Paper for Warwick[1]

BEYOND THE 'NEW' REGIONALISM

Björn Hettne

Over the last decade regionalism, or what has become known as 'new regionalism' (NR), has become a hot issue in a number of social science specialisations: European studies, comparative politics, international economics, international relations (IR) and international political economy (IPE). The approach of these different academic specialisations varies considerably, which means that regionalism means different things to different people.[1] In fact, we are facing an intriguing ontological problem. There has been little agreement about what we study when we study regionalism. This implies that there also is a lack of agreement about how we should study it; in other words, we are facing an epistemological problem as well. The great divide, albeit an exaggerated one, is between what has been termed 'old' and 'new' regionalism. Whatever the merits of this distinction, I shall use it in this article as a pedagogical device to underline the shifting terrain and the instruments to explore it. Yet I shall also propose its dissolution, and a move beyond NR, in looking more generally for the role of the regional factor in global transformation. It is in any case awkward to call something 'new' that now is already more than two decades old. But the search for continuities does not mean that regionalism constitutes exactly the same phenomenon across time. On the contrary. The competing approaches (as well as the earlier approaches here called 'old') in no way lack merits; it is my ambition to do justice to what durable contributions they have provided.

Part 1 thus describes the first generation of regionalism studies, focused on regional integration in Europe, and the subsequent 'big leap' from the 'old' to the 'new' regionalism, which really was the study of regionalisms in the context of globalisation. The 'old' regionalism has been well documented before, so my purpose is rather to look for continuities.[2] The discontinuities are of course also acknowledged.[3] Part 2 goes into the various dimensions of the more recent regionalism, the actors driving it and the societal levels at which it manifests itself. Besides the globalised context, this multidimensional, multiactor and multilevel character – or, in short, complexity – was what distinguished the 'new' regionalism. Part 3 moves from regionalism as such to regionalism as a dimension of the changing international political economy and world order. I shall suggest that regionalism might actually shape world order. In a concluding section the achievements as well as the remaining gaps and unresolved issues of this fascinating field are discussed.

Generations of regionalisms: continuities and discontinuities

As suggested, regionalism is one of those contested concepts that has continued to baffle social scientists for years. I have therefore to start with the problem of definition, even if this often has proved to be somewhat of a dead end, due to the fact that region, regional cooperation, regional integration, regionalism, regionalisation and region building are moving targets. The overproduction of concepts signals a certain disarray. Thus we have to come back to the problem of definition when dealing with different approaches to the elusive phenomenon of regionalism.

---

[1] To be published in New Political Economy 2005

Conceptualisation

The concept of region is used differently in different disciplines: in the field of geography, regions are usually seen as subnational entities, either historical provinces (which could have become nation-states) or more recently created units. In IR, regions are often treated as supranational subsystems of the international system. It is of some importance whether regions are seen as subsystems of the international system or as emerging regional formations with their own dynamics. Even so, such macroregions can be defined in different ways: as continents or as supranational formations of countries sharing a common political and economic project and having a certain degree of common identity. The minimum definition of a world region is typically a limited number of states linked together by a geographical relationship and a degree of mutual interdependence.[4] According to a more comprehensive view, a region consists of 'states which have some common ethnic, linguistic, cultural, social, and historical bonds'.[5] Even more comprehensively, regions can be differentiated in terms of social cohesiveness (ethnicity, race, language, religion, culture, history, consciousness of a common heritage), economic cohesiveness (trade patterns, economic complementarity), political cohesiveness (regime type, ideology) and organisational cohesiveness (existence of formal regional institutions).[6] Such parsimonious attempts at definition seem have come to an end. Today, researchers acknowledge the fact that there are no 'natural' regions: definitions of a 'region' vary according to the particular problem or question under investigation. Moreover, it is widely accepted that it is how political actors perceive and interpret the idea of a region and notions of 'regionness' that is critical: all regions are socially constructed and hence politically contested.[7]

But there are other pitfalls. Often a region is simplistically mixed up with a particular regional organisation. The organisation tries to shape what it defines as 'its' region by promoting cooperation among states and other actors, which is possible to the extent that a genuine experience of shared interests in a shared political community exists - that the region is 'real' and not only 'formal'. Regional integration belongs to an earlier discourse, primarily related to a spiralling translocal market integration (thus including the building of national markets as well). Regional integration as a translocal process, simply defined in terms of market factors, has occurred over a long period of time.[8] The concept of integration can also be made more or less complex. According to Joseph Nye, the concept of integration groups too many disparate phenomena to be helpful, and should therefore be broken down into economic integration (the formation of a transnational economy), social integration (the formation of a transnational society) and political integration (the formation of a transnational political system).[9] Regional cooperation is somewhat less complex and normally refers to joint efforts by states to solve specific problems. Ernst B. Haas defined the concept as follows: 'regional cooperation is a vague term covering any interstate activity with less than universal participation designed to meet commonly experienced need'.[10] Andrew Axline asserted that 'regional cooperation can only be understood from the perspective of the national interests of the individual member states, and that the politics of regional negotiations will involve accommodating these interests for all partners'.[11] Regional integration is, in contrast, normally taken to imply some change in terms of sovereignty. According to Haas, 'the study of regional integration is concerned with explaining how and why states cease to be wholly sovereign'.[12]

Regionalism and regionalisation are two more recent concepts, and much effort has been devoted to the distinction between them. Regionalism refers to a tendency and a political commitment to organise the world in terms of regions; more narrowly, the concept refers to a specific regional project. In some definitions the actors behind this political commitment are

states; in other definitions the actors are not confined to states. According to Anthony Payne and Andrew Gamble, 'regionalism is a state-led or states-led project designed to reorganize a particular regional space along defined economic and political lines'.[13] They go on in their pioneering book to say that 'regionalism is seen as something that is being constructed, and constantly reconstructed, by collective human action',[14] which sounds like a more comprehensive view as far as agency is concerned.[15] Other authors find it difficult to confine the regionalism project to states. Helge Hveem also makes a firm distinction between regionalism and regionalisation, but talks about 'an identifiable group of actors' trying to realize the project.[16] Andrew Hurrell lets the concept regionalism contain five varieties: regionalisation (informal integration), identity, interstate cooperation, state-led integration and cohesion.[17] Sometimes, particularly in a neoliberal discourse, regionalism is identified with protectionism, normally with (worried) reference to the rise of economic nationalism in secluded regional markets in the interwar period.

Regionalisation refers to the more complex processes of forming regions; whether these are consciously planned or caused by spontaneous processes is not agreed upon by all authors. In my view, they can emerge by either means. More recently, the concept of region-building (in analogy with nation-building) has been employed to signify 'the ideas, dynamics and means that contribute to changing a geographical area into a politically-constructed community'.[18] Iver B. Neumann in particular has developed a region-building approach, which he himself terms 'post-structural' and which sees the region as born in discourse on 'inside and outside'.[19] The enlargement of Europe, particularly the current debate on Turkey's inclusion or exclusion, provides a rich source for this kind of analysis.

The early debate

Today the concept of regionalism has become the most common, and it has also become commonplace to distinguish between an older wave or generation of regionalism (then often referred to as regional integration) in the 1950s and 1960s and a more recent new 'wave' or 'generation' of regionalism (the new regionalism) starting in the latter half of the 1980s and today being a prevalent phenomenon throughout the world. [20] 'Old' theories or approaches to regionalism were all concerned with peace, and tended to see the nation-state as the problem rather than the solution.[21] The relevant theories were federalism, functionalism and neofunctionalism. Federalism, which inspired the pioneers of European integration, was not really a theory but rather a political programme; it was sceptical of the nation-state, although what was to be created was in fact a new kind of state. There was no obvious theorist associated with federalism. In contrast, functionalism has been much identified with one particular name, that of David Mitrany. This was also an approach to peace-building rather than a theory. The question for functionalists was on which political level various human needs (often defined in a rather technical way) could best be met. Usually, the best way was found to be going beyond the nation-state, but not necessarily going regional.[22] Thus both federalism and functionalism wanted the nation-state to go, but through different routes and by different means. International organisations should be established in the promotion of cooperation and transnational activities around basic functional needs, such as transportation, trade, production and welfare. Economics was seen as more important than politics. Functionalism was rather technocratic and therefore unrealistic. Form, in the functionalist view, was supposed to follow function, whereas for federalists it was really form that mattered. Mitrany criticised both federalism and regional integration in general because both were primarily based on territory rather than function. For functional solutions there should be no territorial boundaries. Territoriality was seen as part of the

Westphalian logic and Westphalia implied conflict and war. However, in contrast to the European Community (EC), which was a political community, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was, according to Mitrany, a functional and therefore acceptable organisation (for here the technical question was: how can coal and steel production best be organised?).

One early approach that to a larger extent had theoretical ambitions was neofunctionalism: the theory (but also strategy) of European integration. The central figure here was Ernst Haas. He challenged the functionalist assumption of the separability of politics, claiming that the technical realm was in fact made technical by a prior political decision. Neofunctionalists argued that raising levels of interdependence would set in motion a process eventually leading to political integration. The emphasis was on process and purposeful actors, far away from functional automaticity. Haas in fact theorised the 'community method' of Jean Monnet. Even if the outcome of this method could be a federation, the way of building it was not by constitutional design. The basic mechanism was 'spillover', this key concept being defined as 'the way in which the creation and deepening of integration in one economic sector would create pressures for further economic integration within and beyond that sector, and greater authoritative capacity at the European level.'[23] Bela Balassa applied a similar logic to economic integration. A free trade area would lead to a customs union and further to a common market, economic union and political union.[24]

Europe was the centre of the debate about old regionalism. In the 1960s the fit between the neofunctional description (and prescription) and the empirical world, now dominated by de Gaulle's nationalism, disappeared. Stanley Hoffman asserted that integration could not spread from low politics (economics) to the sphere of high politics (security).[25] Integration happened only as long as it coincided with the national interest. The image of the EC began to diverge. According to Alan Milward, the EC should be seen as a 'rescue of the nation-state'.[26] The EC could furthermore be understood as a confederation rather than a federation, according to the intergovernmentalist turn in the study of European integration. The ontological shift thus implied an epistemological shift towards a more state-centric, realist analysis.

