Introduction: Intellectuals, Ideas, and Identity in the Sources of International Change

> It is only by studying the minds of men that we shall understand the causes of anything. —James Joll, *1914: The Unspoken Assumptions*

In the early 1980s, superpower relations were at their lowest ebb since the Berlin and Cuban crises of the early 1960s. The painstaking gains of arms control were unraveling with "palisades of missiles" rising on earth and "space strike weapons" soon to enter the heavens amid mutual accusations of treaty violation and deceit. Détente's diplomatic and economic ties had withered in the aftermath of Angola and Afghanistan, and Soviet and U.S. proxies were now at war on three continents. Moscow saw an adversary engaged in reckless provocations and sweeping challenges to its legitimate interests, launching a massive arms race that at best sought to exhaust the USSR, and at worst was actually readying for nuclear attack. Its citizens were barraged with parallel images of Nazi and NATO aggression; Kremlin propaganda shrieked of a dying imperialism preparing "to take with it all life on earth."

The view from Washington was not dissimilar—that of an "evil empire" increasingly repressive at home and aggressive abroad. Though ultimately destined for "the ash can of history," the USSR was still on the march. Administration officials exposed its plots, denounced its barbarity, and debated its plans for nuclear war. Some more thoughtful analysts, though less alarmist, still viewed Soviet global power as on an upward trajectory. Others saw a chance for modest reform but, noting the strength of military-industrial interests and the depth of imperial commitments, agreed that there was little hope of détente's revival.

None foresaw what soon occurred, the rise of a dynamic Soviet leader who, launching an ambitious perestroika at home, took even more radical steps abroad under the banner of *novoe myshlenie*—new thinking. In rapid sequence, Mikhail Gorbachev silenced the skeptics by opening his country to the world, unilaterally slashing arms, withdrawing from Afghanistan and other third world outposts, peacefully relinquishing the "outer" East European empire, and—in a final test of fealty to democratic, universal human values—ceding the "inner" empire as well. Striving, in his words, to "rejoin the path of world civilization," Gorbachev overturned nearly 50 years of cold war confrontation in just five.

How can this truly epochal change be explained? Was the cold war's end essentially just the overdue retreat of an overextended, bankrupt empire? Or, anything but inevitable, was it instead largely the handiwork of a rare visionary statesman whose very accession was an event of remarkably good fortune? Or does credit properly belong not to the inexorable dictates of power, nor to the innovation of leadership, but rather to institutions—namely, the détente-era international ties and supporting domestic networks that altered ideas and "incentive structures" in favor of major foreign-policy change?

These categories of explanation, which dominate the literature on the cold war's end, each highlight important aspects of new thinking's late development and subsequent implementation; in short, the cold war "endgame." None, however, adequately addresses a critical, earlier, process that made such an endgame possible: the emergence, over the preceding two decades, of a Soviet intellectual elite holding sharply unorthodox beliefs about their country's development and proper place in the world community.

The new thinking's global-integrationist outlook, rooted in the cultural thaw, domestic liberalization, and burgeoning foreign ties of the early post-Stalin era, had begun coalescing as a powerful alternative worldview by the mid-to-late 1960s. Shared by philosophers and physicists, economists, political scientists, and historians, this diverse policy-academic elite constituted a "Westernizing" minority within the Soviet intelligentsia. Numbering perhaps in the hundreds, the most active of its ranks—a few dozen—were already promoting a broad range of foreign and domestic reforms by the

early 1970s; that is, prior to the full flowering of détente and more than a decade before the sharp worsening of problems and subsequent accession of Gorbachev in 1985. Also in advance of his accession, Gorbachev came under the influence of these ideas and, together with his core group of political allies, embraced the new-thinking *weltanschauung* and the new thinkers' ambitious agenda *before* his boldest steps of the later 1980s. So while crisis and leadership transition were vital preconditions, so was an earlier intellectual change—the rise of a global, "Westernizing" identity among a liberal policy-academic elite—a sine qua non of the cold war's sudden and peaceful end.

