

CHAPTER 3 THEORISING POLITICO-SECURITY REGIONALISM

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter attempted to conceptualise politico-security regionalism not only with defining security and regionalism respectively, but also with linking security with regionalism in its political context. This conceptualisation is helpful for this study to develop theoretical approaches to regionalism in politico-security terms. All three contending theories of international relations such as neo-realist, neo-liberal institutionalist and constructivist claims (which emphasise the major roles of states) will be debated in this chapter. In doing so, this chapter will illuminate the significance and applicability of the social constructivist approach, at the same time emphasising the insufficiency of both neo-realist and neo-liberal institutionalist approaches for the ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms.

As pointed out in chapter 2, in fact, the term 'politico-security regionalism' in this study represents regional projects, including institutions, norms and identities, which are socially constructed by regional states as main actors. In this context of the concept 'politico-security regionalism', therefore, this chapter attempt to theorise politico-security regionalism with focusing on the scope and extent of constructivism's function to explain the mechanisms of politico-security regionalisms in ASEAN and SADC. In explaining the function of constructivism, in particular, this chapter will highlight the effects and roles of ideational structures such as institutions, norms and collective identities in which politico-security regionalisms are constructed and reconstructed.

3.2 Neo-realism

Neo-realism belongs to systemic theories or approaches to regionalism. Systemic theories stress the significance of the broader political structures within which regionalist schemes are embedded and the impact of outside pressures working on the region. Given the anarchical and conflictual nature of the international system, neo-realism seeks to explain why states cooperate at the regional level. Neo-realism underlines the importance of external configurations of power, the dynamics of power-political competition, and the constraining role of the international political system (Hurrell, 1995a:339-40; 1995b:47). Discussing neo-realist assumptions, neo-realists argue that the international security environment is too anarchic and the intentions of

others too uncertain for states to stay in any arrangement that might constrain unilateral initiative and/or benefit others more than it does themselves. From this perspective, the fear that others will utilise their relative gains against oneself in the near or distant future is enough to discourage states from cooperation even for mutually beneficial rewards; that is, relationships between states are always competitive. The logic of a state's concern with relative gains is best explained by Waltz (1979:105):

When faced with the possibility of cooperating for mutual gain, states that feel insecure must ask how the gain will be divided. They are compelled to ask not, 'Will both of us gain?' but 'Who will gain more?' If an expected gain is to be divided, say, in the ratio of two to one, one state may use its disproportionate gain to implement a policy intended to destroy the other. Even the prospect of large absolute gains for both parties does not elicit their cooperation so long as each fears how the other will use its increased capabilities...The condition of insecurity... the uncertainty of each about the other's future intentions and actions ... works against their cooperation.

Neo-realists argue, as noted above, that international politics is competitive and conflictual. In this context, neo-realists are likely to believe that both logics of common threat perceptions and balance of power are indispensable in not only explaining regionalism, but also guaranteeing regional security as well as national. During the Cold War era, yet, ASEAN lacked any specific threat common to all (see Chapter 4). Moreover, although SADCC had the threat perception of South Africa's destabilisation policy which was relatively common to most of its members (see Chapter 5), in fact, it experienced a deeper and broader instability and insecurity in the region instead of assuring stability and security. As shown in the case of the Cambodian crisis (1978-1989), furthermore, the different threat perceptions of ASEAN members did not cause war, but rather could be settled through the methods of consultation and consensus as well as the inclusion and exclusion of the principle of regional autonomy (see Chapter 4).

In terms of the logic of balance of power, neo-realists also believe that it will prevail whenever the system is anarchic and the units want to survive (Powell, 1994:313-344). This implies that neo-realism places an emphasis on power, particularly military power that is regarded as a desirable means to guarantee the peace and security of a state.

However, when the Southern African region witnessed increased militarisation within the regional conflictual framework (which evolved particularly out of the rivalry (in 1979-1980) between the FLS and South Africa), it was placed in a zero-sum game with hampering regional stability and security. That is, the mechanism of balance-of-power politics in the Southern African region played a role in endangering regional security instead of guaranteeing it (see Chapter 5).