Haas responded to his critics by calling the study of integration 'pre-theory' (since there was no clear idea about dependent and independent variables), then spoke about the field in terms of obsolescence, and ended up suggesting that the study of regional integration should cease to be a subject in its own right. Rather, it should be seen as an aspect of the study of interdependence (a concept then popularised by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye).[27] This was again a new turn. The global context was not really considered by old regionalism theory, concerned as it was with regional integration as a planned merger of national economies through cooperation among a group of nation-states. Comparative studies were for obvious reasons rare. Haas listed a number of background factors for successful integration and Philippe Schmitter focused particularly on Latin America.[28] Axline criticised neofunctionalism for being Eurocentric: 'The goal of integration and the dependent variable of the theory used to understand integration remained a higher degree of political unification from the neo-functionalist perspective. Yet the goal of regional integration in the Third World was not political unification.'[29]

The recent debate

In the real world, the 1970s was a period of 'Eurosclerosis' within the EC. Elsewhere, those attempts to create regional organisations that had been made were failing and most of these organisations fell into dormancy. However, the 1985 white paper on the internal market started a new dynamic process of European integration. This was also the start of the 'new regionalism' elsewhere; after some time, everywhere. Naturally, this attracted a lot of interest in the late 1980s

and early 1990s. What was striking, though, was the lack of correspondence in this respect between economics and political science. At that time few introductions to IR, IPE or development studies contained sections on regionalism. Today, this is commonplace.

The studies of the new regionalism considered new aspects, particularly those focused on conditions related to what increasingly came to be called globalisation, a phenomenon which was to give rise to another academic growth industry.[30] Regionalism is strongly related to globalisation, but there are, as we shall see, different views on the nature of this relationship. Is regionalisation an integral part of globalisation, or is it a political reaction against that process? In fact, it can be both.

Regionalisation and globalisation represent related but different aspects of the contemporary transformation of world order; globalist and regionalist political projects may have different impacts at different points in time. Contemporary globalisation can, in accordance with the classical theory of Karl Polanyi, be seen as 'second great transformation', a 'double movement', where an expansion and deepening of the market is followed by a political intervention in defence of societal cohesion - the expansion of market constituting the first movement, and the societal response the second.[31] The 'second movement' contains counter-movements caused by the dislocations associated with market penetration into new areas. Regionalism is thus part of both the first and second movement, with a neoliberal face in the first, and a more interventionist orientation in the second. There is thus a transnational struggle over the political content of regionalisation, as well as over that of globalisation.

However, regions must at the same time be understood as endogenous processes, emerging from within the geographical area in question. They are not simply geographical or administrative objects, but subjects in the making (or un-making); their boundaries are shifting, and so are their capacities as actors, which can be referred to as their level of 'regionness'.[32] Regionness defines the position of a particular region in terms of regional cohesion, which can be seen as a long-term historical process, changing over time from coercion, the building of empires and nations, to voluntary cooperation. In general terms one can speak of five levels of regionness: a regional space, a translocal social system, an international society, a regional community and a regionally institutionalised polity. The regional space is a geographic area, delimited by more or less natural physical barriers. In social terms the region is organised by human inhabitants, at first in relatively isolated communities, but more and more creating some kind of translocal relationship. The region as a social system implies ever widening translocal relations, in which the constituent units are dependent on each other, as well as on the overall stability of the system. The region as international society is characterised by norms and rules which increase the level of predictability in the system. The region as community takes shape when an enduring organisational framework facilitates and promotes social communication and convergence of values and behaviour throughout the region. Finally, the region as institutionalised polity has a more fixed structure of decision making and stronger actor capability. The five levels must not be interpreted in a deterministic fashion as a necessary sequence. Since regionalism is a political project, created by human actors, it may, just like a nation-state project, fail. In this perspective, decline could mean decreasing regionness; ultimately a dissolution of the region itself.[33]

Thus endogenous (levels of regionness) and exogenous (the challenges of globalisation) must both be considered. Globalism and regionalism became competing ways of understanding the world, and much analytical work was devoted (or wasted?) in trying to clarify how the two processes were related. Since the impact of globalisation differs in various parts of the world, the actual process of regionalisation also differs between the emerging world-regions, thus giving shape to many regionalisms. Globalisation and regionalisation processes interact under different

conditions of 'regionness', creating a variety of pathways of regionalisation. This also meant that many different understandings of regionalism coincided, resulting in great confusion. Let us try to clarify some of them.

With regard to old and new regionalism, the former was a Cold War phenomenon. It was specific with regard to its objectives (some organisations being primarily security-motivated, others more economically oriented), whereas the latter resulted from a more comprehensive, multidimensional societal process. The new regionalism took shape in a multipolar world order and in a context of globalisation. It formed part of a global structural transformation. In this transformation a variety of non-state actors were operating at several levels of the global system.

The new regionalism as studied in IPE can also be contrasted both to what is better termed 'the new protectionism', which was basically an early interpretation of the new wave of regionalism by neoliberal economists who feared that the sudden interest in regionalism heralded a new protectionism.[34] The difference lay very much in the ontological and epistemological perspectives. The neoliberals conceived the new regionalism as a trade promotion policy, building on regional arrangements rather than a multilateral framework; by contrast, for IPE, regionalism was a comprehensive multidimensional programme, including economic, security, environmental and many other issues. To neoliberals, regionalism could only be a second-best contribution to the task of increasing the amount of world trade and global welfare, and at worst a threat against the multilateral order. The IPE perspective, on the other hand, held that free trade was not the main issue and that regionalism could contribute to solving many problems, from security to environment, that were not efficiently tackled on the national level and to which there were no market solutions. Thus, for the neoliberals, regionalism was 'new' only in the sense that it represented a revival of protectionism or neomercantilism, whereas IPE saw the current wave of regionalism as qualitatively new, in the sense that it could only be understood in relation to the transformation of the world economy. This also implied that the closure of regions was not on the agenda; rather, the new regionalism was 'open regionalism', which emphasised that the integration project should be market-driven and outward-looking, should avoid high levels of protection and should form part of the ongoing globalisation and internationalisation process of the world political economy.[35] Cable and Henderson defined 'open regionalism' as a 'negotiating framework consistent with and complementary to GATT'.[36] For Gamble and Payne, 'one of the most striking characteristics common to all the regionalist projects is their commitment to open regionalism'.[37]

Another important issue discussed in the context of more recent regionalism is that it is a worldwide phenomenon, covering both more and less developed countries and, in some cases, combining both in the same regional organisation. Regions can thus be ordered in the world system hierarchy. Three structurally different types of regions can be distinguished*:* core regions, peripheral regions and, between them, intermediate regions. The regions are distinguished, first, by their relative degree of economic dynamism and, second, by their relative political stability, and the dividing line may run through existing states. The borderlines are impermanent. Rather, one could think of the hierarchical structure as consisting of zones which the regions enter or leave depending on their economic position and political stability, as well as their level of regionness. This means that the regions may be differently situated and defined at different occasions, or at different times in world history. The level of regionness can purposively be changed. For instance, security cooperation within a region would lead to improved stability, making the region more attractive for international investment and trade, and development cooperation would mean a more efficient use of available resources.

The 'blind men metaphor' is relevant also for the recent debate. It contains a number of different theoretical approaches, from a revival of neofunctionalism to social constructivism, and with neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism in between. There are quite a few interesting theoretical explanations of specified aspects of regionalism. The problem with rigid theorising is that it must delimit the object for study, even while the object refuses too much reductionism.[38] An empirical case can (and perhaps should) be approached from different theoretical angles. Different theories illuminate different dimensions of a multidimensional phenomenon. Therefore I will not propose any preferred theory in this overview.

Dimensions, Actors and Levels

In contrast with the time in which Haas was writing there are today many regionalisms and thus a very different base for comparative studies.[39] Different kinds of regions in interaction have appeared on different levels of the global system. 'Old' regional organisations continued but with new functions, while new regional organisations were formed to meet new challenges. At the same time various actors began to operate in these regional arenas, dealing with regional and global problems and providing regional and global public goods. In view of all of this, it is rather obvious that neither the object for study (ontology) nor the way of studying it (epistemology) will have been likely to have remained the same. The 'new regionalism' must be seen as a new political landscape in the making, characterised by several interrelated dimensions, many actors (including the region itself) and several interacting levels of society.

