Editor's Note

Traditional benchmarks for ethical choice in international affairs are always being tested by new circumstances. In recent months, the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity have been challenged by the humanitarian intervention in Somalia and violence in the former Yugoslavia. The ideals of self-determination and collective security have encountered some of their intrinsic limitations, leaving us to wonder how far these principles can take us before they become counterproductive. And, with such initiatives as the Earth Summit of 1992, cosmopolitan standards of human rights have been enjoying a resurgence that may have significant political impact. These developments show that while realist theories of state behavior based on "national interest" remain relevant, the considerable influence of "justice" as a factor in decision-making remains as powerful as ever.

In keeping with our past efforts, this issue of *Ethics & International Affairs* focuses on the intersection of principles and policy. Specifically, it examines various means of working toward justice in the international arena: What tools are available to citizens and statesmen, and how can we evaluate the moral worth and appropriateness of each of these instruments?

In this issue, one recurring theme is the trend toward collective security— the enforcement of justice through community responsibility. Hard questions are asked as to whether collective security arrangements always offer the morally preferable path. Collective security and community enforcement have made sanctions an increasingly popular diplomatic weapon. The same questions asked of collective security also apply to sanctions: Are they a morally sound instrument of statecraft, and what can they realistically achieve? Perhaps the most important question for sanctions concerns their "ends" or objectives. Should sanctions be used as an enforcement mechanism, an instrument of punishment, or a method of keeping one's own hands clean by avoiding any dealings with repugnant regimes?

A number of criteria for ethical choice already exist to give guidance on these matters. The most prominent, and the ones most often cited, are those that grow out of the Western liberal tradition (incorporating Judeo-Christian and Greco-

Roman elements). But these traditions alone are not enough. Cross-cultural comparisons are crucial to understanding moral choice as exercised within Western societies and elsewhere. Comparative evaluations are useful in helping to make distinctions and draw lines. For that reason, we are pleased to include a number of pieces incorporating non-Western perspectives.

The renewed strength of nationalism and the sheer power of non-Western traditions (as seen in Asia and the Middle East) remind us that many forces are at work in international politics today. As our Russian contributors point out, real peace and cooperation can be achieved only through mutual acceptance of common moral values. Alliances and settlements based on anything short of this are unlikely to endure.

Three of our pieces—those on philosophic history and the lives and work of Reinhold Niebuhr and John Dewey—remind us that the consideration of "ethics and international affairs" requires attention to individual moral choice. We should not forget that choices are made by real people, acting in history, in a specific time and place. As thinkers who themselves understood this, Niebuhr and Dewey are particularly good representatives of their times.

Finally, we conclude this volume with a new feature, "Recent Books in Ethics and International Affairs." We consider these to be some of the best new books in the field. Each of them discusses issues *in terms of ethics:* they are not books that merely address conventional issues with some ethical significance. By including this listing here, we hope to generate increased conversation among our readers.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.1993.tb00139.x Published online by Cambridge University Press