Notwithstanding the disappearance or change of 'balance of power' in the post-Cold War, the SADCC states did make the effort to evolve SADCC into SADC in 1993 and attempted to establish the SADC Organ (OPDS) in 1996 with a view to advancing regional security in reaction to changing international environment. In this period, likewise, although neo-realists foresaw the bipolar instability with a decline of U.S. involvement in the ASEAN region, ASEAN members attempted to renew their interests by pushing for the leading role of multilateral activities in the ARF. Thus, by implication, this means that even though neo-realism is sceptical of cooperative security strategies, both ASEAN and SADC in the post-Cold War era have increased, not decreased, regional security cooperation which led to push for institutionalisation in a different level, extent and scope (see Chapter 6 and 7).

For some neo-realists, multipolarity is inherently more destabilising than hegemony or bipolarity. Hegemonic stability theory is conventionally concerned with the neo-realist. Within this perspective, Gilpin (1987) expounds that hegemony is a necessary prerequisite for the emergence and maintenance of order and cooperation in world affairs. Emphasising the important role of hegemonic leadership with regard to the stable regionalism, as Grieco (1997:173) also notes, 'regionalism is at a less pronounced pace in those areas where local hegemonic leadership is less visible'. However, some arguments provide the insufficiency and ambiguity of hegemonic stability theory or benevolent hegemonic leadership for explaining the ASEAN and SADC regionalism: for Southeast Asia, ASEAN in politico-security dimension is hoping for the US military presence in order to balance the China's or Japan's military might in the area, whereas ASEAN in economic-security dimension opts the widening and deepening of ASEAN integration into an East-Asian economic system in order to resist US economic imperialism (Palmujoki, 2001:16); for Southern Africa, 'South Africa may be a regional hegemon, but is not necessarily benevolent so long as market forces which are clearly beyond the control of the state continue to play such an important role in its policies as well as those of its neighbours' (Iheduru, 1996:26).

In brief, it can be concluded that neo-realism leads to three assumptions with regard to security regionalism in political context: first, the focus of neo-realists will be on warding off external fear and threats. That is, regional security arrangements will be predominantly military power-related; second, security regionalism in political context will be affected by the relative gains accruing to the different partners in the regional security arrangement, which will ultimately deter the member states from cooperating among themselves; finally, the existence of regional hegemonic state will promote the creation of regional security arrangements (Hout, 1999:16). By this reasoning, as noted earlier, the debate of the neo-realists on regionalism provides weaknesses as well as the strengths for explaining the SADC and ASEAN politico-security regionalisms.

3.3 Neo-liberal institutionalism

Neo-liberal institutionalists place much more stress on cooperation among states than do neo-realists. In fact, neo-liberal institutionalists tend to argue that the declining US hegemony and the collapse of the Cold War do not necessarily mean a return to an anarchical and antagonistic international condition. They believe that states are concerned with absolute gains, not relative gains, and that states come to appreciate how institutional arrangements can promote cooperation by improving inter-state communication and extending relationships into the future, thus lessening mutual suspicions and helping states attain mutually beneficial rewards that might not be had otherwise. For neo-liberal institutionalists, that is, security cooperation within ASEAN and SADC respectively is not only possible, but even likely under conditions of anarchy as long as rational actors overcome the problems of imperfect information and poor communication (Hurrell, 1995a:349-352;1995b:61-64; Müller, 2002:374-376).

Indeed, both ASEAN and SADC have attempted to enhance regional security cooperation through increasing the level of self-restraint, which is conducive to reducing the likelihood of conflict amongst the member states in the region respectively. For example, both ASEAN in the ARF and SADC in OPDS(C) and the SADC Mutual Defence Pact sought to promote regional confidence and security-building measures (CSBMs) with placing an emphasis on reinforcing transparency and openness in the regions through growing involvement of defence and military officials in the areas of security cooperation and military exchanges (see Chapter 6 for ASEAN and Chapter 7 for SADC).