Crisis, Leadership, and Ideas in the Cold War's End

Power-centered approaches, which emphasize Soviet economic woes and consequent difficulty in continuing the arms race and maintaining empire, highlight some of the problems bedeviling Moscow in the mid-to-late 1980s. But they also describe well the problems of the late 1970s and, absent perestroika, largely the same dilemma Moscow would still be facing in the late 1990s. Neorealist theory, stressing the primacy of power in an anarchical international system, tells less about when and how a state will adjust to decline.[1] In the Soviet case, as will be seen, in addition to continuing the status quo indefinitely, there was also a reactionary alternative to liberalization; increasingly repressive at home and confrontational abroad, it was arguably an equally likely choice in 1985. "Crisis" may indeed have created an opportunity for reform, but it also emboldened powerful reactionaries; it was probably a necessary condition for some kind of major change, but certainly an insufficient one for the new thinking's triumph.[2]

Dynamic, innovative leadership was thus central to when, and how, crisis was addressed in the USSR. Even this is an understatement, for it is nearly impossible to imagine any of Gorbachev's competitors for the general secretaryship even undertaking, much less carrying through, his bold domestic and foreign reforms. Yet Gorbachev did not act alone. He was supported by a few, like-minded, senior colleagues (principally Alexander Yakovlev and Eduard Shevardnadze), who together relied heavily—for general inspiration and specific advice—on the new-thinking pioneers noted above.

The latters' role was vital, for they empowered leaders with ideas and information. If Gorbachev was indispensable in the launching and implementation of radical reforms, the new thinkers were similarly critical in their conception.[3]

The third broad approach noted above, encompassing various neoliberal and institutional analyses, does address the missing link in this causal chain. Drawing on theories of regimes and the international spread of norms, some stress the constructive influence of Soviet participation in arms control and other détente-era ties. These contacts fostered "transnational learning" and "epistemic communities" of experts promoting cooperative approaches to international affairs.[4] In such accounts, ideas do matter, but in often narrow or instrumental terms that do not capture the breadth, depth, and long genesis of new thinking.[5] Other analyses focus on one or another foreign-policy issue and the specialists directly concerned, and so cannot take full account of the earlier, underlying links among diverse reformist individuals (policy analysts, scientists, academics, even dissidents) and reform ideas (political, economic, social) that formed the vital broader context of new thinking in *all* fields.[6] Most also assume a rationality at odds with Soviet reality, i.e., the influence of "incentive structures" favoring reform initiatives when in fact they were mostly weighted against change and, in numerous instances, it was at the risk of privilege or career that individuals motivated by *ideals* pioneered key innovations.[7]

In short, while offering useful insights into the new thinking's late development and subsequent implementation, neoliberal approaches are limited by frameworks that—due to their largely instrumental conception of ideas—neglect the broader social-intellectual context, and often miscast the real political context, in which they actually emerged. Simply put, can the ideas of Soviet physicists be understood through their participation in disarmament fora abroad, overlooking their earlier efforts at home in the fight to de-Stalinize and "globalize" the social sciences? Can the beliefs of foreign-affairs experts be analyzed via their role in détente-era exchanges while ignoring their patronage of Moscow's avant-garde theater or reading of samizdat historical and cultural works? Can economists who sought global integration be viewed as students of the capitalist West without attention to their study of East European

reforms, of the market experience of the Soviet 1920s, and of pioneering prerevolutionary Russian economists? And can the motives of these and many other diverse reformers be understood absent appreciation of their strong professional and personal ties, their shared hopes in the thaw era and common anguish over the crushing of the Prague Spring?

Analyzing the Origins of New Thinking: The Elites-Identity Framework

The first step toward an analytical framework that can address these questions is a redefinition of both the agents of intellectual change and the substance of their ideas. As suggested above, the ranks of the new thinkers were not limited to a narrow group of security specialists but comprised a broad cohort of social and natural scientists, students of culture and the humanities, ranging from academics to apparatchiks. The new thinking, too, has seen several definitions. Early ones, which listed such elements as "defense sufficiency" or "mutual security," were soon seen only to have enumerated the policies flowing from what was indeed a deeper new *thinking*. Later definitions—as a belief system, ideology, or operational code—agree that the ideas at issue were not such peripheral ones but rather the most basic "philosophical" beliefs about the nature of world politics.[8] With varying emphases, most include the elevation of universal over class values, and the rejection of inevitable East-West hostility, as central tenets.