This second part of the article deals with this regional complexity, a complexity not minimised by the difficulty in clarifying what is influencing what in this triangle and the fact that the three issues overlap, particularly level and actor. An important point here is that the idea of levels is a gross simplification. It is better probably to talk about scales of regionalism in various regional formations, which overlap and interact in different issue areas. This complexity is a major challenge for social science, particularly IR and IPE

Dimensions

The central issue on which studies of both old and new regionalism focused was trade. Regional formations were seen as more or less synonymous with trade blocs. Indeed, as noted above, some were afraid that these trade blocs represented a step backwards towards protectionism; others saw them as a good substitute to a badly functioning multilateralism; others again saw them as a step towards global free trade. Monetary issues are of course inseparable from trade. However, other dimensions were soon added to the regional complexity. There was, first of all, the problem of development, which, albeit often related to trade, is quite distinct and has generally been discussed in terms of developmental regionalism. Security also emerged as a regional issue, thus creating an interest in so-called security regionalism.[40]

Trade blocs. Regional trading arrangements are often seen as a 'second-best' and therefore judged according to whether they contribute to a more closed or more open multilateral trading system, embodied in the so-called 'stumbling block vs. stepping stone' dichotomy Many of the regional trading arrangements that existed during the era of the old regionalism in the 1950s and 1960s were inward-looking and protectionist, and were often regarded by contemporary economists as failures. At the time, however, they were widely considered to be instruments for enhancing industrial production, as in the strand of development thinking associated with the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the even more ambitious strategy

of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, both led by Raúl Prebisch. The culmination of this process was the demand for a new international economic order (NIEO). Regionalism developed into a form of global mobilisation against an unequal world order, but lost some of its strength in the process. As suggested by Percy Mistry, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has been 'hijacked' by governments of Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries to protect their interests in a world where power is challenged by developing countries.[41] It should thus be recognised that much of today's regionalism, especially but not only in the South, has often developed in response to the dominance of WTO and globalisation. As Mistry again put it, 'new regionalism is being embraced because old multilateralism no longer works'.[42]

Furthermore, members of regional trading arrangements are increasingly likely to demand new services from the WTO, so that its discipline serves to 'police' regional relations and contribute to their health. This need is a severely understated demonstration of 'how regionalism is providing a substance to multilateralism'.[43] In other words, regionalism can be seen as a prerequisite for reconstructing multilateralism on a more equal basis.

Monetary regionalism. The monetary issue has been neglected due to the heavy concentration on trade in the regionalist discourse. Monetary regionalism may have many objectives, the most important of which is likely to be financial stability, which means the absence of excess mobility. Since financial crisis has the potential to spread across countries, it requires a collective response, the main question in this context being at what level. The exit of international investors from one particular 'emerging market' transforms a national public 'bad' into a regional and eventually global public 'bad'.[44] Like the trading system of the world, the financial system is asymmetric. Financial stability is a global issue, but the global instruments show a bias against the weak, which has raised the issue of building regional institutions for protection against excess volatility.

The 'Asian Financial Crisis' (AFC) of 1997 underlined the degree of interdependence within the larger region of Southeast and East Asia and 'exposed the weakness of existing regional institutional economic arrangements', causing crises for both the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the two competing regional organisations .[45] The affected countries were frustrated over the lack of remedies offered on the global level. In the West the opportunity was taken to impose neoliberal policies in a region known (and criticised) for its interventionism.

Before the AFC there was little discussion about regional approaches to the management of financial stability outside Europe. Monetary regionalism in Europe is itself not a complete success story, but it shows the importance of institutional backing as well as of political commitment and a common approach to economic policy. This discovery was later made in East Asia. A regional approach in the form of an Asian Monetary Fund was proposed by Japan, but received little support and was resisted by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the USA and the EU. This underscored the need for deeper institutionalisation and stronger commitments from the countries in the region. In May 2002 there was a meeting of the ASEAN Plus Three (APT) countries in Chiang Mai about the ways that regional cooperation could combat financial crises on the regional level. This meeting may prove to have been a breakthrough for 'monetary regionalism', but it is too early to tell what the result will be. Looking at the dynamics of the crisis, it is obvious that ASEAN (which is the most developed regional organisation) is too small, whereas APEC (being transregional) is too big and contains too many contradictory interests. An appropriate organisation, the APT, is now emerging, which underlines the fact that the nature of the regional problem impacts directly on the organisational development of regionalism.

Developmental regionalism. By developmental regionalism is meant concerted efforts from a group of countries within a geographical region to enhance the economic complementarity of the constituent political units and capacity of the total regional economy. This can be pursued via trade agreements or through more comprehensive regional development strategies. 'Development' is a multidimensional phenomenon which depends on positive spillover and linkages between different sectors of an economy and society; it can be said to require a regional approach, whereby trade integration is coupled with other forms of economic and factor market integration (e.g. investment, payments, monetary integration and harmonisation), as well as various types of economic cooperation in specified sectors (such as transport and communications).[46] This approach is both fairer and more politically feasible as it is easier to liberalise towards neighbours than on a multilateral basis; it is also easier to handle distributional issues in a regional context. Furthermore still, regional trade clubs can deal more effectively with non-trade economic and political challenges such as environmental protection and migration.[47]

This line of thinking can be said to be part of the EU model and has started to have effect in different versions in other parts of the world (in ASEAN in Southeast Asia, in the Andean Community and Southern Common Market (Mercosur) in Latin America, and in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in Africa). The strategy is only manageable within multidimensional and comprehensive regional organisations, such as those mentioned, since these can exploit spillover effects and linkages between trade and non-trade and economic and political sectors/benefits. By contrast, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is mainly a trade agreement and will find it more difficult to exploit such linkages. What this highlights is the general trend towards more multidimensional forms of regional cooperation and towards regional organisations with a higher degree of 'actorness' – a concept to which we will return shortly.

Security regionalism. We have already noted that the first generation of regional integration was concerned initially with economics but ultimately with peace and security. In more recent theorising, security concerns are seen as causal factors that force countries to cooperate because of the risk of the regionalisation of conflict. By this I mean both the outward spread or spillover of a local conflict into neighbouring countries, and the inward impact from the region in the form of diplomatic interference, military intervention and, preferably, conflict resolution carried out by some kind of regional body. Security regionalism has now become a genre in its own right.[48]

Regionalism and conflict can be related in many different ways. One has to do with the choice of unit for investigation, such as a 'regional security complex', defined by Barry Buzan as 'a group of states whose primary security concerns link together sufficiently closely that their national security cannot realistically be considered apart from one another'.[49] Buzan goes on to note that 'the task of identifying a security complex involves making judgements about the relative strengths of security interdependencies among different countries'.[50] The concept has later been rethought in a multisectoral and social constructivist direction,[51] making the actual delimitation of the unit more nuanced, but not necessarily easier to utilise since different security sectors (economic, environmental, societal) may define different regions. The region is thus primarily understood as a level of analysis and is not seen to possess actor capacity.[52] This is different from the approach applied here in which region is both level of analysis and actor.

A second link between regionalism and conflict concerns the regional implications of a local conflict, which depends on the nature of the security complex and the way various security problems are linked. A third has to do with the conflict management role of the organised region

(if there is one) for internal regional security, or 'regional order'[53], for the immediate environment (the neigbourhood policy of Europe) of the region, and for world order as a whole (to the extent that there is actorness enough to influence the shape of world order). Conflict management with regard to the immediate environment (but outside the region) can refer to an acute conflict or aim at preventively transforming the situation by stabilisation or integration. No clear-cut distinctions can really be made.

By security regionalism is thus meant attempts by states and other actors in a particular geographical area - a region in the making - to transform a security complex with conflict-generating inter-state and intra-state relations in the direction of a security community with cooperative external (inter-regional) relations and domestic (intra-regional) peace. The routes may differ and pass through several stages. The concept also includes more acute interventions in crises, but the long-term implications should always be kept in mind. The region can be cause (the regional complex), means (regional intervention) and solution (regional development). Indeed, in discussing regional crisis management in the longer perspective beyond intervention, it is important to link security regionalism and development regionalism. Ultimately, these two dimensions are complementary and mutually supportive. This is implied in the concept of security communities, which Karl W. Deutsch famously defined as 'the attainment of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure, for a long time, dependable expectations of peaceful change among its population'.[54]

Actors

Much of current mainstream regionalism theory continues to be dominated by state-centric perspectives. In summing up the body of research on regionalism produced by the United Nations University/World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU/WIDER), the editors admitted that 'our project, in spite of good intentions to the contrary, has been too state-centric and too focused on formal organisations rather than pinpointing the processes of more informal regionalization that take place on the ground'.[55] This is by no means equivalent to rejecting the state. States and inter-governmental organisations are often crucial actors and objects of analysis in the process of regionalisation. The state, as well as the forces of state-making and state destruction, are all at the core of understanding today's political economy of regionalism. However, there is a need to understand how this so-called national/state interest is formed in the first place. Neither states nor regions can be taken for granted. The 'national interest' is often simply a group-specific interest or even the personal interest of certain political leaders, rather than the public good or national security and development understood in a more comprehensive sense. The UNU/WIDER project suggested that, in the context of globalisation, the state was being 'unbundled', with the result that actors other than the state were gaining strength. By implication, the focus of analysis should not only be on state actors and formal inter-state frameworks, but also on non-state actors and what is sometimes referred to broadly as non-state regionalism.[56] A prominent non-state-centric contribution is Etel Solingen's coalitional approach, in which regional orders are deemed to be shaped by domestic coalitions.[57] In this approach the region as such is defined by the 'grand strategies' of relevant coalitions. Other authors treat the region itself as an actor.[58] Accordingly, I have distinguished below between actors on the regional arena, and regions as actors in their own right.

Actors in the regional arena. In his book on the political economy of regionalism in Southern Africa, Fredrik Söderbaum 'unpacks' the state and addresses the question for whom and for what purpose regionalisation is being pursued.[59] He shows how ruling political leaders engage in a

rather intense diplomatic game, whereby they praise regionalism and sign treaties, such as free trade agreements and water protocols. In so doing, they can be perceived as promoters of the goals and values of regionalism, which enables them to raise the profile and status of their authoritarian regimes. Often, the 'state' is not much more than a (neopatrimonial) interest group. Furthermore, although the rhetoric and ritual of regional diplomacy serves the goal of the reproduction and legitimisation of the state, it can also be a means to create a façade that enables certain regime actors to engage in other more informal modes of regionalism, such as trans-state regionalism or networks of plunder.[60] This has also been referred to as 'shadow regionalism'.

