Copyright © British International Studies Association 1998

Condition(s) of Peace

EMANUEL ADLER

'Ladies and gentlemen, the time for peace has come.'
The late Yitzhak Rabin, prime minister of Israel

Introduction

The conditions in which peace can exist are now just what they have always been (even if time and place make them appear different): a higher expected utility from peace than from war; a 'civic culture'; a commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes; strong institutions; an ethical code; mutual legitimization; peacemakers (because peace is socially constructed); a social-communicative process; material and normative resources; social learning (to take us from here to there); shared trust; and, most important, a collective purpose and social identity. As I will explain below, these are not 'necessary' conditions in any formal sense. Nor are there really sufficient conditions of peace, other, perhaps, than lobotomy and the total elimination of weapons, including fingernails.

Like war, peace is a moving target. People in the Middle Ages probably understood peace very differently than did their descendants in the seventeenth century. Our understanding of peace, too, seems to be changing: if war may soon become the mutual infliction of disease, would peace mean a state of 'mutual inoculation'? And if, as I believe, future wars will be fought in and by computers, will peace exist only in cyberspace?

Again, is it not the case that peace has always been 'virtual', or nonexistent, from an epistemological or an ontological point of view? The notions of peace that realists of all colours and denominations have advanced since Classical Antiquity, under the rubric of 'the absence of war',[1] amount to nothing at all. The concept of 'negative peace'[2] may indeed represent a situation in the real world where organized

[1] See, for example, Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, trans. Rex Warner (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972); Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. Henry C. Mansfield, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C. B. Mac Phearson (Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1954); Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 'Judgment on Perpetual Peace', in *A Project of Perpetual Peace*, trans. Edith M. Nuttall (London: Richard Cobden-Sanderson, 1927); Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948); Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

[2] Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, 6 (1969), pp. 167–91; Johan Galtung, *Essays in Peace Research*, Vol. 1 (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1975); Kenneth E. Boulding, *Stable Peace* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978). See also Arie Kacowicz, *Zones of Peace in the Third World: South America and West Africa in Comparative Perspective* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

violence between political units does not occur for a number of years. Epistemologically speaking, however, peace merely as the absence of war is an oxymoron; we cannot positively define something as the opposite of something else.[3] In other words, peace may exist but we cannot know it.

'Positive peace',[4] on the other hand, has no ontological existence at all; it is a goal that can never be achieved in our times.[5] Idealists of all stripes have portrayed peace as a utopia, incorporating the improvement of politics and human nature, social justice, morality, international organization and law, and human progress.[6] Seen this way, peace never existed, does not exist now, and probably never will. In other words, although we may be able to imagine peace and understand what is required to achieve it, peace really does not exist.

This is why, while inspired people, such as Immanuel Kant, may have been able to *imagine* the necessary conditions for 'perpetual peace' among republics,[7] all that contemporary scholars have been able to say about the 'democratic peace' (to stick to Kant's theory) is that 'democracies *do not make war* on each other'.[8] Even Kenneth Boulding, who was keenly aware of the ontological and epistemological

[3] During the 1960s and 1970s, Galtung and Boulding conducted a lively debate on the meaning of peace, which centred in part on Galtung's notions of 'negative' and 'positive' peace. See Kenneth E. Boulding, 'Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung', *Journal of Peace Research*, 14 (1977), pp. 75–86. Whereas Galtung defined 'negative peace' as the absence of physical violence, Boulding argued that the concept of 'negative peace' is a 'complete misnomer', 'Peace . . . is not just "not-war" any more than water is "not ice" ' (Boulding, 'Twelve Friendly Quarrels', p. 78). A year later, however, Boulding himself referred to peace's 'negative side' as 'the absence of turmoil, tension, conflict, and war' (Boulding, *Stable Peace*, p. 3). According to Herbert C. Kelman, the concept of negative peace is valuable because it stresses the avoidance of violence and destruction', see Herbert C. Kelman, 'Reflections on the History and Status of Peace Research', *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 5 (Spring 1981), p. 105.

[4] Galtung is mostly in a category of his own when he defines 'positive peace' as the *absence* of something else, i.e. 'structural [socio-economic] violence' (Galtung, 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', pp. 167–91; Galtung, *Essays in Peace Research*). See also Heikki Patomaki and Ole Waever, 'Introducing Peaceful Changes', in Heikki Patomaki (ed.), 'Peaceful Changes in World Politics' (Research Report No 71, Tampere Peace Research Institute, University of Tampere, 1995). Boulding, on the other hand, correctly defined 'positive peace' in positive terms, i.e. as a 'condition of good management, orderly resolution of conflict, harmony associated with mature relationships, gentleness, and love' (Boulding, *Stable Peace*, p. 3).

[5] 'In this sense [positive peace] peace is one of the ultimate time's arrows in the evolutionary process, an increasing product of human development and learning' (Boulding, *Stable Peace*, p. 3). According to Kacowicz, positive peace 'includes also social and economic justice, and some kind of world order that meets the needs and interests of the human population as a whole' (Kacowicz, *Zones of Peace in the Third World*).

[6] See, for example, Isaiah 1:16–17, 2:2–4, 11:1–4,6,9, and 42:5–7; Matt. 5:3–11 ('The Beatitudes'); Dante Alighieri, *Monarchy and Three Political Letters*, trans.. Donald Nicholl and Colin Hardie (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1954); Emeric Cruce, *The New Cyneas*, trans. C. Frederick Farrell, Jr., Edith Farrell (ed.) (New York: Garland, 1972); William Penn, *An Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe* (Washington, D.C.: American Peace Society, 1912); Abbé de Saint Pierre, *Ouvrages de Politique*, 16 vols. (Rotterdam, 1733–41); Antoine-Nicolas de Condorcet, *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind*, trans. June Barraclough, introd. Stuart Hampshire (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1955); Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*, trans. Ted Humphrey (Indianapolis: Hacket, 1983); Jeremy Bentham, *Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace* (London: Grotius Society, 1927); Norman Angell, *The Great Illusion* (London: Penguin Books, 1908); A Zimmern, *The League of Nations and the Rule of Law* (London: Macmillan, 1939); Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, *World Peace Through World Law*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973); Philip Noel-Baker, *The Arms Race: A Programme for World Disarmament* (London: Stevens and Sons, 1958); Richard A. Falk, *A Study of Future Worlds* (New York: The Free Press, 1975).

[7] Kant, *Perpetual Peace*.

[8] Michael W. Doyle, 'Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part I', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12 (Summer 1983), pp. 205–33; Bruce M. Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

traps of characterizing peace in 'negative' and 'positive' ways, defined 'stable peace' merely as 'a situation in which the *probability of war* [my emphasis] is so small that it does not really enter into the calculations of any of the people involved'.[9]

And yet, at the end of the second millennium, peace, though still uncommon, does exist. It has a positive meaning, is ontologically real and epistemologically significant, and can be empirically described. The state of peace, as envisaged by E. H. Carr more than fifty years ago, given specific meaning by Karl Deutsch and Richard Van Wagenen more than forty years ago, and recently redefined by Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, is neither the antithesis of something else nor something that exists only in the future; rather, it is something very much like a *security community.*[10]

Deutsch and his associates defined a security community as 'a group of people which has become integrated'. This means 'the attainment, within a [transnational] territory, of a sense of community and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure, for a "long" time, dependable expectations of peaceful change'.[11] Thus peace is not some temporary absence of war or a phantom to be achieved in the future. The nature and quality of the relationships among states that share collective identities and trust one another can and have created transnational regions of people who maintain dependable expectations of peaceful change.

Because collective identities (and other collective understandings that are the marks of a security community) manifest themselves in and through practice, peace is, first and foremost, itself *a practice.*[12] Practices are real, not only because their physical and material manifestations can be empirically described, but also in the socio-ontological sense that they embody the collective meaning that people give to material reality. In other words, peace as it exists today can be traced back to the cognitive structures or collective understandings—mainly collective identities—that constitute the practices characteristic of security communities.[13]

Defining peace as a practice also endows the concept with a dynamic character. In this view, 'it is not possible to tame or freeze history for long';[14] that is, neither war

[9] Boulding, *Stable Peace*, p. 13.

[10] Karl W. Deutsch, Sidney A. Burrell, Robert A. Kann, Maurice Lee, Jr., Martin Lichterman, Raymond E. Lindgren, Francis L. Loewenheim, Richard W. Van Wagenen, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957); Richard W. Van Wagenen, *Research in the International Organization Field: Some Notes on a Possible Focus* (Center for Research on World Political Institutions, Princeton University, 1952); Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds.), *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See also E. H. Carr, *Conditions of Peace* (London: Macmillan, 1942). According to Kelman, 'positive peace does not imply an ideal, utopian situation, but merely a livable one' (Kelman, 'Reflections on the History and Status of Peace Research', p. 108).

[11] Deutsch *et al.*, *Political Community*, p. 5.

[12] 'If we can speak of violent practices, or of practices based on (threats) of violence . . . we can also speak of making practices more peaceful' (Patomaki and Waever, 'Introducing Peaceful Changes', p. 10).