Neo-liberal institutionalism's challenge is directed at the neo-realist claims that cooperation is difficult to achieve and even more difficult to sustain (Grieco, 1988:485-506; 1990:27-50), Nevertheless, as neo-realism asserts that hegemony can provide a better condition for regional security, neo-liberal institutionalism also argues that regional institutions, including ASEAN and SADC(C), can facilitate security cooperation by allowing hegemonic leadership to constrain state behaviour through norms and rules of their own institutions. In this sense, Keohane (1984:7-10) argues that considering transaction costs to be lower when a hegemon exists, hegemony is necessary for maintaining and facilitating institutionalised cooperative regimes. Thus, although neo-liberal institutionalism puts more emphasis on the interdependence and cooperation among states than neo-realism, both theories share the assumption that hegemony can provide a better condition for stable regionalism. In fact, neo-liberal institutionalists argue that institutions facilitate 'cooperation' by constraining state behaviour through norms, rules and agreed-upon ways of sanction, by allowing hegemonic leadership, and by limiting sovereignty via formal and coercive mechanisms.

As Keohane (1993:274) notes, 'institutionalists do not elevate international regimes to mythical positions of authority over states: on the contrary, such regimes are established by states to achieve their purposes; facing dilemmas of coordination and collaboration under conditions of interdependence, governments demand international institutions to enable them to achieve their interests through limited collective action'. In terms of regimes, Krasner (1983:3) argues that facilitating cooperation is primarily to create international regimes which can be defined as 'sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations'. In addition, Keohane (1984:85) regards regimes as a response to 'political market failure', which can be understood as 'institutional deficiencies that inhibit mutually advantageous cooperation'. Thus neo-liberal institutionalists are likely to view regionalist arrangements as regimes through which the allocation of certain public goods can be attained. This implies that regional arrangements, including ASEAN and SADC, seek to develop the norms, interests and expectations of the states as members of the regional institution with a view to enhancing the common good of the member states by tackling regional problems.

Given that both the SADC and ASEAN states are interested not in economic and

political integration, but mainly in 'cooperation' between national states, neo-liberal institutionalism seems to have relevance for both ASEAN and SADC in explaining the mechanisms of politico-security regionalism in the region respectively. Nevertheless, neo-liberal institutionalism has limited relevance for the ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms. Unlike the neo-liberal institutionalists' argument of limiting sovereignty for increased cooperation, the SADC and ASEAN states are more interested in state-building by strengthening their sovereignty instead of limiting it. In particular, as Narine (2002:194-5) notes, ASEAN prohibits its members from using force to settle disputes: in other words, the institution encourages the members to adhere to the basic norms primary among which is the principle of non-intervention and respect for each other's sovereignty.

Even though neo-liberal institutionalists are interested in legalistic norms, coercive rules and material interests, both the ASEAN and SADC states are inclined to retain informal and non-legalistic norm-based rules which are considered as problems and challenges to overcome in a changed international environment after the Cold War. ASEAN members have continued to maintain informal and non-legalistic security approaches within the ASEAN Way context (see Chapter 6) and SADC members also appear not to completely orient their organisation towards a legally binding security architecture as shown in the case of the SADC Mutual Defence Pact (see Chapter 7).

Like neo-realism, furthermore, neo-liberal institutionalists take up rationalist and materialist conceptions of state behaviour, often neglecting the 'sociological and intersubjective processes underlying the emergence of cooperation' (Acharya, 1998:198-219). That is, while neo-liberal institutionalists, who emphasise material factors, argue that the emergence of cooperation is largely a function of 'measurable linkages' and 'utility-maximising transactions' (Acharya, 1998:200), intersubjective factors, including ideas, norms and beliefs (which are conducive to developing collective interests and identities in the regional group) also play an important role in explaining both ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms. This implies that it would be difficult to understand both ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms without explaining the 'processes' which are conducive to developing collective interests and identities in their own regional group. In this context, a constructivist perspective of international relations is helpful for this study to explain politico-security regionalisms of both ASEAN and SADC within the ideational as well as material factors.

3.4 Constructivism

Constructivism is a label given to a wide variety of approaches to International Relations (IR) that range from modernist constructivism to critical constructivism¹¹. Despite the various strands of constructivism in IR theory, what all varieties of constructivism share is a belief that no objects of our knowledge are independent of our (re)interpretations which produce social reality. Rather, social meaning is constructed and reconstructed by social interaction which creates certain mechanisms of norms, identities and interests that guide human actions (Adler, 1997:319-363).

