

and revisionists would transform an international order based upon superpower hegemony in order to redress the stark imbalance in global economic and military power. If the incrementalist focus was, after 1978, principally East-West, the expressed concerns of the idealist and revisionist neutral and non-aligned states would remain perceptibly North-South. Unlike revisionism, however, "idealism" was at the outset markedly anti-nuclear and heroic in its quest for nuclear disarmament. It has never rejected out of hand the desirability of superpower agreements, but has exhibited a clear preference that these should be framed in United Nations and CD rather than Soviet-American terms. Bilateralism, then, should be subordinate to the multilateral arms control and disarmament process. To this end the idealists, unlike the moderate incrementalists, have been political activists and have assumed advocacy roles.

The minority "revisionist" trend has been more controversial, and more ambiguous in its aims, than either idealism or incrementalism. Its dislike and distrust of superpower nuclear hegemony and arms control bilateralism is still evident in the CD debates but, with a limited convergence of idealism and incrementalism after 1982, revisionism has become more isolated. In important respects, the position of non-nuclear powers within this typology can over time be suggested by the extent to which they have come to accept the precepts and *quid pro quos* of an admittedly discriminatory NPT. The attitude of the revisionists toward the existing non-proliferation regime would seem to signify an incipient preference for a multipolar nuclear order, failing nuclear arms control and disarmament. If incrementalism can be termed non-nuclear in disposition, and the idealists anti-nuclear, then revisionism represents a potential threshold or "near-nuclear" trend. It remains unclear whether revisionism has stemmed from a conception of a truly multipolar nuclear world order deemed to be more stable than the existing bipolar structure, or whether it has been governed by regional insecurities and aspirations. Both possible sources of revisionism continue to pose a significant challenge to the existing international order, and to superpower arms control orthodoxy.¹³

¹³ Beker, pp. 44-53.