[13] My approach follows a 'constructivist' line of reasoning. On constructivism, see Alexander Wendt, 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization*, 46 (1992), pp. 391–425; David Dessler, 'What is at Stake in the Agent–Structure Debate?', *International Organization*, 43 (1989), pp. 441–74; and Emanuel Adler, 'Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics', *European Journal of International Relations*, 3 (1997), pp. 319–63. On the reality of 'social facts', such as practices, see John Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality* (New York: The Free Press, 1995).

[14] Patomaki and Waever, 'Introducing Peaceful Changes', p. 16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

nor peace is permanent and absolute or evolves according to some philosophically based teleology. Rather, they exist in time and space; which of the two dominates depends on whether, in dealing with their ever-changing reality, societies (not only of the anarchical type[15]) resolve their conflicts by violent means[16] or have learned to expect and implement peaceful change.

Defining peace as a practice also entails agency.[17] 'Peacemakers' (active or passive, individual or institutional) play a social and political role in endowing physical objects (including people and physical resources) with collective meanings, identities, and myths. Furthermore, the equation of peace with the practice of security community means that, like all practices, it can be arrived at through *learning*. Rather than existing as an a-historical fact, it owes its existence to the attachment of meaning to physical reality in particular historical, cultural and political contexts.[18] In other words, peace is socially constructed.

Finally, because meanings are not direct representations but interpretations of physical reality, which, in turn, depend on other meanings (for example, sovereignty and state), the social construction of shared meanings, and thus of security communities, depends on the sharing of experiences, narratives, symbols, and, more generally, historical, political, and cultural contexts. Whether states that enjoy an absence of war become a security community, then, depends not only on time (twenty, thirty, fifty years), but also on the particular contexts within which the social construction of shared meanings and identities takes place.

This means that, although we should look to constitutive conditions—such as collective identity, mutual trust, social processes of communication, and social learning—to explain the social construction of security communities, we should take account of facilitative conditions—including a higher expected utility from peace than from war or Great-Power commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes—to explain the historical, political, and cultural contexts that permit the constitution of security communities. For example, a higher expected utility from peace than from war, in addition to bringing about the temporary absence of war, may also, and more importantly, help warring societies see each other with greater empathy and thereby promote the development of collective meanings and identities.

The state or *condition* of peace[19] is the practice of security community sustained by the attachment of collective meanings and purposes to physical reality. It can be concisely represented by the formula (borrowed from philosopher John Searle): '*X counts as Y in C*'.[20] The paradigmatic case is: 'This paper counts as money in a given context'. In our case, *X* is the material aspect of living in peace in a security community (demilitarized borders, extensive trade, etc.); *Y* is the collective meanings

[15] Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977).
[16] Andrew B. Schmookler, *The Parable of the Tribes* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1984).
[17] There is a growing attention in the IR literature to the role played by agents in the constitution of international practices. One such type is known as 'moral entrepreneurs'. See, for example, Ethan Nadelmann, 'Global Prohibition Regimes: The Evolution of Norms in International Society', *International Organization,* 44 (1990), pp. 479–526.
[18] On learning, see Ernst B. Haas, *When Knowledge is Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).
[19] Although I prefer the expression '*condition* of peace', to avoid confusion with the *conditions* of (for) peace I shall refer instead to the '*state* of peace',
[20] Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality*, pp. 43–51. See also the comments by Ian Hacking, Mary Midgley, Thomas Osborne, and John R. Searle in 'Review Symposium on John R. Searle', *History of the Human Sciences*, 10 (1997), pp. 83–110.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and purposes attached to physical reality, which are manifested in the practice of peaceful change ('we' democracies, '"we" who follow the Asian way', etc.); and *C* is the historical, cultural, and political contexts through and within which social reality acquires a particular meaning (the nuclear era, a global economy, American hegemony, etc.)

As used here, the *conditions* for peace—what Carr, in the title of his often-overlooked book, called the 'conditions of peace'—does not refer to its determinants in a positivist (if A then B) or a realist-scientific (A causes B) sense. Rather, I have in mind the material and ideological attributes that *enable* X to be constituted as Y in C—the propensities that, when actualized by the practices of peoples of states, enable them to de-emphasize national borders, stop imagining war among themselves as a real possibility, and feel instead that they can be safe within the cognitive borders of their community.

In this paper, I will define, describe, and explain the *condition* and the *conditions* for peace in the context of what, evoking E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis*,[21] this volume refers to as 'the eighty years' crisis'. I find it appropriate, therefore, to begin by pointing out that, more than fifty years ago, Carr believed that peace would take hold in the European continent only if and when the peoples of Europe came to understand that 'the national unit ha[d] become visibly too small' for controlling military and economic policy and were consequently 'induced to determine themselves into different units for different purposes' and build-up 'a wider form of international community'.[22] Moreover, according to Carr, Europeans might then discover that they had 'constructed something which mankind will come gradually to recognize as indispensable to its future well-being and which can some day be given both wider geographical extension and appropriate constitutional forms'.[23]

From the perspective of what Carr thought to be the resolution of the 'twenty years' crisis', the way out of the 'eighty years' crisis' becomes much more intelligible: the development of security communities and the diffusion of security-community practices and institutions around the world. Although, at the end of the second millennium, the crisis is far from being over (in fact, there is room to argue that it has gotten worse since the end of the Cold War), in some (overlapping) parts of the world—such as Scandinavia, Western Europe, the Euro-Atlantic space, the US and Canada, US and Mexico, the southern cone of Latin America, and, increasingly, the region encompassed by the Association of Southeast Asian States (ASEAN)—people who have learned to organize themselves into security communities now practice and experience peaceful change.

My arguments may sound profoundly idealistic; indeed they are, in the sense that ideational structures are both ontologically *real* and also help constitute reality. They are not idealistic (in the 'pie in the sky' sense), however, because they view power and socio-cognitive processes as two sides of the same coin. Otherwise, how can we explain that Carr, generally regarded as the 'father of realism', linked the development of a European international community to a collective transnational identity that arises from a shared moral purpose[24] In fact, Carr believed (as I do) that the

[21] E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis: 1919–1939* (New York: Harper, 1964).
[22] Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, pp. 123 and 274.
[23] Ibid., p 273.
[24] Ibid., pp. 102–25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

material world and power affect the world through the medium of purposeful and meaningful action;[25] consequently, history need not repeat itself endlessly and can evolve in directions made socially possible both by power relations and by the collective ideas of an age.

In the next section I shall continue to explore what Carr considered to be the reasons for the crisis of the twentieth century and its solutions, and compare his ideas about the development of shared purpose and loyalty with those of more recent scholars, especially Deutsch, Ernst Haas, and Charles Taylor. Section Three explains the concept of security communities and reflects on the processes by which domestic societies adopt new and broader transnational identities. Section Four analyses the conditions for peace and briefly describes some recently created war-prevention practices that enhance the propensity to the development of security communities. In Section Five, by way of example, I describe contemporary attempts to construct a 'Mediterranean Region' by imbuing leaders and civil societies with the practice of peaceful change. In the last section, I look around the corner of the year 2000, including the conditions of interstate, intrastate, and transnational violence, and reflect on courses of action that can protect and further promote the *state* and *conditions* for peace.

Common purpose, collective identity, and security community

Evoking the linkage between identity and understanding, Charles Taylor wittingly wrote that, in the human sciences, the valid response to 'I don't understand' is 'change yourself!'.[26] In this section, after a short review of Deutsch's notion of the security community I will draw on the work of Carr, Deutsch, Haas, and Taylor to advance the argument that peaceful change involves a change of identity, such that 'I' becomes 'we'.[27] In other words, a new and more encompassing social identity is developed, one that instils an enhanced sense of mutual trust and security in people's minds.

As already mentioned, Deutsch and his associates defined a *security community* as 'a group of people which has become integrated'. This means 'the attainment, within a [transnational] territory, of a sense of community and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure, for a "long" time, dependable expectations of peaceful change'.[28] Security communities may be either 'amalgamated' or 'pluralistic'. In an amalgamated community, two or more (sovereign) states formally merge into an expanded state. Deutsch cites the United States as an instance. A pluralistic security community preserves the legal independence of its component states but integrates them to the point that the units entertain 'dependable expectations of peaceful change'. A pluralistic security community develops when its members possess a compatibility of core values derived from

[25] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, p. 92.
[26] Charles Taylor, 'Interpretation and the Sciences of Man', in Fred R. Dallmyr and Thomas A. McCarthy (eds.), *Understanding Social Inquiry* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), p. 127.
[27] Ibid., p. 123.
[28] Deutsch *et al.*, *Political Community*, p. 5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

common institutions and mutual responsiveness—a matter of mutual identity and loyalty, a sense of 'we-ness', or a 'we-feeling' among states.[29]

Security communities, according to Deutsch, are different from more limited 'no-war communities'. Whereas the former are characterized by a communicative process that leads to integration at the level of 'we-feeling' or identity, thus making war 'unimaginable' among its members, the latter, which can best be exemplified by a successful balance-of-power system, is a community of nations enjoying a stable truce, where war is always possible and preparations for war among its members are always a distinct possibility.[30]

At first glance, associating Carr, 'the father of realism', and Deutsch, one of the main exponents of postwar 'idealism', as part of a common tradition may seem an aberration.[31] When it comes to the conditions for peace, however, it is not. According to Carr, peace is to be found only as a by-product of the search for something else.[32] Building peace, therefore, means creating positive conditions for an orderly and progressive development of human society;[33] these conditions in turn depend chiefly on the identification of a common moral purpose. Because modern military technology and economic life and organization demand the construction of transnational units that are larger than the modern state, however, a common moral purpose depends on the construction of new and broader transnational social identities.