The problem lies not with what is included in such definitions, but what is left out. For in discarding longtime core tenets, new thinking did not just posit an end to conflict with the West or the desirability of cooperation with the liberal international community. It argued that the USSR was, or should be, a *member* of that community. Thus I argue that the new thinking is best viewed as a watershed in national identity—not in opposition to, but in unity with the West—and so entailing a sharply different conception of Soviet national interests in world politics. Put simply, a diverse group of specialist elites, on the basis of their knowledge and experience over the preceding two decades, had by the early 1970s embraced a distinct "Westernizing" set of beliefs and political orientation that would play an indispensable role in shaping

Gorbachev's reforms. By privileging two factors—the paradigmatic and constitutive nature of belief change in reference to international "others," and the central role of intellectuals in that process—the elites-identity framework helps to answer the questions posed above and so offers a better model for analysis of intellectual-political change in the USSR.[9]

If the nation is a self-conscious community of people bound by a common culture and understanding of their past and future—a distinct "historical narrative"—then its identity is that which explains "Who are we, what do we collectively aspire to . . . and what most distinguishes us from the rest of the world?"[10] If a nation is shaped (and a state legitimized) by the symbols, norms, and beliefs that comprise the "map" of its political culture, then national identity provides the "compass" that guides the nation (state) in world affairs.[11] It includes a distinct sense of mission or purpose, possibly a messianic individualism, leadership of a cultural or ethnic bloc, or membership in some other political or economic grouping of states.[12] Identity powerfully influences the interplay of deep-rooted cultural and fast-changing material factors in deciding how national interests—and so international behavior—are determined.[13]

National identity is not immutable. It can change in a slow process of cultural evolution or more rapidly during such socioeconomic upheavals as industrialization.[14] But even when "imposed" from abroad—as after military defeat and foreign occupation—a key role in the rise of a new identity is played by intellectuals, the "secular priesthood" of the nation.[15] Whether in reaction to their personal alienation,[16] or to their professional insight into the nature of crisis,[17] it is intellectuals who lead the assault on a hegemonic identity and are the "storytellers in the invention of [a new] nationality."[18] Their role is even more vital in dictatorial systems where the state controls discourse over history and politics, imposing an identity from above through its monopoly over education, the media, and scholarship. In many such cases, where intellectuals have been the agents of large-scale belief change, several factors stand out as crucial.

First, the *prerequisites* of change include both an opening to foreign ideas and information, and the emergence of particular elite congregations in which these ideas are debated and an intellectual "critical mass" can accumulate. In Franco's Spain, the two were met in several ministries where the rise of a modern,

"European" identity paved the way for democratization. For the deradicalization of some Latin American Marxists, the conditions were found abroad; political exile in Italy, wrote one, "affected us as much as the Cuban revolution. . . . It was there [reading Gramsci and cementing close ties to Eurocommunists] that I changed my political perspective."[19] In post-Mao China, the journal *World Economic Herald,* through articles, seminars, and other ties with Western political and business figures, became "an important source of foreign ideas [and] helped set the agenda" for the prodemocracy movement.[20] In the case of Soviet new thinking, as will be seen, a handful of research centers and editorial boards constituted strikingly similar "networks . . . where the diffusion of foreign ideas" was greatly encouraged.[21]

Second, the *process* of identity change combines learning on two levels: *comparative-interactive* learning, wherein foreign ties facilitate a shift in intellectuals' essential "self-categorization" of the nation among allies and adversaries; and *social* learning, in which growing numbers of intellectuals, from diverse professions, are drawn into an informal domestic community. In other words, international links serve not only as conduits for ideas, but also as "reference groups" vital to realignment of identity vis-à-vis other states.[22] Simultaneously, rethinking of "external" identity prompts reappraisal of fundamental internal issues as well, thus further widening the circle of those involved.[23] Again, the Chinese case illustrates this two-level process: writers and journalists who began with a tentative opening to foreign ideas soon turned to a searching critique of their own society; economists and scientists who first sought expanded ties abroad later pushed for broader domestic liberalization; they were the "ideological entrepreneurs" who constructed a new "global" Chinese identity.[24] And so foreign "transaction flows"—the ties that "link people across space so as to form a new community"[25]—foster similar ties at home by "building bridges" among diverse actors and interests. Common aspirations for a reformed domestic society, and shared beliefs about its place in the international community, "create the basis of a new identity" among critically thinking intellectuals.[26]

The transformation of national identity, particularly in a closed-dictatorial system, is rarely a linear process. Periods of gradual change are punctuated by intervals of rapid intellectual upheaval.[27]

These can result from such external shocks as economic collapse or military defeat. Or the regime itself can unwittingly encourage rethinking of core beliefs, via permission of such signal cultural events as the 1988 televising of *The Yellow River Elegy* with its indictment of Chinese isolation, or the 1962 publication of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and other explosive critiques of the Stalinist legacy. The crackdowns that followed—the Tienanmen massacre and subsequent repressions in China, or the crushing of the Prague Spring and stifling of dissent in the USSR—provided still more powerful "cognitive punches" by revealing the limits of reform and exposing the brutal essence of the existing system.[28] But even as it suppresses open debate, such reaction only heightens the importance of informal intellectual congregations and catalyzes the development of a new identity.