According to Reus-Smit (2001:216), constructivism can be identified with three basic claims that serve as a useful starting point: first, normative and ideational structures are just as important as material structures; second, understanding how non-material structures condition actors' identities is important because identities inform interests and, in turn, actions; third, agents and structures are mutually constituted. The first claim implies that instead of focusing solely on material incentives, constructivists emphasise the importance of shared knowledge, learning, ideational forces and normative and institutional structures (Hurrell, 1995a:353). In this sense, as Hurrell (1995a:352) argues, the constructivist approach 'focuses on regional awareness and regional identity, on the shared sense of belonging to a particular regional community, and on what has been called 'cognitive regionalism''.

As Ruggie notes, 'at bottom, constructivism concerns the issue of human consciousness' (1998:33), its central matter concerns the role of ideas, norms and identities, as opposed to material factors, in the study of regionalism. For constructivists, ideas are not just rules for action, rather ideas operate to shape actors and action in world politics (Wendt 1999:92-138). This means that ideas not only constrain actors but also constitute actors and action. In fact, where neo-realists stress the material structure of the balance of military power which can determine the way that states should act, constructivists argue that systems of shared ideas, beliefs and values also have structural characteristics, and that they exert a powerful influence on social and political action (Reus-Smit, 2001:216-217). As discussed in chapter 4 and 6, for example, the ideas and values of the 'ASEAN Way' are crucial to understanding and

¹¹ By and large, there are four constructivist approaches to International Relations (IR): modernist, modernist linguistic, radical and critical constructivism (see Adler, 2002:97-98).

explaining the ASEAN politico-security regionalism in Southeast Asia. In this context, Wendt (1995:73) argues that although rationalists such as neo-realists and neo-liberal institutionalists believe that material structures are the driving force behind international politics, indeed, 'material resources only acquire meaning for human action through the structure of shared knowledge in which they are embedded'.

The second claim indicates that identities are important because they frame the interests of actors: that is, 'identities are the basis of interests' (Wendt, 1992:398). For the relationship between identities and interests, Hopf (1998:175) argues that 'in telling you who you are, identities strongly imply a particular set of interests or preferences with respect to choices of action in particular domains, and with respect to particular actors'. In fact, constructivism focuses on the intersubjective nature of regional bodies, in which developing a shared sense of belonging or regional identity/interest is regarded as a significant part of institutionalising regional cooperation. Unlike a rationalist approach, with the state very much as a given, the constructivist approach examines how the identities and interests of actors are constructed within the context of different processes of interaction, cultures and histories. Within this sense, the constructivist approach is more than an economic approach to regionalism; it is, rather, a social approach. In this context, the constructivist approach attempts to explore how the sharing of norms, ideas and identities is conducive to the character and emergence of regional cooperation and regional arrangements.

Thus, it can be argued that constructivists do not take identity and interests as a given and fixed result, but rather as a constitutive open-ended process. In this context, Wendt (1999:170) describes the process by which identities are formed and come to frame interests as 'socialisation': that is, 'socialisation is in part a process of learning to conform one's behaviour to societal expectations'. In fact, such rationalists as neo-realists and neo-liberal institutionalists say nothing about who the actors are or how their interests are constituted; they only explain how states should choose or how they should bargain; they just offer answers to some questions about when states should cooperate and when they might be expected to fight (Kowert, 1998/99:2). Constructivists, in contrast, assert that understanding how actors form their interests is crucial to explaining a wide range of international political dynamics that rationalists neglect or misunderstand (Reus-Smit, 2001:217).

As discussed in chapter 5, for example, SADCC could form a consensual collective-

identity as response to apartheid South Africa in order not only to protect each member country's national dignity and sovereignty, but also to garner support for the norm of racial equality (Klotz, 1995). During the apartheid era, that is, SADC as a consensual collective-identity opted often for a flexible approach to seeking substantial security aid from the Western as well as the Eastern bloc even though the organisation aimed to reduce the economic dependence of member states, especially but not exclusively, on South Africa (see Chapter 5). In this context, thus, it can be argued that as constructivists like Wendt (1992:394) note, 'identities and interests are endogenous to interaction, rather than a rationalist-behavioural one in which they are exogenous'.