When Carr applied these thoughts to the construction of a European transnational unit (the 'New Europe') at the end of World War II, he realized that several conditions would have to be met: (1) There would have to be enlightened power,

[29] Deutsch *et al.*, p. 5; Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, 'Security Communities in Theoretical Perspective', in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*. To measure this 'sense of community', Deutsch and his associates quantified transaction flows, with particular emphasis on their volume, within and among nation-states. A relative growth in transaction flows between societies, as contrasted to flows within them, was thought to be a crucial test for determining whether new 'human communities' might be emerging. See, for example, Deutsch's essays in Philip E. Jacob and James V. Toscano (eds.), *The Integration of Political Communities* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1964): 'Communication Theory and Political Integration', pp. 46–74; 'Transaction Flows as Indicators of Political Cohesion', pp. 75–97; 'The Price of Integration', pp. 143–78; 'Integration and the Social System', pp. 179–208. For incisive analyses of Deutsch's contribution to integration theory, see Donald J. Puchala, 'Integration Theory and the Study of International Relations', and Arend Lijphart, 'Karl W. Deutsch and the New Paradigm in International Relations', both in Richard Merritt and Bruce M. Russett (eds.), *From National Development to Global Community* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981), pp. 145–64, 233–51.

[30] Karl W. Deutsch, *Political Community at the International Level: Problems of Definition and Measurement* (New York: Doubleday, 1954), p. 41.

[31] 'His [Carr's] readers, overwhelmingly realists, have pounced upon his attack on utopianism but generally have failed to note his . . . criticism of realism and his positive comments about utopianism' (Ken Booth, 'Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice', *International Affairs*, 67 (1991), p. 531). There is a relatively large literature dealing with Carr's writings and ideas. On the realist side see, for example, Hans J. Morgenthau, 'The Political Science of E. H. Carr', *World Politics*, 1 (1948), pp. 127–34; William T. R. Fox, 'E. H. Carr and Political Realism: Vision and Revision', *Review of International Studies*, 11 (1985), pp. 1–16. On the Grotian side see, for example, Hedley Bull, 'The Twenty Years' Crisis Twenty Years On', *International Journal*, 24 (1969), pp. 625–638; Booth, 'Security in Anarchy'. For constructivist and critical theory critiques see, for example, Cecelia Lynch, 'E. H. Carr, International Relations Theory, and the Societal Origins of International Legal Norms', *Millennium*, 23 (1994), pp. 589–620; Paul Howe, 'The Utopian Realism of E. H. Carr', *Review of International Studies*, 20 (1994), pp. 277–97. For strong criticism of Carr's work, see Whittle Johnston, 'E. H. Carr's Theory of International Relations: A Critique', *Journal of Politics*, 29 (1967), pp. 861–84.

[32] Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, p. xxiii.

[33] Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

because 'no durable peace can be made unless those who have the power have also the will . . . to take and enforce with vigor and impartiality the decisions which they think right'. Yet 'those who have the power should recognize the moral obligation which alone makes its exercise tolerable to others'.[34] (2) There would have to be a recognition that the right of nation-states to self-determination 'must carry with it a recognized responsibility to subordinate military and economic policy and resources to the needs of a wider community, not as a hypothetical engagement to meet some future contingency, but as a matter of the everyday conduct of affairs'.[35] (3) New institutions would be required that could 'be made effective only on the basis of new loyalties arising out of newly felt needs: yet to create the new loyalties new institutions are required'.[36] Finally, there would have to be (4) leadership and, above all, (5) a common moral purpose.[37]

Carr's analysis of the twentieth century's crises made perfectly clear that a common moral purpose was the most important condition. Beyond the crises of *liberal democracy* (which excluded the masses and thus failed to generate a feeling of mutual obligation),[38] *self-determination* (which equated self-determination with nationalism and led to the emergence of a large number of small states, whose survival was rendered problematic by advances in military technique),[39] and *laissez-faire economics* (which created unemployment and left war as the only way to generate employment),[40] there loomed the *moral crisis* of the breakdown of the ethical system that prevailed during the last part of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century: the 'harmony of interests' doctrine. The other three crises were only specific particular manifestations of the larger moral crisis.[41]

Solving the liberal-democratic, self-determination, and economic crises meant, therefore, that postwar Europe (C) would be compelled to develop a new common ethical purpose (Y) that would give meaning and direction to people's actions and their use of resources (X). This common moral purpose, however, was also needed in a more practical sense, that is, to enable the

[34] Ibid., p. 275.
[35] Ibid., p. 62.
[36] Ibid., p. 273.
[37] Ibid., pp. 117–25. On leadership, see p. 123.
[38] The failure to create modern mass democracy, Carr thought, had to do, first, with the 'failure to give adequate social and economic content to the concept of equality'; second, with the fact that political rights became 'a sham', because economic power exercised a predominant influence on political affairs; and third, with the removal of issues of great importance from popular control, because of the technocratic nature of the machinery of government (ibid., pp. 35–6).
[39] Ibid., p. 50. 'Shorn of its moral foundation . . . nationalism, as the history of the last twenty years has shown, could lead only to the doctrine of the morally purposeless super-nation or *Herrenvolk*. . . . The "good" nationalism of the nineteenth century . . . has been transformed into the "bad" nationalism of the twentieth century, the fertile breeding-ground of "economic nationalism", racial discrimination, and war' (ibid., pp. 106–7).
[40] Ibid., p. 101. 'Our most urgent economic problem is no longer to expand production, but to secure a more equitable distribution of consumption and a more regular and orderly utilization of our productive capacity.' Ibid., p. 80.
[41] 'Liberal democracy assumed that individual citizens would recognize the existence of a fundamental harmony of interest between them and would adjust apparent differences of interest on particular points by a process of give-and-take to their mutual advantage. . . . National self-determination was the sure basis for an international community because each nation, in pursuing its own highest interest, was pursuing the interest of the world as a whole, so that nationalism was the natural stepping-stone to internationalism. *Laissez-faire* economics assumed that by promoting their own interest individuals were doing all they could to promote that of the community' (ibid., p. 102).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

establishment of a procedure of peaceful negotiation in disputes [which] presupposes, not merely an acute perception on both sides of the strength and weaknesses of their respective positions at any given time, but also a certain measure of *common feeling* as to what is just and reasonable in their mutual relations, a spirit of give-and-take and even of potential self-sacrifice, so that a basis, however imperfect, exists for discussing demands on grounds of justice recognized by both. It is this *common feeling* between nations, not the lack of a world legislature, and not the insistence of states on being judges in their own cause, which is the real obstacle in the way of an international procedure of peaceful change.[42]

Conceptually, then, Carr linked peaceful change to an effective bargaining mechanism that owes its existence to a collective identity. Historically, peaceful change was predicated on a resolution of the crises that dominated the twentieth century by means of the development of a European collective identity and a transnational unit, that, while satisfying the needs of modern military and economic organization, would at the same time respect 'the urge of human beings to form groups based on common tradition, language, and usage'.[43] This meant first creating the framework of international order and only then encouraging national independence to develop and maintain itself within the limitations of that framework.[44] Were Carr alive today, he would probably argue that it is a common moral purpose, on which a collective identity is based, that permits the emergence of a 'security community'.

Carr, echoing contemporary studies of security communities, also realized that a European collective identity would not evolve by itself but would have to be constructed by supranational institutions. This was the main rationale for his proposals to create a European Planning Authority (and Bank), a European Relief Commission, a European Transport Corporation, a European Reconstruction and Public Works Corporation, and an international military unit to keep the peace.[45] Fifty years later, Carr's vision was realized: Europe had become a highly institutionalized pluralistic security community.[46]

Although Carr found what he thought was the solution to the twentieth century's crises in the development of multiple identities and loyalties and the construction of something resembling a European security community, he nonetheless thought that to forecast the moral foundations and assumptions of the coming age would be ineffectual and presumptuous. He nevertheless insinuated that 'popular authority as much as popular liberty will be the keynote of the new faith'.[47]

Of the four theorists considered here, Carr was the only one who made a linkage between *moral* purpose, collective identity, and peace. Deutsch, Haas, and Taylor all saw community-building as chiefly a social–epistemological process that results from common meanings. Common meanings enable people to live in the same normative reference world. Deutsch argued that international community results mainly from communication, mutual responsiveness, and shared identity. Haas, on the other hand, linked the development of international community to a process of 'ration-

[42] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, p. 220 (emphasis mine).
[43] Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, p. 63.
[44] Ibid., p. 272.
[45] Ibid., pp. 242–70.
[46] See Ole Waever, 'Insecurity, Security, and Asecurity in the West European Non-War Community', in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*, pp. 00.
[47] Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, pp. 117, 124.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

alization' that accompanies the acceptance of liberal decision-making procedures, coupled with a growing inability of the classic state to satisfy people's economic and security aspirations.[48] All four agreed that common meanings and political community in general are socially constructed. In Taylor's words:

> Common meanings are the basis of community. Intersubjective meaning gives a people a common language to talk about social reality and a common understanding of certain norms, but only with common meanings does this common reference world contain significant common actions, celebrations, and feelings. These are objects in the world everybody shares. This is what makes community.[49]

Although Deutsch gave too little attention to the concept of collective identity, and his behaviourist methodology made it difficult for him to distinguish the growth of collective identity from mere instrumentally led interdependence, he nevertheless thought that the key constitutive factor of community was a 'we-feeling' or collective identity. By 'we-feeling', however, Deutsch did not mean a psychological, largely affective matter of feelings, emotions, and trust, but a socially constructed social-cognitive process.