Business interests are often supposed to be globalist in their orientation. However, this seems to be a myth. Globalisation strategies tend actually to end up creating more regionalised patterns of economic activity.[61] According to Robert Wade, one should talk about the regionalisation rather than the globalisation of business.[62] For example, the larger European business interests were very much behind the EU's 1992 project, led by Jacques Delors.[63] For their part, civil societies are still generally neglected in the description and explanation of new regionalism. This is an important gap. Similarly, even if the external environment and globalisation are often readily called into account, extra-regional actors themselves are also generally weakly described and conceptualised within the study of regionalism. This is somewhat surprising, given the considerable attention which 'external' actors - such as foreign powers, donors, international financial institutions, non-governmental organisations, transnational corporations and so on - receive in the study of national and local transformation processes, especially in the South. In the final analysis, it is not really a question of state-led regionalism versus non-state-led regionalism. On the contrary, 'state, market, civil society and external actors often come together in a variety of mixed-actor collectivities, networks and modes of regional governance'.[64]

The region as actor. As indicated, the region is not only an arena, but can also be seen as an actor, simply through the regional organisation that represents it.[65] It can be conceptualised in effect as a system of intentional acts, which would include numerous actors operating in some way in concert. From this perspective, the difference from a state is one of degree.[66] Furthermore, the capacity of a regional organisation to act changes over time. There is a link between the organisational capacity and the cohesiveness of the region as such. When different processes of regionalisation in various fields and at various levels of society intensify and converge within the same geographical area, the distinctiveness of the emerging region increases. This process of regionalisation was described earlier in relation to the notion of increasing 'regionness', which implies that a geographical area is transformed from a passive object (an arena) to an active subject (an actor) that is increasingly capable of articulating the transnational interests of the emerging region.[67]

Actorness, usually referring to external behaviour, implies a larger scope of action and room for manoeuvre, in some cases even a legal personality. The concept of actorness (with respect to the EU's external policies) was developed by Charlotte Bretherton and John Vogler.[68] Capacity to act is of course relevant internally as well, for instance in the cases of security, development and environmental regionalism – three areas where increased regional cooperation may make a difference within the region itself.

Actorness is a phenomenon closely related to regionness, the latter implying an endogenous process of increasing cohesiveness, the former a growing capacity to act that follows from the strengthened 'presence' of the regional unit in different contexts, as well as the actions that follow from the interaction between the actor and its external environment. Actorness with reference to the outside world is thus not only a simple function of regionness, but also an

outcome of a dialectical process between endogenous and exogenous forces. The unique feature of regional (as compared to national great power) actorness is that this has to be created by voluntary processes and therefore depends more on dialogue and consensus-building than coercion. This way of operating is the model that Europe holds out as a preferred world order, since this is the way the 'new Europe' (organised by the EU) has developed in its recent peaceful evolution.

Actorness defines the capability to influence the external environment. Regionness defines the position of a particular region in terms of its cohesion. The political ambition of establishing regional cohesion, a sense of community and identity has been of primary importance in the ideology of the regionalist project. A convergence of values may take place even if this is not the explicit purpose of the project. The approach of 'seeing region as process' implies an evolution of deepening regionalism, not necessarily following the idealised stage-ist model presented here, for that mainly serves a heuristic purpose. Since regionalism is always a political project, created by human actors, it may, assuming that it gets off the ground in the first place, not only move in different directions, but also, just like a nation-state project, fail. In this perspective, decline would mean decreasing regionness. Enlargement, or widening', also implies decreasing regionness. Generally in the history of the EU, this trend has been countered by reforms aimed at 'deepening'. Widening and deepening can thus be seen as a dialectic of loss and gain with regard to actorness. To the extent that an enlarged region can retain the same level of actorness, its presence will increase because of sheer size. The original EEC contained 185 million people, compared to today's EU with 450 million. European integration has in fact become the unification and even extension of Europe. But, in terms of actorness, this has not, judging from the current crisis, increased actor capacity.

Levels

In spite of the enormous literature to date, there is little consensus on the appropriate terminology of regionalism when it appears on different levels or scales, constituting a multitude of forms in complex inter-relationship to each other. Macroregions or world-regions are supranational. Subregions are more or less distinct parts of large macroregions, such as the new Europe and often represent more dense supranational cooperation. If by region we mean instrumental regions with some actor capacity, we can also make a distinction between intra-continental and inter-continental transregionalism. Intra-continental regional organisations, such as the African Union (AU) and the Organisation of American States (OAS) are usually weak paper organisations without much actor capacity, and therefore also lack intercontinental relations of any importance. Regional organisations of a more substantive kind below the continental level, which then develop relations between continents, have more actor capacity, and their mutual relations therefore gain a certain significance for the organisation of world order. In what follows I will focus on 'lower' and 'higher' levels of regionalism as being thus far under-theorised in the literature. As 'higher' levels (interregionalism and multiregionalism) link up to the discussion on world order in the next part of the article, I will start with the former.

Lower level regionalisms. As indicated, in the terminology employed here subregions are smaller parts of macroregions. Glenn Hook and Ian Kearns define subregionalism as a regionalist project promoted by weaker states in contradistinction to the 'Triad' or the 'Core'.[69] This corresponds to what I referred to earlier as intermediate and peripheral regions. In my understanding, regions can be weak or strong, but, as long as they display internally some degree of regionness, cohesion and actorness, they are to be seen as distinct regional formations. The Economic Community of West

Africa (ECOWAS) is in this view a region, but it is doubtful whether APEC is a region. Rather, it is a transregional organisation.

Microregions exist between the 'national' and the 'local' level, because they consist of 'sub-national' territories rather than whole countries.[70] Historically, microregions have been seen as subnational regions within the territorial boundaries of particular nation-states (or before that empires). Microregions may or may not fall within the borders of a particular nation-state. Increasingly, they are constituted by a network of transactions and collaboration across national boundaries, which may very well emerge as an alternative or in opposition to the challenged state, and sometimes also in competition with states-led regionalism.[71] However, as illustrated by the various concepts of growth polygons, growth triangles, development corridors and spatial development initiatives, microregionalism is often created by networks of state and non-state actors, and even inter-personal transnational networks (ethnic or family networks, religious ties and so on).[72] Thus conventional distinctions between international and domestic, as well as between states and non-state actors, are being diluted. The so-called growth triangles are particularly interesting from the perspective of the micro-macro relationship, not the least since there exist a series of interpretations of the nature of these linkages. Joakim Öjendal points out that the growth triangle strategy has been described in a multitude of ways in the literature - for instance, as a response to global political transformation, as a complement to macroregional economic integration, as paving the way for macroregionalism, and as a way to achieve regional integration while avoiding the creation of a time-consuming macroregional political bureaucracy.[73] Growth triangles are certainly one of the most important forms of microregionalism in Southeast Asia, being frequently considered as driving forces behind economic growth. They utilise the different endowments of the various countries, exploiting cooperative trade for production and development opportunities. The initiatives are generally constructed around partnerships between the private sector and the state, which explains why they have been referred to as a form of 'trans-state development'.[74] In such partnerships the private sector provides capital for investment, whereas the public sector provides infrastructure, fiscal incentives and the administrative framework to attract industry and investment.

Still, it is evident that micro-level forms of regionalism may sometimes be less formal and inter-state than formal macroregions; they may ultimately be more reflective of private sector interests than those of either states or civil societies. However, at the same time there is increasing evidence also that macroregions and subregions are themselves increasingly influenced by non-state actors. So, if regions are made up by actors other than states alone, and if state boundaries are becoming more fluid, then it also becomes more difficult to uphold old distinctions between microregionalism and macroregionalism.

Higher level regionalisms. Regionalisation has structural consequences beyond and 'above' the particular region. *Transregionalism* refers to actors and structures mediating between regions. To the extent that this takes place in a formal way between the regions as legal personalities one can use the word *interregionalism*. If the pattern of interregional relations becomes more predominant, constituting a new regionalised form of multilateral world order, we speak of *multiregionalism.* This is of course a very distant and highly uncertain prospect (to the extent indeed that it is seen as a prospect at all). Like new regionalisms operating on the regional level, all transregional arrangements are voluntary and cooperative, but can become more or less institutionalised and formalised, thus forming the structure of a multiregional world order.

Interregionalism is the latest step in the theorising on regionalism. The phenomenon is very much a consequence of the EU policy of creating and relating to regions as preferred counterparts

in the international system. From this perspective, interregionalism simply constitutes a part of the foreign policy of EU, being the hub of a global pattern of interregional relations. On the other hand, if regionalism is a global phenomenon, and there are different regionalisms in different parts of the world, it is reasonable to expect that many of these emerging regions, to the extent that they develop actorship (with varying degrees of actorness), will establish some kind of links with each other. Thus interregionalism can also be explained in relation to the global system.

This point is reinforced by the fact that other regions (ASEAN, Mercosur, SADC) also now establish interregional relations. Of course, these regions, albeit harbouring potential structural changes in world governance, are still embryonic; it is possible therefore to read different trends of theoretical significance into them. In other words, the problem lies in the ontological status of what we call interregionalism. The problem, again, is that there is a lack of consensus regarding that phenomenon as well.

The existing definitions to date are *ad hoc* and rather provisional, rather than based on a systematic overview of the phenomenon to be conceptualised and theorised. To my mind, it is important that the concept of interregionalism is reserved for formal relations between regions as juridical or at least quasi-juridical entities, since this is a new political phenomenon, possibly signifying a new post-Westphalian era. It does not imply 'post-sovereignty' since the regions get their actorness from the pooling of national sovereignties. Maybe one should talk instead about the emergence of a putative neo-Westphalian phenomenon?

Interregionalism can also be seen as one of the more regulated forms that globalisation may be taking. As compared to market-led globalisation in a Westphalian world of nation-states, it is more rooted in territory; and, in contrast to traditional multilateralism, it is a more exclusive relationship, since access to regional formations is limited by the principle of geographical proximity. Nevertheless, interregionalism, not to speak of multiregionalism, is a long-term, non-linear and uncertain trend which certainly will include setbacks, the final outcome of which we cannot yet expect to know.