The third claim is closely related with the 'agent-structure problem' better known as social structuration theory of Giddens (1984). This agent-structure problem arises from 'two uncontentious truths about social life: first, that human agency is the only moving force behind actions, events, and outcomes of the social world; and second, that human agency can be realised only in concrete historical circumstances that condition the possibilities for action and influence its course' (Dessler 1989:443; Wendt 1987:337). As discussed in chapter 6 and 7, for example, both the ARF and the OPDS(C) were constructed by the member states of ASEAN and SADC respectively in order to meet the external as well as internal demand for advancing regional security in reaction to changing international environment.

Within this context, it can be assumed that the politico-security regionalisms of ASEAN and SADC are produced by the member states of each organisation respectively. Given that human action can be realised in certain historical circumstances that condition the possibilities for action and influence its course (Dessler 1989:443; Wendt 1987:337), as mentioned above, it can be argued that for both ASEAN and SADC, the emergence of the ARF and the SADC Organ (OPDS) could be realised in a new and changing international milieu and a recognition that many of the problems and threats faced by the region which 'can only be addressed through increased cooperation' in the post-Cold War era (Van Aardt, 1997:23). Nonetheless, both the ARF and the OPDS(C) were constructed by the member states of ASEAN and SADC respectively in their own ways: for the ARF, ASEAN rejected Western ideas on the forum and tried to develop security regionalism on the basis of the regional political norms of the ASEAN Way; for the OPDS(C), although SADC leaders sought to consolidate a formal regional security structure with signing the OPDSC Protocol, SADC committed itself to the principle of 'national sovereignty' by opting for the consensual decision-making structure within

SADC (see Chapter 6 and 7).

Given that politico-security regionalisms not only evolve from conscious political projects by the regional (member) states, but also create new ideational structures that socialise both members and non-members into unique types of practices (Bellamy, 2004:20), therefore, the third claim which is closely related with 'agent-structure problem' should be emphasised for understanding and explaining the ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms.

Although there is considerable division between different brands of constructivism, all constructivists – with the exception, perhaps, of the extreme postmodernist wing of radical constructivism – agree that reality is socially constructed (Adler 2002; Guzzini 2000), that ideational structures condition the identities and interests of agents and hence form their actions, and that the relationship between agent and structure is mutually constitutive (Wendt 1987; 1992; 1999). With regard to the mechanisms of politico-security regionalisms in ASEAN and SADC, it is worth illuminating three concepts that emanate from constructivism that inform us important things about the way that politico-security regionalisms are constructed and reconstructed. These concepts are: institutions, norms and collective identity.

3.4.1 Institutions

From the rationalist or utilitarian perspective of international relations, including neo-liberal institutionalism, 'institutions exist because they could have reasonably been expected to increase the welfare of their creators' (Keohane 1984:80): that is, institutions are 'persistent and connected sets of rules (formal and informal) that prescribe behavioural roles, constrain activity, and shape expectations' (Keohane 1989:3). In this way, neo-liberal institutionalism sees regional institutions emerging in response to the concrete needs of states to manage regional problems and as an instrument of helping to reduce the costs of strengthening intra-regional linkages, as in the case of economic transactions amongst regional states (Hook and Kearns 1999:3).

As mentioned earlier, neo-liberal institutionalists argue that institutions facilitate cooperation by constraining state behaviour through norms, rules and agreed-upon ways of sanction, and by limiting sovereignty via formal and coercive mechanisms. With regard to the effect and role of institutions, however, constructivism focuses on the

intersubjective nature of regional groups, including ASEAN and SADC, where developing a regional identity or shared sense of belonging is seen as an essential part of institutionalising regional (security) cooperation (Hook and Kearns 1999:3). By implication, thus, this means that institutions not only take such a rationalist or utilitarian role as the calculation of costs and benefits, but also constitute (regional) identity and interests through interactions among actors who are affecting the idea of each other (Acharya, 2001:22-24).