The core of Deutsch's security community approach was the assumption that communication binds social groups in general and political communities in particular. 'Communication alone enables a group to think together, to see together, and to act together'.[50] Moreover, communication processes and transaction flows between peoples are not only 'facilities for attention' but also factories of shared identification. Through transactions such as trade, migration, tourism, cultural and educational exchanges, and the proliferation of communication facilities, a social fabric is woven among both the elites and the masses, instilling in them a sense of community, which becomes

> a matter of mutual sympathy and loyalties; of 'we feeling,' trust and mutual consideration; of partial identification in terms of self-images and interests; of mutually successful predictions of behavior . . . in short, a matter of perpetual dynamic process of mutual attention, communication, perception of needs, and responsiveness in the process of decision making.[51]

Communication, according to this view, is the social glue that enables peoples to share common meanings across national borders and, therefore, a common normative environment. Security communities can count on compliance with collective norms because some of them are not only regulative, designed to overcome the problems associated with interdependent choice, but also constitutive (Deutsch referred to them as 'main values', which 'can be determined from the internal politics of the participating units'),[52] a direct reflection of the actor's identity and self-understandings.[53]

[48] Deutsch *et al.*, *Political Community;* Ernst B. Haas, *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress: The Rise and Decline of Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Taylor, 'Interpretation and the Sciences of Man'.

[49] Taylor, 'Interpretation and the Sciences of Man', p. 122.

[50] Norbert Wiener, cited by Karl W. Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government* (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 77.

[51] Deutsch, *Political Community*, p. 36. See also Adler and Barnett, 'Security Communities in Theoretical Perspective', p. 0.

[52] Deutsch, *Political Community*, p. 47.

[53] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities', in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sense of community also requires particular habits of political behaviour, which are acquired through processes of social learning and socialization. People learn the new habits slowly, as background conditions change; they diffuse their 'lessons' and expectations to one another through various processes of communication. Security communities are thus communities with deeply entrenched habits for conflict resolution; they are a representation in the material world (X) of a collective identity (constituted by shared meanings through the medium of communication) (Y) in the context (C) of what Deutsch thought of as 'background conditions'—'main values', mutual responsiveness, and predictability of behaviour (so that people can 'perceive one another's sensitive spots or "vital interests", and . . . make prompt and adequate responses to each other's critical needs').[54]

Deutsch's notion that collective identities have a *history,* i.e. are *socially constructed,* is evident from the fact that he thought that security communities may have humble and self-interested beginnings. All that is required initially, he thought, is a 'complementarity' of needs and resources.[55] With (a) increased communication; (b) a large number of transactions; (c) learning and socialization processes, which lead to the generation of a common normative framework and common behaviour patterns; (d) a 'core of power' that attracts weaker states; and under the guidance of (e) security-community–building institutions and (f) elites that use material and symbolic resources to empower a particular set of identity traits, to the detriment of others, the cultural affinities ('a way of life')[56] needed for a collective identity to exist would develop and become institutionalized.[57]

Like Deutsch, Haas rejects the idea that moral ideas are necessary for the construction of international community. Associating liberalism 'with a certain procedure for the making of collective decisions, not with a distinct moral substance' that has universal connotations, he believes that attachment to a particular moral doctrine that must necessarily be less than universal would contradict the very notion of shared meanings that he advances.[58] Haas's mostly epistemic view of liberalism, however, is partly at odds with Deutsch's, who made the development of security communities contingent not only on expectations but also on (*de facto* liberal) values.

To be sure, Haas's analysis has much more to do with the rationalization of the nation-state and with progress—the improvement of every person's lot with respect to health, wealth, and peace[59]—than with the development of international community. Security communities have become important and a real possibility, however, because in some parts of the developed world rationalization processes are beginning to lead to the development of confederation-like transnational communities. The whole process is fuelled by common meanings.[60]

In short, Haas argues that states can effect outcomes that are first imagined by political actors and then projected onto the stage of history. Social visions, however, must have some coherence; in Haas's terms, they must be rationalized and consistent

[54] Deutsch, *Political Community*, ch. II; idem, *Political Community at the International Level*, p. 37.
[55] Deutsch, *Political Community*, p. 91.
[56] Ibid., p. 47.
[57] Ibid., chs. II and III.
[58] Haas, *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress*, pp. 19–20.
[59] Ibid., p. 323.
[60] Ibid., pp. 14–21, 59, 342, 351–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

with a set of institutions. Nationalism, he claims, has provided this sense of rationalization to modernizing societies. But there are different types of nationalisms, each offering its own vision of coherence. Haas claims that liberal nationalism has been relatively successful in producing coherence in the North and in parts of the South because 'the overwhelming majority of the world's political elites wants to have the trappings of material-industrial civilization of the secular civilization of the West'.[61] Liberal nationalism, he continues, will eventually prevail in much of the Third World.

But, just as the Third World is beginning to enjoy the fruits of the 'rationalization' process, post-industrial states appear to be increasingly unable to govern and produce these same gains for their peoples. In response to these fundamental changes, and in an attempt to avoid jettisoning centuries of experience and progress, Western Europe is *learning*—questioning original shared meanings and replacing them with others—to create international community; in other words, it is inventing a new type of rationalization that, though depending less on an already ailing national myth, does not necessarily demand a pan-European national identity.[62] 'Only the kind of nationalism we call "liberal",' says Haas, 'is consistent with the progressive transnational sharing of meanings'.[63]

To sum up, Carr, Deutsch, and Haas agree that common meanings are the building blocks of the collective identities on which international or transnational communities are based. But whereas Carr believed that European states would have to develop a new common *moral* vision in order to overcome the twentieth century's crises and transform themselves into a peaceful transnational community, Deutsch and Haas understood the process of community formation as a social-cognitive rather than a moral process and as involving the social construction of shared understandings (Deutsch also introduced a normative dimension). Essentially, the three advanced a positive (temporally and spatially contextual) concept of peace, one that involves the progressive metamorphosis of nation-states into pluralistic security communities.

The state of peace: security communities

Peace, according to the positive definition put forward in Section One, refers to *pluralistic* rather than to amalgamated communities. States that have integrated to the point where they constitute a new enlarged nation-state do not fulfil the ontological and epistemological conditions for peace *among* sovereign states. Adler and Barnett have recently redefined pluralistic security communities as 'transnational regions comprised of sovereign states whose people maintain dependable expectations of peaceful change'; they distinguish 'loosely coupled' from 'tightly coupled' pluralistic security communities. Loosely coupled communities maintain the minimum properties of the foregoing definition. Tightly coupled communities, on the other hand, possess a political regime that lies somewhere between the sovereign state and centralized regional government. The latter kind of community is

[61] Ernst B. Haas, 'Nationalism: An Instrumental Social Construction', *Millennium*, 22 (1993), p. 541.
[62] Ibid., pp. 543–5.
[63] Haas, *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress*, p. 19.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

something of a post-sovereign system, comprising common supranational, transnational, and national institutions, and some form of a collective security system.[64]

Empirical data indicate that pluralistic security communities can develop without a tightly coupled institutionalized environment; for example, in Scandinavia, the southern cone of Latin America, the Euro-Atlantic Community, and ASEAN (the last-mentioned is only in the process of becoming a pluralistic security community). Nor, as the cases of the United States and Canada and the United States and Mexico demonstrate, is such an environment required for security communities to remain stable over time. A tight institutional environment, therefore, is not a necessary condition for regional peace.[65] On the other hand, post-World War II conditions have increased the role of multilateral institutions in the social construction of pluralistic security communities; Western Europe has become a clear case of a tightly coupled pluralistic security community.

A tightly coupled security community lies between the anarchical arrangement of sovereign states and a system of rule characterized by either hierarchy (as within states) or heteronomy (as in the Middle Ages, when multiple layers of authority coexisted in the same territorial space). In these communities, mutual aid becomes a matter of habit, the institutional context for the exercise of power changes, and the right to use force is transferred from the units to the ensemble of states, which deems it legitimate only against external threats or against community members that revert to un-community ways.[66]

From the perspective of either loosely or tightly coupled pluralistic security communities, then, real positive peace does not require the transcendence of the nation-state or the elimination of existing cultural and ethnic loyalties and identities or full integration into a single state. It merely requires sovereign states to adopt a novel form of regional governance that, relying on collective identity and mutual trust for coordination and compliance with norms, sustains dependable expectations of peaceful change.

Dependable expectations of peaceful change are consequently driven by the development of trust and the formation of a collective identity. 'Trust and identity are reciprocal and reinforcing: the development of trust can strengthen mutual identification, and there is a general tendency to trust on the basis of mutual identification'.[67] Trust and collective identities are themselves prompted by the dynamic and positive relationship between structural variables—power and knowledge—and process variables—transactions, international institutions and organizations, and social learning.[68]

[64] Adler and Barnett, 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities'.