In sum, looking at the existing patchwork of transregional and interregional agreements there is, in terms of structural outcome, presently no clear picture on the horizon. Transregional arrangements are voluntary and cooperative. They are also very diverse and difficult to categorise. Few are interregional in the proper sense of the word; some relations are transregional, some bilateral (for example, hybrid relations between a regional organisation and a great power). The fact that the EU constitutes the hub of these arrangements is in full accordance with its regionalist ideology, which, as is well known, encompasses not only trade and foreign investment but also political dialogue and cultural relations between regions. We shall come back to this in the third part below.

Regionalism and world order

To go beyond the new regionalism, which was the expressed purpose of this overview, implies to my mind looking at the context in which regionalisation occurs, as well as the interrelationships between regions and the larger context, not least other regions. It is significant that the pioneering works in exploring the 'new regionalism' referred even in their titles to 'world order' (Gamble and Payne) or 'international order' (Fawcett and Hurrell).[75] In this third and final part of the article I will therefore discuss ways in which regionalism may affect the future world order, defined in terms of governance, structure and legitimisation. I will investigate alternative models derived from this somewhat formalistic definition of world order. The recent coercive trend towards Pax Americana, where regionalism only serves a unilateral purpose, is contrasted with what I regard as the more deliberative European model, according to which institutionalised

regionalism, interregionalism and ultimately multiregionalism, to different degrees, will gradually shape a post-Westphalian world order. In view of decreasing actorness in the wake of the current constitutional crisis in the EU, I will also raise the question of whether interregional relations will be promoted by other regions as well.

Conceptualising world order

The concept of world order is rarely defined. In recent books the concept often occurs in the text (sometimes even in the title), but is absent in the index, which means that it is given a common sense meaning in no need of being defined, or used as an attractive slogan, but not really meant to be thought of as an analytical concept. Hedley Bull focused on international order, which meant the system of states, and saw world order as both a more general and a more normative concept, but he left it at that.[76] According to Robert Cox, who is one of the few who has used the concept in a conscious way for analytical purposes, it is genuinely transhistorical (there is always a world order of some sort, but not necessarily an orderly one). However, this order is seen as an outcome of underlying factors - social forces and political units - which then gain more analytical importance for understanding world order.[77] The concept is, furthermore, commonly used normatively in a more political sense, which is to say it describes not primarily the actually existing order (or historical orders) but models and/or utopian projects. It has even been used as a political slogan.[78]

In order to be able to compare alternative models,I propose a non-normative and mainly political definition of world order as constituted by three dimensions: structure, mode of governance and form of legitimisation. Structure is the way the units of the system are related, that is, different forms of polarity determined by the distribution of power and resources; mode of governance refers to avenues of influence on decision making and policy making; legitimisation is the basis on which the system is made acceptable to the constituent units. On the structural dimension, I make a further distinction between the unipolar, the bipolar and the multipolar. Polarity can define relations between regions as well as great powers and these relations are not necessarily hostile (as postulated in realist theory). In the area of governance, the distinction I draw is between the unilateral, the plurilateral and the multilateral. The difference between plurilateral and multilateral is especially important. A plurilateral grouping of actors is exclusive, whereas multilateral by definition implies inclusion, provided the rules of the game are accepted by all parties. Multilateralism is therefore often seen as preferable, but, for many purposes, regionalism, as a form of plurilateralism defined by geographical proximity, is just as useful. By contrast, unilateralism undermines collective arrangements and may even be a path towards imperialism. By relying on unilateral decision making, which means prioritising the 'national interest' over collective security, structural anarchy is promoted for as long as no single power is able to impose its will on the whole of international society. In that eventuality the structural result, to the extent that such a policy ultimately succeeds, will be unipolarity (or imperialism). Needless to say, a well functioning multilateral world order requires a certain degree of institutionalisation that counters unilateral action, limited bilateral solutions, or ill-considered political or military reactions which aggravate sensitive security situations. Finally, in terms of legitimisation, I discern a declining scale from the universally accepted rule of international law, through hegemony exercised by one great power (which means 'acceptable dominance'), to pure dominance, legitimised only by the national interest of the dominant power and relying on coercion and pre-emption. The dividing line between hegemony and dominance is not a very sharp one, but trends in one direction or the other can easily be established within the general diplomatic/political international debate. For example, the preparedness to accept dominance

increases in crises such as 9/11

With the help of this framework a comparative analysis can be made between alternative models, as well as of changes in and of world orders over time. The concepts of international order and world order are often used as pseudonyms. Here international order connotes a more state-centric conception, whereas world order connotes a more complex multidimensional and post-sovereign order. An international system can furthermore be less than globally encompassing, for instance Europe as a regional international system in the 19th century. World order of course implies a system including all of the world and all human beings. The degree of order within a region or in the international system can vary; thus different security theories speak of regional security complexes, anarchies, anarchic societies, regional security communities and so on. The security agenda is broadened, which makes regional approaches to security more relevant.

Identifying world orders

Theoretically, there are various options of world order. After the First World War, Europe believed in the power of collective security through the League of Nations. After its collapse, the United Nations (UN) constituted mankind's new hope for a stable and just world order based on multilateralism and international law (and the fiction of a international community of equal states). As we saw, the early theorising on regional integration was, above all, concerned with international order. Later, in the 1970s, there was discussion of an NIEO and thus the issue of order *and* justice was raised on a global plane. More recently, after the first Gulf war in 1991, President George H. W. Bush coined the concept 'a new world order', based on multilateralism and international law and upheld via US hegemony. Significantly, George Bush Senior did not seek to change the regime in Baghdad after this war. This gives an indication of his enduring respect for the multilateral world order, since then demolished by the neoconservative movement and its influence on the present US administration. In short, the old multilateral world order, based on US hegemony, is being transformed. The question is: in what direction?

The liberal view of globalisation (globalism), which still enjoys a hegemonic position, stresses the homogenising impact of market forces on the creation of an open society. Liberals take a minimalist view on political authority and are sceptical of regionalism. To interventionist thinkers on the left, who want to politicise the global, this liberal project is not realistic; these critics tend to see the unregulated market system as analogous to political anarchy and demand political control of the market. The return of the 'political' may appear in various forms of governance. One possible form, assuming a continuous role for state authority, is a reformed 'neo-Westphalian order' (another 'rescue of the nation-state'), governed either by a reconstituted UN system that can be called 'assertive multilateralism', or by a more loosely organised 'concert' of dominant powers, assuming the exclusive privilege of governance (including intervention) by reference to a shared value system grounded in stability and order rather than justice. This we can call 'militant plurilateralism'. The first is preferable in terms of legitimacy, but, judging from several unsuccessful attempts at reform, hard to achieve; the second is more realistic but dangerously similar to old balance-of-power politics (the Concert of Europe of the 19th century). The multilateral model in a more 'assertive' form would be based on radical reforms in order to upgrade the UN into a world order model. Instead, it has lately entered its worst crisis ever, after the unilateral attack on Iraq in 2003 and the corruption scandal relating to the Iraq 'Oil for Food Programme' in 2005.

A more appropriate form for the return of 'the political' in today's globalised world would be a post-Westphalian order, where the locus of power moves up the ladder to the transnational level

by means of the voluntary pooling of state sovereignties. The state can be replaced or complemented by a regionalised order, or by a strengthened global civil society supported by a new 'normative architecture' of world order values.[79] 'Global cosmopolitanism' thus emphasises the role of community at the global level, as well as the formation of global norms. The most likely candidate for such a role, although it does not appear to be imminent, is the interregional network pursued by the EU, facilitating multiregional governance as the major alternative to unilateralism. There is also the possibility of moving down the ladder, which implies a decentralised, 'neomediaeval', world, whether constituted by self-reliant communities ('stable chaos') suggested by 'green' political theory [80]or something more Hobbesian ('durable disorder'), which at present seems more likely.[81] Transnational forms of government on the regional and global level are meant to prevent such a 'decline of world order' and 'pathological anarchy'.[82]

After 11 September 2001 there existed initially, to a greater degree even than in connection with the first Gulf war, the possibility of forging an institutionalised multilateralism, an international regime based on the premises of an extended scope for international law and extensive participation by states and other transnational actors. Of course, there was never such a thing as fully-fledged multilateralism. By 'false multilateralism' is meant political and military actions that take place in the guise of multilateralism, but which in reality are expressions of more limited interests: plurilateralism, if it is a matter of a group of major powers; regionalism, if it is a geographically united bloc; or unilateralism, if a superpower or regional major power is, to all intents and purposes, acting alone. Unilateralism globally obviously encourages unilateralism at the regional level. A certain kind of regionalism (interregionalism) may, however, be supportive of multilateral principles (regional multilateralism, or multiregionalism). But this is a long-term perspective and will depend on the strength of the political project of taking regionalism as the crucial element in reorganising world order. At present, this project is represented principally by the EU.

A European world order: Pax Europaea?

What impact will or could Europe - or rather the EU - have on the future world order? The alternative world orders discussed above will of course not appear in their pure 'ideal' form, but rather in various hybrid forms of combination within which the influence of regionalism differs. From a moderately conservative perspective, one form of world order could be a 'neo-Westphalian order', governed either by a reconstituted UN system, in which preferably the major regions or, perhaps more likely, the major powers of the world have a strong influence; another alternative would be a more loosely organised global 'concert' of great powers and the marginalisation of the UN. The relevant powers in both models will be the regional powers of the world. In the former case, the UN will make use of the old idea of complementary 'regional arrangements'.[83] In the latter case, regionalism will suffer from imposed or hegemonic regionalism, and the regions as such will be far from the ideal of security communities. It will thus be a multipolar and plurilateral world, but the concert model will be lacking in legitimacy.