Unlike the neo-liberal institutionalists' argument of limiting sovereignty for increased cooperation, constructivists emphasise institution-building which does not necessarily entail diminishing national sovereignty (Palmujoki 2001:8). Even though neo-liberal institutionalists are interested in a legally binding institutionalisation, in fact, both the ASEAN and SADC states are inclined to retain informal and non-legalistic institutionalisation. As ASEAN members have continued to maintain informal and non-legalistic security approaches within the ASEAN Way context (see Chapter 6), for example, SADC members also appear not to completely orient their organisation towards a legally binding security architecture as shown in the case of the SADC Mutual Defence Pact (see Chapter 7).

As Adler and Barnett (1998:42) argue, although international relations theory traditionally views international institutions as constraints on state actions, institutions may be seen as 'structures' or as 'processes': in fact, 'a key constructivist point is that norms, rules and institutional contexts constitute actors and constrain choices'. Thus, using a constructivist perspective of international relations to study the development of politico-security regionalism would mean going beyond the study of 'how states should choose or how they should bargain' (Kowert 1998/99:2). Rather, studying the effect and role of institutions from a constructivist perspective of international relations helps us to examine how institutions promote four factors: first, the development of mutual trust; second, the forming of shared identity; third, the creation of regional culture or value system, involving democracy and human rights; finally, the cultivation of social learning which represents the capacity of social actors to manage and even transform reality by changing their beliefs of the material and social world and their identities (Adler and Barnett 1998:42-44).

Furthermore, while neo-liberal institutionalists, who stress on material factors, argue that the emergence of cooperation is largely a function of 'measurable linkages' and

'utility-maximising transactions' (Acharya, 1998:200), intersubjective factors, including ideas, norms and beliefs (which are conducive to developing collective interests and identities in the regional group) also play an important role in explaining the mechanisms of regional institutions, including ASEAN and SADC. This implies that it would be difficult to understand both ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms without explaining the impact of intersubjective factors upon the processes of institutionalisation in both ASEAN and SADC. In this context, it is important to note that a social constructivist perspective of international relations is helpful for this study to explain politico-security regionalisms of both ASEAN and SADC within the ideational or intersubjective factors beyond the material or rationalist ones.

3.4.2 Norms

The concern with norms makes constructivists to see actors and structure much differently from the rationalist approaches to the study of politico-security regionalism. Although there exist different views between neo-realism and neo-liberal institutionalism in terms of the possibilities for interstate cooperation in regional and global structure, both approaches assume a world controlled by rational actors, whose relations are formulated by the balance of material power (Jervis, 1999:42-61). Nonetheless, according to renowned constructivists, norms are intersubjective beliefs about the social and natural world that define actors, their situations, and the possibilities of action. Norms are beliefs rooted in and reproduced through social practice (Wendt, 1995:73-74; Jepperson, et al. 1996:54).

According to Krasner (1983:2), 'norms are standards of behaviour defined in terms of rights and obligations'. In fact, the definition and functions of norms vary. Kratochwill (1989:70) offers three ordering functions of norms: first, by 'ruling out' certain methods of individual goal seeking through the stipulation of forbearances, norms define the area within which conflict can be bounded; second, within the restricted set of permissible goals and strategies, rules that take the actors' goals as given can create schemes or schedules for individual or joint enjoyment of scarce objects: third, norms enable the parties whose goals and/or strategies conflict to sustain a 'discourse' on their grievances, to negotiate a solution, or to ask a third party for a decision on the basis of commonly accepted rules, norms and principles.

Although many theories of international relations, including neo-liberal institutionalism,

recognise the importance of norms, constructivism allows for a much deeper understanding of norms in forming international relations (Acharya 2001:24). As Katzenstein (1996:5) notes, norms play two particular roles within international organisations and regional mechanisms. First, norms prescribe the proper enactment of an already defined identity, thus having 'regulative' effects that specify standards of proper behaviour. This means that the regulative effects of norms contribute to constraining the activities of actors. Second, norms define the identity of an actor, thus having 'constitutive effects' that specify what actions will cause relevant others to recognise a particular identity. That is, norms not only prescribe and regulate behaviour (the regulate effect), they also define and constitute identities (constitutive effect). To put it differently, given that the concept of state is not only constituted by international norms, but also constrained by them (Biersteker 2002:157-176), norms can be seen as fulfilling a constitutive function as well as a regulative one.