[65] See, for example, Waever, 'Insecurity, Security, and Asecurity', and Guadalupe Gonzalez and Stephan Haggard, 'The United States and Mexico: A Pluralistic Security Community?' in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*.

[66] Adler and Barnett, 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities'; Emanuel Adler, 'Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations', *Millennium*, 26 (1997), pp. 249–77.

[67] Adler and Barnett, 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities'.

[68] Ibid. Trust is a social phenomenon that depends on the assessment that another actor will behave in ways that are consistent with normative expectations. Identities are 'images of individuality and distinctiveness ("selfhood") held and projected by an actor and formed (and modified over time) through relations with significant "others" ' (Ronald L. Jepperson, Alexander Wendt, and Peter J. Katzenstein, 'Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security', in Peter J. Katzenstein, *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1996], p. 59). Collective identities require people not only to identify (positively) with the destiny of other people but also to identify themselves and those others as a group in relation to other groups.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Structural variables make security communities possible. In this context, material and ideological resources are power, as is the authority to determine shared meaning and the 'magnetic' attraction that strong, secure, and materially successful states ('core of strength'[69]) exert over relatively weaker states. This attraction arises from weaker states' expectations of the security and economic benefits that can arise from belonging to a community that includes stronger states. Collective knowledge, mainly normative rules about proper behaviour in international *and domestic* affairs, makes possible the development of a regional governance system based on collective identity. Both—power and knowledge—may be considered to be collective resources that create the propensities for the development of security community practices.

Processes, on the other hand, translate material and social structural propensities into practice. To begin with, economic and social transactions are part of the interaction through which broader social identities are created and recreated. International institutions, on the other hand, not only provide monitoring capabilities and help states discover new areas of common interest; by helping establish, articulate, and transmit norms of acceptable and legitimate behaviour, they also encourage elites and people in general to consider themselves to be part of a region, thereby building a sense of community and shaping state practices. Finally, 'by promoting the development of shared definitions of security, proper domestic and international action, and regional boundaries, social learning encourages political leaders to see each other as trustworthy. And it also leads people to identify with those who were once on the other side of cognitive divides'.[70]

The idea that communication (even communication that is motivated by previous interests), such as debate and persuasion, can be the basis for new bonds and understandings is consistent not only with Deutsch's views of social communication but also with Jürgen Habermas's theory of 'communicative action'.[71] The main idea behind this theory is that social actors, rather than bargaining to achieve the utilities they expect, as in rational choice theory, engage in debate or discourse that helps demonstrate the validity of their arguments and thereby promote collective understanding.[72]

More specifically, according to Thomas Risse,

> communicative behavior oriented toward argumentation, persuasion, and mutual understanding enables and changes social relations among actors. Such discursive processes can also establish a joint definition of the situation and, thus, define in the first place the situational structure and the nature of the collective action problem. Moreover, international negotiators may engage in a moral discourse challenging the validity claims entailed in each other's interests and preferences. Thus, the theory of communicative action abandons the

[69] Deutsch, *Political Community*, pp. 37–9, Adler and Barnett, 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities'.

[70] Adler and Barnett, 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities'.

[71] Jürgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. T. McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984); idem, *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy,* trans. William Rehg (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996).

[72] When we scratch the 'surface' of strategic rational choice, we realize that it is enabled and mediated by communicative action. For example, a closer look at Thomas Schelling's strategic and bargaining theory shows that its rational-choice assumptions can work only in the context of a process of social communication (Schelling's innovation was pointing out the tacit and implicit manifestations of such processes). See Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

assumptions of 'common knowledge' and of fixed preferences in game theoretical approaches by showing that both are social constructs which can be established in the discursive process.[73]

Communicating and acting, in short, are two sides of the same coin. The key insight for the subject of security communities is that common meanings are necessary for communicative action and, when unavailable, must be socially constructed by institutional and individual agents.

Having identified the main variables that explain the development of security communities, I next turn to two questions that cut to the heart of the security community approach. First, how do people in domestic societies change their identities and preferences?[74] Second, do security communities, once constituted, recreate anarchy in their mutual relations?

With regard to the first question, a change in structural variables may bring domestic societies to learn new 'rules of the game', dealing mainly with how they should redefine themselves in order to achieve security and economic progress. Moreover, a structural change is likely to empower one set of domestic institutions and elites to the detriment of others. The empowered elites will be in a better position to persuade policy-makers that security and economic progress henceforth depend on the adoption of a new social identity and a set of related practices.

For example, Mikhail Gorbachev's decision to implement the momentous changes that led to the end of the Soviet empire and the Cold War was related to his understanding of the Soviet Union's domestic economic constraints as well as to his realization that the country could only gain from linking its fate to a transnational European identity and participating in the activities of multilateral institutions and practices. What prompted this understanding, however, was the continual strengthening of the Western alliance, not just from the military but also from the economic and technological perspective (to the point where the alliance became an indisputable 'core of strength') and new ideas about international reality (e.g., interdependence and 'cooperative security') that Soviet technocrats adopted and which Gorbachev expressed as part of his 'New Thinking'.[75]

Second, as the above example shows, even closed domestic societies need individual and organizational agents to drive home the implications of structural change. Through social-communicative processes, agents conceptually connect structural causes to what they consider to be desirable effects. Communicative processes involving debate and persuasion are the chief vehicle for constructing a collective transnational shared identity around material and cultural attributes. Moreover, collective understandings are diffused to domestic and societal settings around a would-be region through a dense web of economic and social exchange

[73] Thomas Risse, ' "Let's Talk!": Insight from the German Debate on Communicative Behavior and International Relations', paper presented to the annual convention of the American Political Science Association, Washington D.C., August 27–31, 1997, p. 8.

[74] Andrew Moravcsik, 'A Liberal Theory of International Politics', *International Organization*, 51 (1997), pp. 513–53.

[75] On Soviet ideas, technocrats, and the end of the Cold War, see Thomas Risse-Kappen, 'Ideas Do Not Float Freely: Transnational Coalitions, Domestic Structures, and the End of the Cold War', *International Organization*, 42 (1994), pp. 185–214. See also Jeffrey T. Checkel, *Ideas and International Political Change: Soviet/Russian Behavior and the End of the Cold War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and international and transnational organizations. Initially, domestic elites and societies in general may adopt collective meanings for instrumental reasons only. With the passage of time, however, and, especially with the rise to political power of individuals and groups that have internalized the new ideas (in fact, they probably came to power *because* they adopted these ideas), a new collective identity may become firmly established.

Third, with the intensification of exchange and under the prompting of security-community–building institutions, transnational subcommunities—of diplomats, business people, soldiers, academics, etc.—may form and add their input to the communicative processes referred above. Representing a variety of societal sectors and often intensely involved in state policy-making and implementation, these transnational subcommunities may become the carriers of a collective transnational identity. They also may play a major role in the internalization of new meanings by individuals and institutional routines and may thereby help frame the alternatives entertained by policy makers and the choices they make.[76]

Finally, when they interact, domestic institutions and elites from different countries come into direct sustained contact and may learn to 'know' each other as trustworthy and as belonging to the same region. As part of the process, they become involved in conceptual bargaining; that is, they bargain not only over the issues on the table but also about the concepts and norms that constitute their social reality. Sometimes they may learn to frame issues in totally new ways and make choices about the material and cultural attributes around which a collective transnational identity might be built.

I now return to the second question, namely, whether security communities can recreate anarchy in their mutual relations. To answer this question, it is essential to bear in mind that, when it comes to security communities, a state-centric logic is limited at best. It is true that (a) pluralistic security communities are composed of mostly sovereign states; (b) within security communities, (non-military) security dilemmas may still be common and the use of coercive power (other than war) may still occur; and (c) state elites are still the most important agents of security-community building.

On the other hand, security communities are neither military alliances nor collective security systems; nor are they state-like units, only larger. Rather, they are transnational non-territorial 'cognitive regions' where peaceful change is practised. Consequently, security communities cannot threaten one another, any more than peaceful interstate relations can be mutually threatening. Moreover, because security communities often have overlapping membership—for example, the Scandinavian countries constitute a security community that is in turn part of the wider Western European security community—it is hard to imagine that their relations could be similar to those of states in an anarchical system. It may help, then, to think of security communities, not as transnational aggregations of state power that are differentiated on spatial or functional lines and can therefore engender anarchy between security communities, but as transnational domains of peaceful practices

[76] I take these subcommunities to perform a role similar to that of epistemic communities. On epistemic communities, see 'Knowledge, Power and International Policy Coordination', special issue of *International Organization*, 46 (1992), ed. Peter M. Haas. On security issues, see Emanuel Adler, 'The Emergence of Cooperation: National Epistemic Communities and the International Evolution of the Idea of Nuclear Arms Control', ibid., pp. 100–145.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

differentiated by their community meanings and consequently unlikely to engender intercommunity anarchy.