Regionalism would, however, put its mark on a future post-Westphalian governance pattern. In such a world order, the locus of power would move irreversibly to the transnational level. The states system would be replaced or complemented by a regionalised world order and a strengthened global civil society, supported by a 'normative architecture' of world order values, such as multiculturalism and multilateralism. The EU's recent emphasis on interregionalism may in the longer run prove to be important in the reconstruction of a multilateral world order in a regionalised form, here called multiregionalism, meaning a horizontalised, institutionalised

structure formed by organised regions, linked to each other through multidimensional partnership agreements. The EU's ambition is to formalise these as relations between regional bodies rather than as bilateral contacts between countries; but, for the moment for pragmatic reasons, the forms of agreement show a bewildering variety. The EU's relations with the various geographical areas are furthermore influenced by the 'pillared approach' in its own internal decision making, creating artificial divisions between, for instance, foreign and development policy.[84] The development of the pattern has also been influenced over time by shifting bilateral concerns among additional members: for example, the United Kingdom and South Asia, Iberia and Latin America.

Even so, a multipolar system in which the EU constitutes the hub and driving actor does already exist in an embryonic form. The core of the global interregional complex contains triangular relations within the Triad. East Asia is dominated by the two great powers, China and Japan, with which both the USA and the EU have bilateral relations as well. Transregional links within the Triad are constituted by APEC and by the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), as well as various transatlantic agreements linking the USA and Europe. The partnership between the EU and ASEAN is a prominent example of a formal interregional relationship, but the relevant region here (albeit still very informal) is, as argued earlier, the APT, which is becoming increasingly important not only in the context of ASEM relations but also for internal purposes. Indeed, the APT may soon become an East Asian Community (EAC).[85] Relations between the EU and Mercosur and between the EU and the grouping of African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries further extend the global web that has the EU at its centre.

There is thus a clear pattern in the EU's external policy, namely, to shape the world order in accordance with Europe's (more recent) experience of solving conflicts through respect for 'the other', dialogue, multilateralism based on international law, and institutionalised relations. This can be called 'soft imperialism,' based on 'soft power', since, despite fine diplomacy, it is often felt as an imposition in other parts of the world. The policy varies along widening circles from integration (making certain neighbours EU members), to stabilisation (by entering privileged partnerships with the 'near abroad'), to partnership agreements with other regions and important great or middle powers.

Imperialism as world order: Pax Americana?

Yet regionalism, implying the institutionalised multipolar world order structure preferred by the EU, is unacceptable to the United States, which, furthermore, has made it very clear that multilateralism, although desirable, also has its limitations as set by US security interests. This is wholly in line with traditional realist security doctrine and therefore not new. Yet the current policy of the USA goes beyond classical realism (à la Kissinger or Brzezinski) towards reinforcing what the neoconservative think-tank, the Project for the New American Century, describes as 'a policy of military strength and moral clarity'. This formulation captures the essence of neoconservatism: military strength and an obligation to use it in a moral mission to change the world in accordance with American values, first amongst which is liberty. The opportunity, 'the unipolar moment', came after the end of the Cold War, which means that this thinking is thus older than 9/11.[86] To my mind, it is wrong to call the present world order 'unipolar', since the remaining superpower has to fill the power vacuum created by the collapse of the other. As shown in Iraq, there is no automaticity involved.

To dub this ideological structure 'neoconservatism' is hardly an appropriate description of what seems rather to be a militant revolutionary doctrine, rejecting the multilateral world order model and the role of the UN as the protector of this order. Neoconservatism, or 'militant

libertarianism', and isolationism, however different these typically American doctrines may seem, are both sceptical to subsuming national interests to international cooperation and collective security and constitute different expressions of the specificity (the 'exceptionalism') of the USA as the home of a 'chosen people'.

The current US policy (but to a lesser extent also that of the administration of Bill Clinton) is increasingly discussed in terms of 'imperialism', a concept that is used academically, pejoratively and positively by different people.[87] A minimum academic definition of imperialism should surely contain a unilateralist, exploitative, coercive and systematic (the sustainability problem) relationship with the external world, seen as an object for political and military action by a great power (designed by its political class). Yet most analysts in the new literature on imperialism question the dimension of sustainability and point to the problem of exhaustion or overstretch.[88]

Before 9/11 the unipolar moment was just one ideological current within the USA. From the US point of view, the question of multilateralism revolved around a realistic balancing between legality and effectiveness, and priority was always given to the latter. Unilateralism maintained the upper hand. This has also marked the US approach to regionalism, which always has been subordinated to the national interest. This is clear, for instance in the cases of NAFTA and APEC and the latter's support for regional cooperation in Southeast Asia. All can be explained by specific, perceived national interests: NAFTA was a globalist policy, APEC an instrument for hegemonic control in Asia-Pacific, and support for regional cooperation in Southeast Asia a part of the anti-terrorist struggle.

Conclusion

The first part of this article discussed the transition from old to new regionalism, and the continuities and discontinuities involved. Since the new regionalism now has two decades behind it, this may be the time to bury this distinction and recognise the study of regionalism as a search for a moving target, even if this leaves us with a complicated ontological problem. We are not quite sure about or agreed upon the object of study. The very concept of region remains extremely vague and evasive, and makes sense only when associated with the Westphalian logic of bounded, politically controlled territories and the question of what happens to this logic in the context of globalisation and regionalisation. The early theorists looked for post-Westphalian trends, but the global dynamics were then stifled by the bipolar structure.

One discontinuity that emerges in retrospect is thus the stronger normative and prescriptive nature of the early debate, whether the point of departure was federalism, functionalism or neofunctionalism. The idea was to achieve peace by moving beyond the Westphalian logic to find institutionalised forms of permanent international cooperation. The more recent debate is generated much more by the erosion of national borders and the urgent question of how to find an alternative order beyond Westphalia. Neofunctionalism, the only one of the three early approaches with theoretical ambitions, was dismissed before regionalism (or regional integration which was the preferred concept) had shown its real face. There was a lively debate without much happening on the ground, or perhaps it is more correct to say that whatever happened in the field of regional integration was distorted and finally stifled by the Cold War and the bipolar world order. Based on this poor showing in the real, empirical world, the critics, mostly realists, had a fairly easy task in questioning the viability of and the case for regional integration. The new wave of interest in regionalism should thus be seen in the context of an ending of Cold War and a beginning of globalisation. The challenge now, in other words, is to theorise a fast emerging empirical phenomenon without much theory to work from.

The way the European case relates to the general phenomenon of regionalism is an important

field of research. Unfortunately, I myself once called Europe 'the paradigm' for which, although I did not mean a model to apply, I have been criticised. A contrary view was expressed by Shaun Breslin and Richard Higgott, who argued that, 'ironically, the EU as an exercise in regional integration is one of the major obstacles to the development of analytical and theoretical comparative studies of regional integration'.[89] Andrew Axline has also complained about the Eurocentric view of regionalization and the lack of comparative examples.[90] Today, this is no longer the case, but there is still the need for a conceptual and theoretical framework that can address the complexity of the field. Andrew Hurrell insists that, rather than to try and understand other regions through the distorting mirror of Europe, it is better to think in general theoretical terms and in ways that draw both on traditional IR theory and on other areas of social thought.[91]

Identity is constructed, but also inherent in history. Many regions coincide with distinct civilisations. The concept of civilisation is, however, controversial. By civilisation (in its plural meaning) one can quite simply mean the supreme level of aggregation for a complex but nonetheless uniform cultural identity. In Europe it was possible to combine this macrocultural complex with a decentralised political order, but elsewhere it was normally an integrated part of empire building. It lost importance during the nation-state era when the nation became the most important carrier of identity. It is interesting that even writers within the Marxist tradition find it difficult to renounce the concept.[92]

Continental regions can certainly coincide with civilisations; they are often understood in a simple geographic sense. However, there are continental organisations such as the AU and the OAS which may move from paper organisatons to 'real' regions to the extent that this level becomes functional and operational. It is nevertheless misleading to see more operational regions on a particular continent, for instance Africa, as 'subregions'. Thus ECOWAS and SADC are regions, not subregions, but depending on the strength of the AU they may become subregions in the future.

In the second part of the article an attempt was made to show the complexity of more recent regionalisation initiatives and processes in terms of dimensions, actors and levels of action. Regionalism was first interpreted mainly as a trading arrangement, but it soon became clear that this new trend went beyond trade and into monetary policy, development strategy, security and environmental protection, to mention just the most important fields of cooperation or provision of regional public goods. The region thereby became an arena for many actors apart from governments, and, through the increasing cohesion of the region (regionness) as well as through its increasing capacity to act (actorness), the region itself is becoming an important actor, ultimately with the potential of shaping world order. In particular, the phenomenon of interregionalism has to be further theorised. We need to know if it is a general trend in world society or only a projection of the EU view of the world.

Even in the absence of a thoroughly regionalised world (multiregionalism), the process of regionalisation is, in one way or the other, bound to have an impact on the future world order. The current ideology of globalism argues in favour of a particular form of globalisation, namely, neoliberal economic globalisation. Yet it is a simplification to identify globalisation with neoliberalism. Other political contents should in principle be possible and indeed there is emerging a struggle about the shape of the political content of globalisation. Regionalism can unquestionably influence the nature of globalisation. Stronger regions would, for example, shape the form and content of the global order in different ways, depending on political trends in the respective regions, trends that may shift direction, thus altering the preconditions for constructing world order. As discussed in the third section the future of regionalism, interregionalism and ultimately multiregionalism depends very much on the outcome of the struggle between the two

contrasting world order models, represented by the EU and the USA. There is a role for regionalism in both, but of very different kinds: neo-Westphalian in the US model, post-Westphalian in the EU case. Because of these differences we can assume that the European vision of world order is different from that of the USA and that a European world order would be different. Europe has in effect been given a second chance to influence world order.