To show that beliefs and identity ultimately matter, their impact on policy must be demonstrated. For *novoe myshlenie,* the new thinking, this means that the ideas of an intellectual elite influenced leaders in ways that were not just epiphenomenal to steps necessitated by the crises of the mid-1980s. This will be shown presently, but first it is important to ask why these crises arose in the first place.[29] It has been noted that, for all the attention to new thinking, little has been paid to "the motivated interests that held the old pathologies in power for so long."[30] Can the problems that Gorbachev inherited be explained mainly by the material interests of a Brezhnevist great-power bureaucratism? To what extent were they also a "pathological" product of social and cultural constraints rooted in the Stalinist experience, or earlier? To answer these questions, the elites-identity model directs attention back to the "basic values, cognitions and emotional commitments" of the once-hegemonic identity—how it was initially learned and subsequently socialized—and so to the sociointellectual context in which an alternative identity would later contend.[31] Therefore, as outlined in the chapter summaries that follow, analysis of the new thinking necessarily begins with examination of the old.

The Persistence of Old Thinking

One of the least-studied revelations of glasnost, but a vital one for Soviet foreign-policy studies, is how important ideology really

was. Soviet leaders may have been concerned first to preserve imperial gains and, by the 1970s, to maintain a sort of superpower condominium. But at critical junctures—from wasted chances to improve East-West ties, to provocative ventures that mortally wounded them—ideological motives were important. And these can be understood only via the unique circumstances that made the old thinking, the "hostile-isolationist" identity, so tenacious. Chapter 1 reviews these circumstances, from the contention of early Westernizing and Slavophile intellectual currents, through the upheavals of revolution, war, and consolidation of Bolshevik rule that decimated the old "European" elite, to the Stalinist synthesis of doctrinaire Leninist anticapitalism and traditional Russian nationalist xenophobia.

The generation that came of age in these turbulent decades was repeatedly terrorized, ceaselessly propagandized, and effectively isolated from most challenges to Stalinist dogma on the outside world. Not surprisingly, Stalin's successors parted only slowly, and never completely, with the fears, mistrust, and residual revolutionary ambition of their formative years. From Cuba to Afghanistan, hostile-isolationist beliefs and values periodically reasserted themselves. Of course, it was this Stalin-trained cohort that ruled until 1985. But even among a second echelon of officialdom, once removed from the early traumas and so presumably shaped more by Khrushchev's reforms, the old thinking was strong—largely because the system was so thoroughly ideologized. "Peaceful coexistence" notwithstanding, Leninist tenets of Western hostility and a divided world remained intact. Privilege and career depended on fealty to this dogma; information was controlled and manipulated on this basis; and even language and categories of analysis were built upon its precepts.[32] In such overt and covert ways, old thinking permeated Soviet identity in ways that far outlived the early tragedies and triumphs upon which it was built.

The Origins of New Thinking

So the thaw era, for most of the Soviet elite, did not go terribly far in undoing more than a generation of hostile-isolationist thought. But for some others, it did. Chapter 2 explores how intellectual life changed radically for those who would later mature as

new thinkers. Most came of age in the thaw's emancipatory atmosphere, which found many studying in Moscow or other urban centers where openness and diversity were greatest. They listened to unsanctioned poets and read unpublished manuscripts, discussed Orwell and Gramsci, and debated issues from the Party's past complicity in the terror to its current policy toward Hungary and Yugoslavia. And when new foreign-affairs institutes were established, exchanges with the West begun, and opportunities for working abroad (or in Moscow's corridors of power) were created—all with unprecedented access to ideas and information—they were prominent among the beneficiaries.

Part of this story is already familiar. What I emphasize, later in chapter 2 and in chapter 3, is how these changes combined to nurture a reformist policy-academic elite that differed sharply from the majority of careerists still dominated by Stalin's oxymoronically termed "proletarian intelligentsia."[33] Drawing on recent memoirs and interviews as well as earlier writings, I show this process beginning with the assault of historians and writers on core hostile-isolationist beliefs that launched an implicit debate over Russia's place in world civilization. Also seen is how the influences noted, from exchanges with the West to study of reforms in Eastern Europe, prompted new ideas in fields from foreign affairs and economics to the environment. From Pugwash seminars and Polish sociology to the Prague Spring, these diverse sources had, by the late 1960s, brought many to an increasingly social-democratic outlook that sought their country's integration with the liberal international community.