It follows, therefore, that whether security communities are also military alliances is less a function of intercommunity anarchy than of the 'neighbourhood' (the strategic environment) where the states organized into security communities happen to 'live'. It would be hard to imagine a Latin American security community—e.g. Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay—forming a military alliance against the United States and Mexico, another security community.[77] Moreover, there is a military alliance in the Euro-Atlantic space today, not because a security community of Western European and North American states created NATO, but because, in response to the Soviet threat, these states created NATO and then gradually—and in part because of NATO—became a security community.[78]

The conditions for peace: contextual variables that promote the development of security communities

In the last section, I identified material and normative power, knowledge, communicative processes, institutions, and social learning as variables that contribute to the development of collective identities and mutual trust—which in turn drive dependable expectations of peaceful change. In this section, I will start by analysing conditions that, while not necessary for the development of security communities, may nevertheless play a facilitating role: (1) a higher expected utility from peace than from war; (2) a 'civic culture'; (3) Great-Power commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes; (4) an ethical code; (5) mutual legitimization; and (6) peacemakers. Then I will consider multilateral war-preventing practices that may help avert war and create favourable conditions for the development of dependable expectations of peaceful change.

1. The development of security communities may be favoured where the expected utility of peace exceeds that of war, including victorious war. Technological change, economic development, and a perception of war as inefficient, unnecessary, and normatively unacceptable[79] may lead to what I have elsewhere called 'a peace trap', in which states, taking everything into consideration, choose peaceful rather than violent means of achieving their goals.[80] For example, nuclear weapons have had a strong influence on expectations of the outcome and efficacy of war and produced a recognition of the need to cooperate with adversaries (mainly through nuclear arms

[77] On the incipient security community in South America, see Andrew Hurrell, 'An Emerging Security Community in South America', in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*.

[78] On NATO as a security-community–building institution, see Emanuel Adler, 'Seeds of Peaceful Change: The OSCE's Security Community-building Model', in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*. See also Thomas Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation Among Democracies: The European Influence on U.S. Foreign Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

[79] John Mueller, *Retreat From Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War* (New York: Basic Books, 1989).

[80] Emanuel Adler, 'Seasons of Peace: Progress in Postwar International Security', in Emanuel Adler and Beverly Crawford (eds.), *Progress in Postwar International Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), p. 128.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

control).[81] To a large extent, these expectations help explain why the Cold War stayed and ended cold.

Also, consistent with liberal theory, since the end of World War II expectations of economic progress have done much to increase the disparity between the expected utilities of peace and war. Ole Waever, for example, has persuasively shown that one of the factors that encouraged Western Europe to become a tightly coupled security community was the evolution of a practice and discourse of international politics that gave greater prominence to economic than to security and defence issues.[82] Moreover, according to John Mueller, F. H. Hinsley, and Michael Howard, people attach a smaller social value to war than they did, for example, before World War I, when war was 'almost universally considered an acceptable, perhaps an inevitable, and for many people a desirable way of settling international differences'.[83]

The point is not that the ascription of a higher expected utility to peace than to war is a necessary or sufficient condition for the development of security communities. It may only explain the development of a 'non-war community'. But if people come to expect war only as an unwanted event that is caused by the predatory practices of a surviving minority of predatory states or breaks out only when all efforts to avert hostilities have failed, the higher expected utility of peace may be conducive to the promotion of social, economic, and cultural transactions, the legitimization and strengthening of multilateral institutional means of conflict prevention and resolution, and the development of a climate in which states redefine their understanding of international reality and their social identities and interests.

2. Peace among democratic states has become almost axiomatic, even though, as I argued above, when scholars refer to the 'democratic peace' they do not mean a *state* of peace, but only the absence of war among democracies.[84] Liberal democracy, however, may help create a favourable context for the evolution of security communities. To see this, we must take the liberal system of values that sustains democratic practices and institutions not as a deterministic variable, as 'democratic peace' scholars usually do, but as primarily the historical development and diffusion of a transnational '*civic culture*'[85] that, cutting across national borders, becomes an identity marker and indicator of reciprocal peaceful intentions.

A democratic civic culture encourages the creation of strong civil societies—and of transnational networks and processes—which promote community bonds and a common identity through the relatively free interpenetration of societies, particularly the movement and exchange of people, goods, and ideas. For example, strong civil societies greatly facilitate the spread of practices that promote human rights and environmental protection. These, in turn, help produce and reinforce a collective social identity and security-community bonds. Moreover, social networks constituted around liberal norms facilitate the transfer of democratic norms and practices to societies that lack them.[86]

[81] Robert Jervis, 'The Political Effect of Nuclear Weapons: A Comment', *International Security*, 13 (1988), pp. 80–90.

[82] Waever, 'Insecurity, Security, and Asecurity'.

[83] Michael Howard, 'The Causes of Wars', *Wilson Quarterly*, 8 (Summer 1984), p. 92. See also Mueller, *Retreat From Doomsday*, and F. H. Hinsley, 'Peace and War in Modern Times', in Raimo Vayrynen (ed.), *The Quest for Peace* (Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage, 1987), pp. 77–8.

[84] See n. 8 above.

[85] Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1963).

[86] Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. Security communities are more likely to develop and remain stable when 'outside' Great Powers (we already have seen that security communities tend to develop around 'cores of strength', which may include Great Powers) are committed to the peaceful resolution of conflicts.[87] Otherwise, their predatory practices may interfere with the proliferation of regional economic exchanges, the work of regional international institutions, and regional social learning processes; in the long run this can only endanger the development and stability of security communities. While it is possible that real or perceived outside military threats by Great Powers may trigger the development of security communities—for example, the Soviet Union vis-à-vis Western Europe and China vis-à-vis ASEAN—over the long term the threat and use of organized violence against some or all of the members of a security community may actually undermine its survival. To assess the future of ASEAN as a security community, therefore, we should keep an eye on China's behavior toward its members and on whether they manage to bind China to multilateral security practices and institutions.[88]

4. Despite all the horror stories of the twentieth century, Dorothy Jones maintains that what she calls the 'world of the warlord states' has increasingly been challenged by the development of a 'Code of Peace' or set of international standards of peaceful behaviour.[89] She claims (and I agree) that the August 1975 Helsinki Final Act—which spawned the continuing Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)—did much to strengthen the 'Code of Peace'.[90] Although history has repeatedly shown that 'codes of peace' may prove insufficient to prevent war, they can nevertheless create favourable conditions for the development of security communities. Moreover, as in the case of the CSCE (which in 1995 became the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE]), a 'code' may be merely a legal or political representation of the constitutive rules that make up a collective identity.

The Helsinki Final Act, which was signed by all European countries (except for Albania), the Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada, comprised ten principles of legitimate international behaviour (e.g. respect for territorial integrity and the political independence of states) and domestic political conduct (e.g. respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms). With the addition by the Charter of Paris (1990) and subsequent documents of important stipulations about democracy, the rule of law, and human rights, what began as a regional code of conduct turned into a constitutive normative structure for a security community expected to develop in the area between Vancouver and Vladivostok.[91]

The 'OSCE region' has not yet become a security community; I doubt that it will any time soon. In spite of the ethnic conflicts now raging in its domain, however, and despite the fact that two steps forward have sometimes been followed by one

[87] On the role of Great Powers in regional security, see Paul A. Papayoanou, 'Great Powers and Regional Orders: Possibilities and Prospects After the Cold War', in David A. Lake and Patrick M. Morgan (eds.), *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), pp. 125–39.

[88] On ASEAN as an emerging security community, see Amitav Acharya, 'Collective Identity and Conflict Resolution in Southeast Asia', in Adler and Barnett, *Security Communities*.

[89] Dorothy V. Jones, *Code of Peace: Ethics and Security in the World of the Warlord States* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991).

[90] *Ibid.*, pp. 159–66; Adler, 'Seeds of Peaceful Change'; Adler, 'Imagined (Security) Communities', pp. 268–75.

[91] Adler, 'Imagined (Security) Communities', pp. 268–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

step backward, OSCE injunctions have helped increase the interdependence of East and West and transactions between them, thereby laying the foundation for a liberal transnational collective understanding in the OSCE region. To a large extent, whether Eastern European states are accepted as members of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will depend on the extent to which they internalize the OSCE 'code of peace', which now includes, for example, the innovative 'accountability norm' whereby OSCE states are accountable to one another and to the OSCE community for what they do to their own citizens.[92] Thomas Buergenthal captured the subtle but crucial essence of the OSCE 'Code of Peace' when he asserted that it can be compared to those national constitutions that, without being legally binding or enforceable in the courts, serve as the normative source of a country's public order.[93]

5. The development of a security community also requires states wishing to become part of it to see each other—and the future community—as legitimate. It is the community's legitimacy in the eyes of its members that, more than anything else, explains the workings of a regional governance system based on collective identity. At the same time, the conditions in which members of a security community view each other as part of a community and are given certain rights, obligations, and duties are contingent on their ability to abide by the community's constitutive principles.[94]

This explains why the EU and the Euro-Atlantic security community, as represented by NATO, have extended 'probationary' status to Eastern European states that wish to join them. The behaviour of the probationers is constantly scrutinized for indications that they can be legitimate members of these communities. The main purpose, for example, of NATO's Partnership for Peace is to transform (teach and socialize) some of the former Communist states of Eastern Europe into legitimate members of the Euro-Atlantic security community. As far as I know, nothing in realist theory says that states wishing to enter an alliance with other states must transform the prospective partners' domestic institutions and practices. NATO's enlargement, therefore, is not only the strengthening of an already strong military alliance, but also the expansion eastward of a veteran and generally stable security community.

