Order* (1982).

REFERENCES

- Calleo, David. *The Imperious Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Falk, Richard, S. Kim, and S. Mendlovitz, editors. *Toward a Just World Order*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1982.
- Galtung, Johan. *The True Worlds: A Transnational Perspective*. New York: The Free Press, 1980.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. London: Andrew Crooke, 1651.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Nye, Joseph S. *Power and Interdependence*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.
- . “Two Cheers for Multilateralism.” *Foreign Policy* 60 (Fall 1985): 148–167.
- Shuman, Michael. “Dateline Main Street: Local Foreign Policies.” *Foreign Policy* 65 (Winter 1986–1987): 154–174.
- Waltz, Kenneth. *Man, the State and War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- . *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979.