The EU also applies its own experiences in conflict resolution and development on neighbourhood relations, as well as on the world as a whole. And so of course does the USA. Two different kinds of power, hard and civil, thus face each other. Coercion may be replaced by influence, imposition by dialogue. What has worked in Europe may ultimately prove to have wider relevance. Indeed, the European model may have relevance even if Europe no longer seems to believe in it, judging from the debate on the new constitution. It is important to note that the differences do not express varieties of national mentality – Europe versus America – but constitute contrasting world order principles held by political groupings in both areas. It is therefore reasonable to expect coexistence, whether uneasy or not, and the emergence of hybrids formed somewhere between these competing world order models. Even so, changes in the USA are much the more important. Notwithstanding the election of the second George W. Bush administration, there exists in the USA now a call for a return to multilateralism: the 'USA and its main regional partners must begin to prepare for life after Pax Americana'.[93] Such a shift would bring Europe and the USA closer, but it will not eliminate the difference between the models of multiregionalism and a global concert of regional powers; between a post-Westphalian and a neo-Westphalian world order.

Notes

Much of my recent work in this field has been carried out jointly with Fredrik Söderbaum, and his help in writing this article has also been invaluable. Of great importance was also Tony Payne's generous support and enthusiasm, now as earlier.

[1] Donald Puchala once compared this predicament with the blind man's unsuccessful attempts to define an elephant. See the discussion in Ben Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration* (Palgrave, 2000), p. 12.

[2] For introductions to the earlier debate focusing on Europe, see R.J. Harrison, *Europe in Question* (Allen & Unwin, 1974); Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*; and Dimitris N. Cryssochoou, *Theorizing European Integration* (Sage, 2001).

[3] Previous overviews of the recent debate include Björn Hettne, Andras Inotai & Osvaldo Sunkel (eds), *Studies in the New Regionalism*, Vols I-V (Macmillan, 1999/2001); Mario Telò (ed.), *European Union and New Regionalism: Regional Actors and Global Governance in a Post-hegemonic era* (Ashgate, 2001); Fredrik Söderbaum & Timothy M. Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader* (Palgrave 2003). The most recent addition is

Mary Farrell, Björn Hettne & Luk Van Langenhove, *Global Politics of Regionalism* (Polity, 2005), in which theories, key issues and case studies are presented.

[4] See Joseph Nye, *Peace in Parts: Integration and Conflict in Regional Organization* (Little, Brown & Co., 1971 and 1987).

[5] L. J. Cantori & S. L. Spiegel, *The International Politics of Regions: A Comparative Approach* (Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[6] Andrew Hurrell, 'Regionalism in theoretical perspective', in Louise Fawcett & Andrew Hurrell (eds), *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order* (Oxford University Press, 1995), p 38.

[7] *Ibid*., pp. 38-9.

[8] Walter Mattli, *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).

9 Nye, *Peace in Parts*, pp. 26 – 7.

[10] Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces* (Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 16.

[11] W. Andrew Axline (ed.), 'Cross-regional comparisons and the theory of regional cooperation: lessons from Latin America, the Caribbean, South East Asia and the South Pacific', in: W. Andrew Axline (ed.), *The Political Economy of Regional Cooperation: Comparative Case Studies* (Pinter,1994), p. 217.

[12] Ernst B. Haas, 'The Study of Regional Integration: Reflections on the Joy and Anguish of Pretheorizing', *International Organization*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (1970), p. 610.

[13] Andrew Payne & Andrew Gamble, 'Introduction: the political economy of regionalism and world order', in: Andrew Gamble & Anthony Payne (eds), *Regionalism and World Order* (Macmillan, 1996), p. 2.

[13] *Ibid*., p. 17.

[14] The first mentioned definition is called 'deliberately straightforward' in Anthony Payne, 'Rethinking development inside international political economy', in: Anthony Payne (ed.), *The New Regional Politics of Development* (Palgrave, 2004), p. 16.

[15] Helge Hveem, 'The regional project in global governance', in: Söderbaum & Shaw, *Theories of New Regionalism*, p. 83.

[16] Hurrell, 'Regionalism in theoretical perspective', p. 39.

[18] Sophie Boisseau du Rocher & Bertrand Fort, *Paths to Regionalisation: Comparing Experiences in East Asia and Europe* (Marshall Cavendish, 2005), p.xi.

[18] Iver. B. Neumann, 'A region-building approach', in: Söderbaum & Shaw, *Theories of New Regionalism,* pp. 160 – 178.

[19] Sometimes the economic nationalism in the interwar period is referred to as the first wave or generation. Luk Van Langenhove and Ana–Cristina Costea speak of three generations of regionalism, referring to: a first generation of economic integration, a second generation of internal political integration and a third emerging generation of external political integration. Speaking in terms of generations also allows the authors to avoid the dichotomy between 'old' and 'new' regionalism. They believe that a 'neo' new regionalism is shaping up, with greater ambitions in global governance in general and the United nations institutions in particular. See Luk Van Langenhove and Ana–Cristina

Costea, 'Third generation regional integration: the transmutation of multilateralism into multiregionalism?', unpublished manuscript, United Nations University/Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU/CRIS), 2005.

[20] This section draws on Rosamond, *Theories of European Integration*.

[22] David Mitrany, 'The Prospect of Integration: Federal of Functional?', *Journal of Common Market Studies,* Vol. 4, No. 1 (1965), pp. 119-49; and David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System* (Quadrangle Books, 1943, 1966), pp 119 - 49.

[23] Rosamond, *Theories of European integration*. p. 60.

[24] Bela Balassa, *The Theory of Economic Integration* (Allen & Unwin, 1961).

[25] Stanley Hoffman, 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation State and the Case of Western Europe', *Daedalus*, No. 95 (1966), pp 865 - 85.

[26] Alan S. Milward, *The European Rescue of the Nation State* (Routledge, 1992).

[27] Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye (eds), *Transnational Relations and World Politics* (Harvard University Press, 1972); also *Power and Interdependence* (Little Brown, 1977).

[28] Ernst B. Haas, 'International Integration: The European and the Universal Process', *International Organization*, Vol 15, No 4 (1961), pp. 366 – 92; and Ernst B. Haas & Phillipe Schmitter, 'Economics and Differential Patterns of Integration: Projections about Unity in Latin America', *International Organization,* Vol. 18, No. 4 (1964), pp. 259 – 99.

[29] Axline, 'Cross-regional comparisons and the theory of regional cooperation', p.180.

[30] Bjorn Hettne & Andras Inotai, *The New Regionalism: Implications for Global Development and International Security* (UNU/WIDER, 1994); William D. Coleman & Geoffrey R. D. Underhill (eds), *Regionalism and Global Economic Integratio:. Europe, Asia and the Americas* (Routledge, 1998); Telò, *European Union and New Regionalism*; Sheila Page, *Regionalism in the Developing Countries* (Palgrave, 2000); Fawcett & Hurrell, *Regionalism in World Politics*; Gamble & Payne, *Regionalism and World Order*; Edward D. Mansfield & Helen V. Milner (eds), *The Political Economy of Regionalism* (Colombia University Press, 1997); and Michael Schulz, Fredrik Söderbaum & Joakim Öjendal (eds), *Regionalization in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Perspective on Actors, Forms and Processes* (Zed, 2001).

[31] Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Beacon Press, 1957). There are now three editions of this book: by Farrar & Rinehart in 1944 and by Beacon Press in 1957 and 2001. In the 1957 edition R.M.MacIver stressed the lessons for 'the coming international organization'. The 2001 edition has a foreword by Joseph E. Stiglitz, former chief economist of the World Bank, who makes the very apt remark that 'it often seems as if Polanyi is speaking directly to present-day issues'. Polanyi was also early in analysing regionalism and world order: see Karl Polanyi, 'Universal Capitalism or Regional Planning', *The London Quarterly of World Affairs*, January 1945.

[32] Björn Hettne, 'Neo-Mercantilism: The Pursuit of Regionness', *Cooperation & Conflict*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (1993), pp. 211-32; and Björn Hettne & Fredrik Söderbaum, 'Theorising the Rise of Regionness', *New Political Economy*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (2000), pp. 457-74.

[33] Europe's contemporary crisis can be compared to that of a 'failed state', based on too fragmented a demos or several demoi, which have no feeling of belonging to the same polity.

[34] Others identify new regionalism with one of its aspects, that of 'open regionalism'. See the special issue of *Third World* Quarterly, Vol. 24, No. 2 (2003) on 'Governing the Asia Pacific – Beyond the New Regionalism'.

[35] Kym Anderson & Richard Blackhurst (eds), *Regional Integration and the Global Trading System* (Harvester: Wheatsheaf, 1993); Jaime de Melo & Arvind Panagariya (eds), *New Dimensions in Regional Integration* (Cambridge University Press, 1993); and Vincent Cable & David Henderson (eds), *Trade Blocs? The Future of Regional Integration*. *(*Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1994).

[36] Cable & Henderson, *Trade Blocs?*, p. 8.

[37] Andrew Gamble & Anthony Payne, 'Conclusion: the new regionalism', in: Gamble & Payne (eds), *Regionalism and Global Order,* p. 251.

[38] For surveys of theoretical approaches, see Söderbaum & Shaw, *Theories of New Regionalism*; and Finn Laursen, *Comparative Regional Integration: Theoretical Perspectives* (Ashgate, 2003). The former focuses on theoretical approaches, the latter makes a conscious selection of both theoretical approaches and empirical cases to illuminate them. Two more focused theoretical explorations are Mattli, *The Logic of Regional Integration*; and Stefan A. Schirm, *Globalization and the New Regionalism: Global Markets, Domestic Politics and Regional Cooperation* (Polity, 2002).

[39] See the special issue of *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 5 (1999) on 'New Regionalisms in the New Millennium'.