6. Although particular individuals cannot be conceived as a necessary, let alone sufficient, condition for the development of security communities, I nevertheless include peacemakers in my list of the conditions for peace, because resourceful, powerful, and sometimes courageous and visionary leaders can create propitious circumstances for the development of security communities. In other words, it takes agency to create common purpose, collective identity, and mutual trust.[95] Moreover, it takes leaders who know they can be trusted to trust others as well.[96] More importantly, it takes peacemakers—whence my epigraph from Yitzhak Rabin—to start communicative processes in conditions of mistrust and adversity; in the long

[92] Ibid., p. 271. See also Marianne Hanson, 'Democratization and Norm Creation in Europe', *Adelphi Papers*, 284 (London: Brassey's for the International Institute for Strategic Studies [IISS], 1994), p. 34.
[93] Thomas Buergenthal, 'The CSCE Rights System', *George Washington Journal of International Law and Economics*, 25 (1992), pp. 380–1.
[94] Thomas M. Franck, *The Power of Legitimacy among Nations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 196.
[95] See n. 17 above.
[96] Robert Wuthnow, 'The Foundations of Trust', *Report from the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy*, 18 (University of Maryland, 1998), p. 4. On trust, see also Barbara Mistzal, *Trust in Modern Societies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

run, trust may spill over to the elites and the masses and thus be conducive to the construction of security communities.

Before ending this section, I would like to refer to war-preventing practices that help generate a propitious setting for the development of security communities. Nuclear arms control practices, for example, now widespread around the world, may help states and societies in conflict initiate communicative processes that create a common ground for evaluation and action. Elsewhere I have argued that the practice of nuclear arms control was beneficial not so much in limiting weapons, in a formal technical sense, but primarily because it engendered international cooperative processes that helped the superpowers develop a coordination game and discover the extent to which its symbolic contents suggested compromises, limits, and regulations.[97] To some extent, and beyond their specific functions—such as conflict prevention and resolution—multilateral diplomacy and UN global peacekeeping activities engage contending states in social communicative and exchange processes that augment the future possibility of peace.[98] Particularly noteworthy are the practices of 'cooperative security', such as confidence-building measures, which are being increasingly adopted in Europe, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. This demilitarized concept of security

> has resulted in imbuing security with political and human dimensions, and in basing security on confidence and cooperation, the elaboration of peaceful means of dispute settlement between states, the consolidation of justice and democracy in civil society, and the advancement of human freedom and rights, including national minority rights.[99]

Thus, while arms control and cooperative security practices cannot, in and of themselves, help constitute a *state* of peace, they can do three things. First, they can promote communicative processes that help states discover their affinities and common interests. Second, they can help keep regional conflicts at bay and facilitate the development of transactions, institutions, and learning processes that are conducive to the development of security communities. Third, they can impede the spread of instability and predatory practices to regions that already enjoy a measure of dependable expectations of peaceful change. Thus, for example, in the absence of urgent and effective arms-control and confidence-building measures, the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan may not only bring disaster to these countries but may also unleash a proliferation chain reaction that would negatively affect existing security communities (such as the EU) and prevent the formation of new ones (in Asia and the Middle East, for example).

By way of example: constructing a Mediterranean region

There is no inevitable trend in world affairs toward security communities; as we have seen, people are enjoying a state of peace in only a few regions. In less 'fortunate'

[97] Adler, 'The Emergence of Cooperation'.
[98] John G. Ruggie (ed.), *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993); Michael Barnett, 'The New UN Politics of Peace', *Global Governance*, 1 (1995), pp. 79–98.
[99] Janie Leatherman, 'Conflict Transformation in the CSCE: Learning and Institutionalization', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 28 (1993), p. 414.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

parts of the world, such as Africa, South Asia, Central Asia, and North Asia, security communities are less likely to develop any time soon. And although Israel, the Palestinians, and Arab countries have recently flirted with ending their protracted conflict, the conditions for peace in the Middle East are weak or nonexistent and a state of peace may still be decades away.

On the other hand, the Euro-Atlantic community is expanding eastward, while the North and South American security communities may soon become a single Western Hemisphere security community. Moreover, in spite (or because) of internal and external sources of instability, ASEAN countries have been keeping on course toward becoming a security community. A weak but noticeable effort is under way to socially construct a Mediterranean regional identity that may in the long run be critical for what happens in the Middle East. Owing to the present and future importance of the Mediterranean area, I will focus on this case.

It is not implausible to suggest that the Mediterranean basin (Southern Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East) may soon become one of the world's most strategically important and contentious regions. Straddling two of the deepest divides of our era—that between the West and Islam, and that between the (prosperous) North and the (destitute) South—the Mediterranean basin harbours some of the most dangerous threats to contemporary international security, including proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, internal and external low-level warfare, interstate military conflict, and—no less serious—the drug trade, uncontrolled migration, and unsustainable development. As one of Samuel Huntington's critical areas, where the 'fault lines' of the 'Clash of Civilizations' are located,[100] the Mediterranean region provides a 'hard case' for assessing the conditions for and state of peace on the eve of the new millennium.

Thus it may be a sign of the times that, when Western states, especially the members of the EU, felt threatened by instability in the South, they chose, not to send in (or threaten to send in) the tanks, build a new system of alliances, or create a collective security system, but to extend the European area of stability southward and create a Mediterranean region and identity. To jump-start this process, European governments, EU institutions, the OSCE, the Western European Union (WEU), the Council of Europe (C of E), NATO (to some extent), and a large number of private non-governmental organizations began to promote: (a) increased economic and social interactions around the Mediterranean (for example, by means of free trade zones); (b) multilateral institutional dialogues, 'track-two diplomacy', and confidence-building measures; (c) a plethora of relations across civil societies between business, professional, and cultural groups; and (d) a long but nevertheless necessary social learning process.[101]

[100] Samuel Huntington, 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs*, 72 (1993), pp. 22–49; *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

[101] On the construction of the Mediterranean region see, for example, Roberto Aliboni, George Joffé, and Tim Niblock, *Security Challenges in the Mediterranean Region* (London: Frank Cass, 1996); Alberto Bin (ed.), *Cooperation and Security in the Mediterranean: Prospects after Barcelona* (Malta: The Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, University of Malta, 1996); Antonio Marquina and Hans Gunter Braude (eds.), 'Confidence Building and Partnership in the Western Mediterranean: Tasks for Preventive Diplomacy and Conflict Avoidance' (Madrid: UNISCI Papers no. 1, UNISCI, 1994); Fred Tanner, 'An Emerging Security Agenda for the Mediterranean', *Mediterranean Politics*, 1 (1996), pp. 279–94.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

So far, however, this attempt has been impeded not only by violent conflict in the Middle East and Algeria, but also by Islamic states' suspicions that lurking behind the Mediterranean initiative are Western attempts to impose a hegemonic regional identity. Moreover, owing to the cleavages referred to above, the process of building a Mediterranean regional identity is likely to be much more difficult than any previous attempts of pluralistic regional integration such as the EU and ASEAN.[102] Thus, while the process of building a Mediterranean region is still in its infancy, the odds may already favour a 'clash of civilizations'. For this reason it is interesting to analyse the conditions for and state of peace in this area.

Past efforts to create a Mediterranean 'region' were severely limited or failed altogether. The first multilateral effort was launched in 1972 by the foreign ministers of Italy, Libya, Malta, and Tunisia.[103] They held a series of meetings aimed at establishing cooperative programmes in communications, tourism, fishing, and trade. The failure to attract other participants, however, kept such cooperation from materializing. In 1975, the predecessor of the OSCE, the CSCE, identified a Mediterranean component of its programme; throughout the 1970s and 1980s it convened regional experts in economics, science, culture, and the environment to explore cooperative efforts that would build mutual trust and contribute to regional stability.[104] The meetings accomplished little, however, and did not attract the attention of the United States, which focused primarily on the East–West conflict. The Euro-Arab Dialogue began in 1974, in the wake of the oil crisis, in order to institute cooperation between members of the European Community and members of the Arab League. These efforts, too, remained unproductive because of the Cold War, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1991, and the Arab League's condition, rejected by the Europeans, that the Palestinian issue be included on the agenda. The Mediterranean Action Plan, formulated within the framework of the 1976 Barcelona Convention to combat pollution of the Mediterranean Sea, was indeed successful, but the focus of cooperation has remained limited to technical environmental issues, with no 'spillover' effects on other areas of concern.

In a post-war world dominated by East–West confrontation, the creation of a Mediterranean region of cooperation and stability was a low priority for the Great Powers. The end of the Cold War, however, promised to eliminate the obstacles to regional cooperation. Accordingly, the notion of a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean (CSCM) became popular. Like earlier efforts, the aim was to boost regional economic development and social conditions through cooperation and to increase regional trust and transparency.[105] The end of the Cold War created fertile ground for the OSCE, WEU, and C of E to become involved in regional activities to promote trust. In 1990–1, several southern European countries

[102] On Europe, see Weaver, 'Insecurity, Security, and Asecurity'; on ASEAN, see Acharya, 'Collective Identity and Conflict Resolution in Southeast Asia'.
[103] The following three paragraphs rely in part on Emanuel Adler and Beverly Crawford, 'Regional Security through Integration: Constructing the Mediterranean Region', draft proposal, December 1997; and on Emanuel Adler, 'The Cooperative Security Way to Stable Peace: Constructing Regional and Global Security Communities', paper commissioned by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, August 1996.
[104] Victor-Yves Ghebali, 'Toward a Mediterranean Helsinki-type Process', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 4 (1993), p. 92.
[105] Ibid., pp. 93–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

proposed a plan for a Western Mediterranean CSCM; in 1994, NATO formulated a Mediterranean policy and promised to work with non-members to strengthen regional stability.

