

1966

## Beyond Sovereignty

G. J. Patton

Max Mark

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Patton, G. J. and Mark, Max (1966) "Beyond Sovereignty," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 19 : No. 2 , Article 10.  
Available at: <http://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol19/iss2/10>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [daniel.desilets@usnwc.edu](mailto:daniel.desilets@usnwc.edu).

The authors indicate the old dilemma that most institutes of higher learning consider military affairs as too narrow a field to be presented as a separate discipline. While existing schools and programs are useful, a planned formal training program is considered the most desirable. Professors Lyons and Morton suggest full incorporation of national security affairs in the history and social science disciplines of our universities and colleges.

W.D. CLARK  
Colonel, U.S. Air Force

Mark, Max. *Beyond Sovereignty*. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1965. 178 p.

The student of political science will find the first four chapters repetitious of much he has already studied. Others will find them easy to read and an orientation for what is to follow. The meat of the book begins with an insight into the split between East and West. This chapter sets forth Mr. Mark's thesis, that there is something for Americans beyond sovereignty. The idea is expertly developed as the reader is drawn through the anti-colonial revolution, the revolution of warfare, and the revolution of rising expectations. This is followed by an analysis of the Communist world and a comparison of this world with the West. The chapter on contemporary international politics is impressive and incisive. In readable language and without tortuous exercises in terminology, the author lays down his thoughts on the decline of the nation-state, transitional ideologies, and the fusion of domestic and international politics. He puts the new diplomacy in its proper place and points out the ambiguous position of physical power reflecting the unsettled character of military doctrine. The United Nations is described as a child of the age of total war; and the philosophical basis for international law is doomed to failure since the rise of the sovereign state. Although the nation-state has become obsolete, world community is still in the distance. Mr. Mark thinks the chances for disarmament should become more promising since wars have become suicidal. But one is forced to the conclusion that in actuality the abstract proposition of disarmament finds itself in a vicious circle. At this point the author offers his perspective of the world scene. This alone could fuel a long debate, but he does not dwell upon it. Instead there follows an excellent appraisal of the American approach to foreign policy—that it lacks the correct understanding of our historical period, that our outlook is narrowly pragmatic. From these corollaries we

are led to the conclusion that we have no capacity to draw long-term policies; the author cites the evidence of our short-term, brush-fire policies providing the momentum to carry us on to another makeshift, equally short-term policy. This shows, he claims, that American foreign policy lacks a working theory of history. In this excellent book Mr. Mark provides us with much intriguing material for discussion. However, it seems that the argument concludes too abruptly, leaving too many answers for the reader to discover, when it becomes clear that there is no solution outside the framework of realism.

G.J. PATTON  
Captain, U.S. Navy