[40] The discussion on these issues draws on Björn Hettne & Fredrik Söderbaum, 'Regional cooperation: a tool for addressing regional and global challenges', in: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *International Task Force on Global Public Goods*, Stockholm, 2004, available at http://www.gpgtaskforce.org/bazment.aspx

[41] Percy S. Mistry, 'New regionalism and economic development', in Soderbaum & Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism*, pp. 117-39.

[42] *Ibid*., p. 136.

[43] Diana Tussie, 'Regionalism: providing a substance to multilateralism?', in: Söderbaum & Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism*, pp. 99 – 116.

[44] Stephany Griffith-Jones, 'International financial stability and market efficiency as a global public good', in: Inge Kaul, Pedro Conceicao, Katell Le Goulven & Ronald Mendoza (eds), *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization* (Oxford University Press for United Nations Development Programme, 2003), pp. ??-??.

[45] Richard Higgott, 'From Trade-Led to Monetary-Led Regionalism: Why Asia in the 21st Century will be Different to Europe in the 20th Century', UNU/CRIS e-Working Papers 2002-1, Bruges.

[46] Peter Robson, 'The New Regionalism and Developing Countries', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 31, No 3 (1993), pp 329-48.

[47] Nancy Birdsall & Robert Z. Lawrence, 'Deep integration and trade agreements: good for developing countries?', in: Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg & Marc A. Stern (eds), *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century* (Oxford University Press for United Nations Development Programme, 1999), pp. ??-??.

[48] Relevant generalising contributions include: David A. Lake & Patrick Morgan, *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997); Emanuel Adler & Michael Barnett (eds), *Security Communities* (Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Barry Buzan & Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[49] Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), p. 190.

[50] *Ibid*., p. 192.

[51] Barry Buzan, 'Regional security complex theory in the post-Cold War world', in: Söderbaum & Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism,* pp. 140 – 159.

[52] See Buzan & Waever, *Regions and Powers*.

[53] See Lake & Morgan, *Regional Orders*.

[54] Karl Deutsch, *The Analysis of International Relations* (Prentice Hall, 1968), p. 194.

[55] Hettne, Inotai & Sunkel (eds), *Comparing Regionalisms: Implications for Global Development* (Macmillan, 2001), p. xxxii.

[56] A large number of labels have been used in the debate for capturing these two similar (but not always identical) phenomena, such as 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' regionalisation; *de jure* and *de facto* regionalisation; states-led regionalism and market and society-induced regionalisation; and formal/informal regionalism.

[57] Etel Solingen, *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn: Global and Domestic Influences on Grand Strategy* (Princeton University Press, 1998).

[58] See, for instance, Luk Van Langenhove, 'Theorising Regionhood' , UNU/CRIS Working Papers, 2003/1.

[59] Fredrik Soderbaum, *The Political Economy of Regionalism: The Case of Southern Africa* (Palgrave, 2003).

[60] Morten Bøås, Marianne H. Marchand & Timothy M. Shaw, 'The weave-world: the regional interweaving of economies, ideas and identitites', in: Söderbaum & Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism,* pp. 197 – 210.

[61] Winfried Ruigrok & Rob van Tulder*, The Logic of International Restructuring* (Routledge, 1995).

[62] Robert Wade, 'The disturbing rise in poverty and inequality', in: David Held & Mathias Koenig-Archibugi (eds), *Taming Globalization* (Polity, 2003), p. 34.

61 Roland Axtman, *Globalization and Europe* (Pinter, 1998), p 173.

[64] Fredrik Söderbaum & Timothy M. Shaw, 'Conclusion: what futures for new regionalism?', in: Soderbaum & Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism*, p. 222..

[65] Theorising actorship has so far been focused on the EU. A pioneering study is that of Gunnar Sjöstedt, *The External Role of the European Community* (Saxon House, 1977).

[66] Van Langenhove, 'Theorising Regionhood'.

[67] Hettne, 'Neo-Mercantilism'.

[68] Charlotte Bretherton & John Vogler, *The European Union as a Global Actor* (Routledge, 1999), p. 38.

[69] Glenn Hook & Ian Kearns (eds.), *Subregionalism and World Order* (Macmillan, 1999) p. 1.

[70] Kenichi Ohmae, who observed the phenomenon at an early stage, referred to these formations as 'region states', which is somewhat misleading. He also saw them as born by globalisation which is a simplification. See Kenichi Ohmae, 'The Rise of the Region-State', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 1 (1993), pp. 78 – 87.

[71] Bob Jessop, 'The political economy of scale and the construction of cross-border microregionalism', in: Söderbaum & Shaw, *Theories of New Regionalism*, pp. 179 – 98.

[72] James H. Mittelman, *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance* (Princeton University Press, 2000); and Markus Perkmann & Ngai-Ling Sum (eds), *Globalization, Regionalization and the Building of Cross-Border Regions* (Palgrave, 2002).

[73] Joakim Öjendal, 'South East Asia at a constant crossroads: an ambiguous new region', in: Schultz *et al*., *Regionalization in a Globalising World*, p. 160.

[74] James Parsonage, 'South East Asia's "Growth Triangle": A Subregional Response to Global Transformation', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Studies,* Vol. 16, No. 3 (1997), pp. 307 – 17.

[75] Gamble & Payne (eds), *Regionalism and World Order* and the various follow-up studies from the project have even been referred to a 'the world order approach' - see, for instance, Fredrik Söderbaum, 'Introduction: theories of new regionalism', in Soderbaum & Shaw, *Theories of New Regionalism*, p. 11; Fawcett and Hurrell (eds), *Regionalism in World Politics*.

[76] Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (Macmillan, 1995), p. 21.

[77] Robert Cox, with Timothy J. Sinclair, *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[78] President George H. Bush's 'new world order' is the obvious example. Cox comments that the concept should not become reduced to 'one specific and political manipulative use of the term': see Cox, *Approaches to World Order*, p 169.

[79] Richard Falk, 'The post-Westphalian enigma', in Bjorn Hettne & Bertil Oden (eds), *Global Governance in the 21st Century: Alternative Perspectives on World Order* (Expert Group on Development Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, 2002), pp. 147-83; and Richard Falk, *The Great War on Global Terror* (Interlink, 2003).

[80] R.R. Goodin, *Green Political Theory* (Polity, 1992).

[81] Mark Duffield, 'Reprising durable disorder: network war and the securitization of aid', in: Hettne & Odén (eds), *Global Governance in the 21th Century*, pp 74 – 105.

[82] Richard Falk, 'Regionalism and world order: the changing global setting', in: Söderbaum & Shaw (eds), *Theories of New Regionalism*, pp. 63 – 80.

[83] Alan K. Henrikson, 'The growth of regional organizations and the role of the United Nations', in: Fawcett & Hurrell (eds), *Regionalism in World Politics,* pp.122 – 68.

[84] Martin Holland, *The European Union and the Third World* (Palgrave, 2002), p. 7.

[85]Julie Gilson, *Asia Meets Europe* (Edward Elgar, 2002).

[86] The concept has been coined by the American publicist, Charles Krauthammer, and stands for the US policy of taking advantage of its military superiority by shaping the world order in accordance with the US national interest (identified with a general interest). This is a project rather than an established fact. See Charles Krauthammmer, 'The Unipolar Moment', *Foreign Affairs,* Vol 70, No. 1 (1991-1992), pp. 23-33; and 'Unilateralism is the key to our success', *Guardian Weekly,* 22 December 2001.

[87] Roger Burbach & Jim Tarbell, *Imperial Overstretch: George W. Bush and the Hubris of Empire* (Zed, 2004); Richard Falk, *The Declining World Order: America's Imperial Geopolitics* (Routledge, 2004); James J. Hentz (ed.), *The Obligation of Empire. United States' Grand Strategy for a New Century* (University Press of Kentucky, 2004); and Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy and the End of the Republic* (Metropolitan Books, 2004).

[88] Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (Random House, 1987). Eric Hobsbawm made the following observation regarding old and new imperialism, further underlining the problem of sustainability: 'The present world situation is quite unprecedented. The great global empires that we have seen before... bear little comparison with what we see today in the United States empire... A key novelty of the US imperial project is that all other great powers and empires knew that they were not the only ones, and none aimed at global domination. None believed themselves invulnarable, even if they believed themselves to be central to the world – as China did, or the Roman Empire at its peak' (cited in Burbach &Tarbell, *Imperial* Overstretch, p. 179) .

[89] Shaun Breslin *et al*. (eds), *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy* (Routledge, 2002), p. 11.

[90] W. Andrew Axline, 'Comparative case studies of regional cooperation among developing countries', in: Axline, *The Political Economy of Regional Cooperation*, p. 11.

[91] Andrew Hurrell, '.....', in: Farrell *et al*., *Global Politics of Regionalism*, pp. ??-??.

[92] Immanuel Wallerstein makes an interesting distinction between civilisation and the empirical historical system, the empire. 'A civilization refers to a contemporary claim about the past in terms of its use in the present to justify heritage, separateness, rights.' See Immanuel Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-system* (Cambridge University Press, 1991). Another materialist approach is to be found in Robert Cox, 'Civilisations in World Political Economy', *New Political Economy*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1996), pp. 141-56. In the

globalised condition, civilisations are de-territorialised and constitute 'communities of thought', global projects in conflict and dialogue. The interplay implies a 'supra-intersubjectivity' and, if it takes the form of dialogue rather than conflict, one can speak of a 'new multilateralism'. This concept is developed in Robert W. Cox, *The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and World Order* (Macmillan, 1997).

[93] Charles A. Kupchan, 'After Pax Americana: benign power, regional integration and the sources of stable multipolarity', in: Birthe Hansen & Bertel Heurlin (eds), *The New World Order: Contrasting Theories* (Palgrave, 2000), pp. 134 – 66.