THE NEW THINKING: YESTERDAY, TODAY, TOMORROW

The shifts in world politics during the past decade have in many ways been related to what we call the *new thinking*. It is true that the new thinking is rarely referred to now, especially in Russia, where it was born. Sometimes people even ask whether this new thinking really existed. And what is it anyway? Is it a conceptual structure, a set of political principles and moral values, the latest variant of some ideology, or perhaps simply propaganda serving government interests?

Many opinions have been voiced on this subject, all marked by outlooks that are intensely ideological. This is understandable. We are all finding it difficult to free ourselves from ideological fetters—both in Russia and in the West. People everywhere are finding it difficult to say goodbye to old, stereotyped ways of thinking.

In the process of constructing new international relations the going has been rough, and still is. Of course no one envisioned a smooth, straight road. But it is alarming today to see that the world, which had begun to move away from confrontation and toward unity, is once again being pushed onto a dangerous path. This tendency has already found expression in actual policies and has led to new divisions, with certain nations being placed in hostile opposition to others. This is simply the result of an absence of new policies adequate to the tasks facing the world at this crucial juncture. The responsibilities of those involved in international politics increase with every

passing day. A new and higher quality of world politics is required. At the time when the new thinking originated, we regarded perestroika as a chance not only to overcome the crisis in our own country but also to contribute to eliminating the nuclear threat to our planet and advancing the worldwide search for adequate answers to the challenges of our times.

What, then, in light of all that has transpired, does the new thinking represent? Is it perhaps limited to one historical period? Has its allotted time expired? Was it perhaps suitable only to end global confrontation? Is it not applicable as a means of problem solving in our new situation? Or is now precisely the time when the need for the new thinking is more acute than ever? All these questions are worth investigating—which is the primary aim of this final part of this work.