Given the aforementioned arguments, it can be summarised that, according to March and Olsen (1989:51), norms do not simply serve instrumental purposes; behaviour is shaped not only by goals and rules of maximisation, but also by roles and norms that define standards of appropriateness; improvisation and strategic behaviour are embedded in a social environment that constitutes the identity of the actors and their interests and that shapes the norms that also help to define their interests.

In Southeast Asia and Southern Africa, the norms that underpin both ASEAN and SADC(C) have, to a varying degree, been utilised in shaping each politico-security regionalism in the region respectively. In particular, for both ASEAN and SADC, such norms as non-interference are not fixed in their definition and functions, but rather open to be structured and restructured in the member states' own intent and interest. That is, norms not only regulate behaviour, they also constitute new interests and identities (Katzenstein, 1996:5). In this context, it can be argued that the norm of non-interference for both ASEAN and SADC should be understood in the constitutive context as well as the regulatory.

Given the fact that both regional groups are political entities with 'weak' state structure and a lack of strong regime legitimacy, the norm of non-interference can and should be understood in the context of the domestic security concerns of regional member states in ASEAN and SADC respectively. As noted in chapter 6 and 7, that is, one of the main reasons for both ASEAN and SADC to adhere to the norm of non-interference can be

found in the context of each organisation's search for internal stability and regime security. After the end of the Cold War, in fact, it is largely argued that the primary sources of threat to the national security of both ASEAN and SADC states are not external, but internal (for ASEAN, see Acharya, 2001:57-58; for SADC, see Nathan and Honwana, 1995:6).

In this regard, it can be assumed that such political norms as the non-interference/intervention in addressing regional crises are open to be restructured and applied to its own historical and social context. In terms of managing conflicts in ASEAN and SADC, furthermore, it is important to note that when the norm of pacific settlement of disputes is applied to regional context, it is not automatically given, but rather produced and reproduced through the various interactions of the political elites of regional group respectively (see Chapter 6 and 7). Given the aforementioned arguments, the constitutive effects of norms seem to be playing a crucial role in constructing the collective identities of ASEAN and SADC, which will be discussed in the next section.

3.4.3 Collective Identity

Collective identity refers to 'positive identification' with the welfare of the other, which is regarded as a 'cognitive extension' of the Self rather than as independent: in this context, collective identity can be regarded as an essential element for the sense of 'solidarity, community and loyalty' (Wendt, 1996:52). According to Hasenclever, et al (1997:186), collective identity implies that regional actors respect each other as members of a community in which decisions are taken on a consensus basis. By implication, for both ASEAN and SADC, this means that collective (regional) identity can be understood as the basis of regional consensus such that peace and stability in the region cannot be realised without regional solidarity on security problems.

As mentioned above, collective identity is a basis for 'feelings of solidarity, community, and loyalty' and for 'collective definitions of interests'. Yet, this does not mean that state actors no longer calculate costs and benefits, but that they do so on a 'higher level of social aggregation'; this then facilitates collective action by 'increasing diffused reciprocity and the willingness to bear costs without selective incentives' (Wendt, 1996: 53). This means that each collective identity of ASEAN and SADC rests primarily on the feeling of solidarity (namely 'we feeling') in dealing with regional security problems, as

was indicated in a number of cases, including the Cambodian conflict and the East Timor Crisis for ASEAN, and SADC's response to apartheid South Africa and the conflict management in the DRC for SADC (see Chapter 4, 5, 6 and 7).