What the early new thinkers also shared—despite their often-divergent career paths in the humanities or natural sciences, from academia to the apparat—was a *social* identity as members of a liberal-reformist domestic community. Rooted in their common early experience and professional ties, these links grew stronger in a few key intellectual congregations: institutes, editorial boards, and consultant groups. They were also seen as liberals rallied in defense of reform, and each other, when reaction surged in the later 1960s. Historians and philosophers, ousted from university posts for faulting dogmas, found refuge at academic institutes with the help of former classmates. Critics of cultural chauvinism were shielded from the harshest punitive blows by their apparatchik allies.

International-affairs analysts, scientists, and even some military officers defended those under siege for questioning Stalin's foreign or economic policies. And this diverse community openly united in protest against the reactionaries' attempts to rehabilitate Stalin himself.

The Mobilization of New Thinking

With the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, there began a difficult period that has usually been viewed as a hiatus in the evolution of new thinking. In fact, as argued in chapter 4, this is better seen as a time of consolidation and advance. The hard-line turn abroad and at home, while pushing many into silence or cynicism, was a critical watershed for others. For the Prague Spring had encouraged and united reformist intellectuals like nothing else since Khrushchev's "secret speech" in 1956; its defeat now prompted more radical rethinking of the country's problems and potential solutions. And it was in the late 1960s and early 1970s—*before* the brief flowering of détente—that some of the most important new ideas emerged. Drawing on internal reports and limited-circulation studies, as well as interviews and memoirs, I show this sharp break with old thinking (and frank criticism of official policy) in many fields: on security and relations with the United States; on policy toward Europe and Asia; on the economy, technology, and the environment; and on cultural freedom and concern over rising Russian nationalism.

Détente was clearly a powerful boost to such innovation. But the key conceptual breakthroughs usually traced to this period were often nearly a decade old. While reform ideas continued to develop, what stands out even more from the mid-to-late 1970s are vigorous new efforts to put them into practice. In chapters 4 and 5, this "mobilization" is detailed—first in analyses and proposals to improve East-West relations further, and later, as reform opportunities were missed and Soviet policy began undermining détente, in appeals to halt the slide back toward confrontation. Crucially, this mobilization also fostered links between the new thinkers and a small group of reform-minded senior Party officials whose emergent leader was Gorbachev.

The Triumph of New Thinking

Together, the proponents of change struggled through the difficult years of transition from 1982 to 1985, as detailed in chapters 5 and 6. Here I also show how the strength of a reactionary leadership faction made a status-quo foreign policy, or even a hard-line turn, a likely outcome. That Gorbachev was initially primarily concerned to reverse domestic decline is clear. But this concern, coupled with a rare intellect (particularly for a member of the Politburo) and broad exposure to reformist influences (a thaw-era Moscow University education, independent European travel, extensive private study) had already led him to early and fruitful interaction with a broad range of new-thinking ideas and individuals. These ranged from Yakovlev, the apparat-academic in Western exile, and Shevardnadze, the innovative Georgian party boss, to a growing circle of reformist economists, scientists, and foreign-policy experts. The members of this "brain trust"—whose ties to Gorbachev worried Politburo conservatives and delayed his accession—were not only the future leader's private tutors on specific international and domestic issues. They were also, in an important sense, the "ambassadors" to Gorbachev of a larger reformist intellectual elite.

Once in office, Gorbachev and his allies relied heavily on these and other new-thinking advisers. And while his reforms did have unintended consequences, it is incorrect to view his foreign policy as mainly reacting to events gone out of control.[34] As shown in chapter 6, Gorbachev's most critical steps abroad were *preceded* by a principled commitment to core new-thinking values. And this came, not in 1989, but as early as 1986. That watershed year began with a sweeping reappraisal of international affairs, even more radical than could be expressed at the reformist 27th Party Congress in February. April brought Chernobyl, another "cognitive punch" to remaining dogmas about security and relations with the world community. By summer, Gorbachev had taken the lead in crafting the radical disarmament plan unveiled at Reykjavik in October. These, together with an intensive series of meetings with Western leaders and intellectuals, brought Gorbachev and his allies to broad acceptance of new thinking's global, democratic, integrationist principles no later than 1987. The "proof" of this commitment may have come only with acquiescence in the tumultuous changes of 1989 and after.

But that commitment—to bury the hostile-isolationist outlook that underlay decades of cold war—was decisively made at least two years earlier.[35]

The Lessons of New Thinking

A decade on, the epoch of perestroika, the cold war's sudden end, and the myriad subsequent changes (and continuities) in the politics of Russia and the international system continue to reverberate in a vast new (and not-so-new) literature on the lessons of new thinking for Sovietology, for foreign policy studies, and for international relations theory. I address some of these at some length in my conclusion, discussing them only after the reader has had the opportunity to sift the evidence and interpretation presented in the chapters that follow. But for now, by way of summary, and as points to be borne in mind as that argumentation is considered, I offer the following.

First, as to U.S. foreign policy: the view that "strength won the cold war" is, at best, greatly oversimplified. The early 1980s Western military buildup, and particularly the U.S. turn toward aggressively challenging the USSR, made the accession of a genuinely reformist leadership much more difficult. The effort to tilt the military balance sharply in the West's favor certainly heightened Soviet perceptions of deepening problems and a need for change. But rarely is it recognized that such change could, and arguably almost did, take the form of a repressive-confrontational turn at home and abroad. Liberalization was hardly "necessary," and collapse was anything but imminent; when it did come, it was an unintended by-product of reforms, not something that their preconditions had preordained.

For their part, critics on the Left must acknowledge that a long-term policy of containment and measured emphasis on maintaining Western power contributed to the perception of some in Moscow that confrontation was fruitless and that there was need for systemic reforms. An eroding position in the global competition was indeed one factor in their embrace of new thinking. But most of this thinking *preceded* the Reagan challenge, a gamble that did as much to complicate as to accelerate reform. Foreign-policy liberals were a distinct minority in a political system dominated by old thinkers. A

different leader, heeding different (and, in 1985, far more prevalent) advice, almost certainly would have chosen a different and more dangerous course. In short, the argument that "Star Wars brought the Soviets to their knees" reflects a lapse in basic counterfactual reasoning, if not an even more deterministic triumphalism.[36]

Thus, a second lesson concerns the intersection of power and ideas in shaping major international change. Clearly, power mattered. The steady erosion in the USSR's relative power and growing difficulty in maintaining military-imperial commitments were significant factors in the emergence of new thinking. Decline was a stimulus of both political and intellectual change—albeit, as noted, in both reformist *and* reactionary directions. But the new thinking's main impetus lay elsewhere, in the long-term rise of a new policy-academic elite whose "Westernizing" identity was rooted in the cultural thaw, domestic liberalization, and burgeoning international ties of the first post-Stalin decades. For what ensued, in terms of foreign policy lessons, the détente of the 1960s and 1970s was probably more consequential than the confrontation of the 1980s. In terms of international relations theory, intellectual change was also a key variable in shaping the cold war's peaceful end; declining power may have been the immediate catalyst of a turn in Soviet foreign policy, but rising ideas were predominant in determining its direction.

In short, ideas mattered, too. They were not merely epiphenomenal or incidental to considerations of power; nor can their impact be grasped in mainly instrumental terms. Ideas mattered as deeply held beliefs that moved many to promote reforms at risk to their personal or institutional interests (and, for the old thinking with which the new contended, to cling to hostile-isolationist policies that ultimately undermined the USSR's bases of power). Moreover, the new thinking was not just a narrow set of precepts on national security acquired in less than a decade, but a broader array of beliefs and values shaping national identity that developed over a full generation.

Further, essential in this development were the links between international and domestic sources of change; exposure to contemporary Western political and social ideas was important, but so was study of European leftist thought, debate over other socialist models, and rethinking of earlier Soviet and Russian experience; international "specialists' communities" were influential in certain areas,

but even more important was the coalescence of a domestic community that united reformers across diverse fields. The ties among historians, philosophers, economists, and foreign-affairs specialists were vital in simultaneously strengthening new thinking's conceptual foundation while broadening its social base among critically minded Soviet intellectuals.

Analytical models that isolate one or another of these dimensions—though contributing much to understanding particular aspects of Gorbachev's reforms—cannot, by definition, capture the critical, larger process of social-intellectual change that was the rise of new thinking. Ironically, it was some of the now much-criticized "area studies" Sovietologists, with their characterization of "within-system reformers" or the evocative "children of the 20th Party Congress," who had it right.[37] And not simply because their terms were evocative, but for *what* they evoked: a broad reformist elite sharing a common intellectual development and commitment to fulfilling the early post-Stalin era promise of liberalizing, humanizing, and opening their country to the world.[38]