Elaborating collective identity, Wendt (1996:53) also used as an example the difference between alliances and collective security arrangements, which are both instructive. On one hand, he considers alliances as 'temporary coalitions of self-interested states' who join together for instrumental reasons in response to a specific threat. As soon as the threat is gone, the basis for the coalition also evaporates and the alliance gets disbanded. With collective security arrangements, on the other hand, states make commitments to multilateral action against non-specific threats. In such multilateral institutions, collective identity is not a sine qua non for its creation, but it nevertheless provides an important foundation for member states to increase the willingness to act based on 'generalised principles of conduct' and diffuse reciprocity (Wendt, 1996:53; also Job 1997:167-168).

With regard to military alliance, both ASEAN and SADC(C) did not form a formal military alliance like NATO owing mainly to the lack of military capabilities, but rather they have opted for their own styles to respond to regional security problems. This implies that both ASEAN and SADC(C) seem to have searched for a collective regional identity respectively so as to consider themselves as distinct regional groups from the European ones, in which they could redefine regional security mechanisms within their own regional context (see Chapter 4, 5, 6 and 7).

In terms of collective security arrangements, both ASEAN and SADC(C) did not establish a true meaning of collective security system in the region respectively although SADC seems to have largely focused on collective security and/or collective defence under the SADC Organ within the region (Hough, 1998:25-26; also Cawthra, 1997:211). Given that collective identity is not equivalent (or essential) to such multilateral institutions as a collective security arrangement (Wendt 1996:53), it should be noted that collective identity can become the basis for developing collective security arrangements, but not vice versa. Thus, the meaning of collective security (defence) system in the SADC region should be understood in the context mentioned above¹².

¹² The adoption of the SADC Mutual Defence Pact will be dealt with in chapter 7.

Given the circumstances above, furthermore, it is important to note that both the ASEAN and SADC(C) states have searched for building collective (regional) identities by paving the way for them to approach conflict management in flexible terms. For instance, in resolving the Cambodian conflict, ASEAN utilised China's intervention and support against Vietnam to punish Hanoi for its use of force in Cambodia at the expense of its norm of regional autonomy providing a 'regional solution to regional problems' (see Chapter 4) Likewise, although SADCC sought the doctrine of self-reliance through reducing the influence of (particularly but not only) South Africa, the organisation also avoided the fixed framework of conventional (East-West) rivalry with a view to seeking substantial security aid from the Western as well as the Eastern bloc (see Chapter 5). For both ASEAN and SADC, in fact, what is important for a collective regional identity is the processes of such positive identification as the spirit of rising or enhanced cooperation among regional actors, which are reproduced and transformed by their intersubjective ideas and practices.

3.5 Conclusion

In searching for regional identity, although most of the ASEAN and SADC states are contending with a number of divisive forces which centre around diverse and fragmented ethnic, religious, and linguistic identities (Narine, 2002:199-200; Mandaza, 2001:133-139), the regional 'collective identity' may be conceived as a process through which its member states adapt to a 'regional existence' in order to reduce the possibility of use of force in inter-state relations (Acharya, 1998:208). In fact, one of the primary catalysts of the evolutionary identity of ASEAN and SADC(C) as regions can be found in intra-regional interactions which have been existent, albeit in a different degree at different times, even before each organisation was established, which will be examined in the following chapter 4 and 5.

As noted in the previous sections (3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3), moreover, the important features (such as institutions, norms and identity) of constructivism can be utilised to reflect the differences and similarities of the nature, character, and focus of regional security cooperation in ASEAN and SADC. Through this comparative analysis based on the constructivist perspective of international relations, this study will focus on exploring the mechanisms of politico-security regionalisms in ASEAN and SADC.

Furthermore, in examining the ASEAN and SADC politico-security regionalisms, as

was shown in this chapter, what is important for this study is that whereas both neo-realism and neo-liberal institutionalism are taking the identities and interests of actors as given, constructivism focuses on how intersubjective practices between actors project identities and interests being formed in the processes of interaction rather than being formed prior to interaction. That is, whereas both neo-realist and neo-liberal institutionalist theories focus on how given and fixed structures affect the instrumental rationality of actors, a constructivist perspective of international relations opens up the possibilities of actors to consider international structures as historically evolved and thus flexible. Within this context, the following chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be presented through the explanation of the roles and effects of ideational structures as well as material ones.