Encouraged by progress in the Arab–Israeli peace process, the EU became formally involved in the project to create regional stability with the establishment of the Euro-Med Partnership in 1994. In 1995, a Euro-Mediterranean Conference was convened in Barcelona to establish a framework for the region, with its population of 700 million people in 27 countries along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. In addition to the 15 EU states, the Euro–Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) includes Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, and the Palestinian Authority. The political element of the Barcelona declaration includes a list of principles concerning respect for democracy and the rule of law, human rights, the right of self-determination, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, and peaceful resolution of disputes. It also stipulates cooperation to combat terrorism. On the economic front, the Barcelona document provides for a regional partnership to promote economic development by means of a free trade zone to be created by the year 2010.[106] The objectives of the Barcelona Declaration were supposed to be confirmed by 27 Mediterranean countries in Malta in 1997. But the stalled Middle East peace process overshadowed that meeting and cast grave doubts on the success of the EMP.

The EMP and related efforts have in large part been about helping Mediterranean basin countries adapt to economic globalization and protecting European states from potential sources of regional instability and insecurity arising from the South.[107] Culture, nonetheless, permeates the entire initiative.[108] By culture, I mean neither what Huntington meant in 'the Clash of Civilizations' nor a romantic view of Mediterranean cultural attributes—olives, wine, sunshine, and gorgeous beaches. Rather, I have in mind the development of a relatively new type of preventive diplomatic practice that depends for its success on the political and social engineering of a Mediterranean 'we feeling' or collective social identity. Thus while it is true that the EMP is mainly driven by short-term incentives, such as material interests and a perceived mutual threat, the long-term interest behind the initiative is to catalyse conditions that may help bring about a future state of peace in the region.

Because few if any of the conditions mentioned in the previous section exist in the Mediterranean area, the challenge of the ongoing Mediterranean 'dialogue' is to *socially engineer* them. To do this successfully, however, greater efforts must be devoted to (a) providing economic incentives so that peace will have a higher expected utility than war; (b) seeking the support of the US (which seldom buys into the type of diplomacy associated with the EMP) and a commitment from that country and Russia to the peaceful resolution of disputes in the area; (c) developing

[106] *Barcelona Declaration Adopted at the Euro-Mediterranean Conference* (Barcelona, November 28, 1995).

[107] On economics, see George Joffé, 'The Economic Factor in Mediterranean Security', *The International Spectator*, 31 (1996), pp. 75–87. On regional security, see Aliboni *et al.*, *Security Challenges in the Mediterranean Region.*

[108] See, for example, Laura Guazzone, 'The Evolving Framework of Arab Security Perceptions: The Impact of Cultural Factors', *The International Spectator*, 31 (1996), pp. 63–74.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

transnational and international social networks[109] to promote the emergence of a Mediterranean civic culture based on values that both Northern and Southern countries can live with, such as sustainable development and the rule of law (which allows for differences in political regimes); (d) investing resources and building strong multilateral institutions, in order to raise the regional political stakes to the point that it becomes imperative for political actors in the Middle East and North Africa to settle their differences; (e) instituting confidence-building measures to promote the development of mutual legitimacy and a consensual Mediterranean identity; and (f) agreeing on the basic normative or 'constitutional' principles—such as sovereignty, non-intervention, the rule of law, and sustainable development—around which shared practices can be constituted.

To sum up, behind the EMP and related efforts lies the haunting (some would say discouraging) idea that the most promising—perhaps only—way to achieve long-term security, economic welfare, political stability, and peace in the Mediterranean area is neither an elaborate system of alliances or collective security system, nor a functional scheme of economic integration, but the socio-cultural process of constructing a region. The challenges are immense; it will probably take decades to construct a Mediterranean region. Nevertheless, as long as other security practices are unavailable or impracticable there, the only alternative left for socially constructing the conditions for peace is Huntington's 'clash of civilizations'.

Beyond the eighty years' crisis

Since Carr referred to the twenty years' crisis, immense changes have occurred in international relations, notably the victory of liberal democracies over fascism and Communism, economic globalization, multilateralism, the widening gap between North and South, the development of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and the emergence of international human-rights and environmental regimes. These changes, however, have done little to overcome what Carr called the crisis of democracy, the crisis of self-determination, and the moral crisis. Many states have yet to become (liberal) democracies. The contradictions between self-determination and the sovereign integrity of states have worsened since the end of the Cold War. And, at the global level, we are very far from having found a common moral purpose around which to build 'the state of peace'. The 'twenty years' crisis' became 'the eighty years' crisis'. Moreover, the eighty years' crisis has probably become more intractable, because of (a) primordial primitivism; (b) technological and integration imperatives; (c) remnants of 'warlord' organization and doctrine; (d) economic inequality; and (e) unsustainable development.

It would go beyond the scope of this paper to analyse these threats to peace in depth; hence I will conclude with a few words about how they are endangering the state of and conditions for peace, supplemented by remarks about positive conditions that may help international society overcome these threats.

[109] See, for example, Roberto Aliboni, Abdel Monem Said Aly, and Alvaro Vasconcelos, *Joint Report of EuroMeSCo's Working Group on Political and Security Co-operation* (second draft), April 1997; Maria-Angels Roque, *Forum Civil Euromed: Towards a New Scenario of Partnership in the Euro-Mediterranean Area* (Barcelona: Institut Catala de la Mediterrania d'Estudis y Cooperacio, 1997).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

By *primordial primitivism* I mean the return, mainly since the Cold War, of nationalist ideologies that glorify the restoration of an ostensible 'golden age', the triumph of the ethnic 'tribe' over other 'tribes', and the use of religion as a 'rationalizing' alternative to secular and modern nationalism. In some parts of the world, including Europe, primordial primitivism and the ethnic conflicts fuelled by it are threatening the state of and conditions for peace. Bosnia, Chechnya, Kosovo, and Hebron—all raise doubts about the ability of peacemakers and international institutions to promote the conditions for and state of peace and constitute warning signs for existing security communities.

Another dangerous threat to peace comes from what I call a *technological and integration imperative,* which is not unrelated to primordial primitivism. I mean the peril posed by the ultra-modern technologies in the hands of the leaders of some states that lack domestic integration and evince an inability and/or unwillingness to integrate into international society and a concomitant pattern of uninhibited bellicose behaviour.

Yet another threat to the state of and conditions for peace comes from the fact that practices of peaceful change, such as arms control and cooperative security, have not replaced what Dorothy Jones called 'warlord' organization practices and doctrines.[110] Even in the most stable security communities, military establishments and doctrines are changing much more slowly than regional economic and political behaviour and constitute a latent threat to dependable expectations of peaceful change.

The gravest threat of all, however, one that requires global cooperation to find adequate and equitable solutions, stems from the economic inequality between the North and South. In other words, the growing poverty, misery, hunger, and, most important, frustration of the less-developed countries that are home to a large fraction of the world's population interfere with social communicative processes and prevent the development of mutual trust both within underdeveloped regions and across the North–South divide. Moreover, unsustainable development, still prevalent in most of the world, coupled with unsustainable population growth, are ticking bombs that threaten to set off the wars of the next century.

To help overcome or at least manage some of these threats and facilitate the development of new security communities and strengthening of existing ones, we need to encourage: (a) the practice of establishing the rights and *obligations* of states and peoples by means of *politically* binding regional codes of conduct; (b) the principle of multiculturalism; and (c) managed globalization and sustainable development.

The promotion, negotiation, and establishment of *politically* binding codes of conduct, such as the Helsinki Final Act and related injunctions, may be crucial for alleviating the ongoing eighty years' crisis and creating favourable conditions for the development of security communities. These regional 'constitutions' or 'codes of peace' should not be seen as coming at the expense of the global constitutive norms, especially sovereignty, which constitute the identities of states *qua* states, but as complementary to them. Regional codes of conduct are constitutive only of privileged regional communities (privileged because they have developed a system of regional governance) and of the social identities of people living in them.

[110] Jones, *Code of Peace*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press

To encourage the development of security communities, regional codes of conduct should include the 'accountability norm', make the rule of law a *sine qua non* principle of regional sociability, and—following Carr's suggestion of 55 years ago—consecrate not only the mutual *rights* of states (e.g. territorial integrity) and of peoples (e.g. human rights), but also the mutual *obligations* of states (e.g. protecting national minorities and preventing transboundary pollution) and peoples (e.g. respecting other peoples' right to self-determination).

The state of peace will also be enhanced by the promotion—through domestic (education) and international (multilateral diplomacy) means—of multicultural principles that encourage people to view nations not as 'real' but as 'imagined communities'.[111] 'One hundred and fifty years of civil peace in multicultural Switzerland make my point'.[112] In other words, taking national identities in a more plastic, if not socially constructed, sense should promote the idea that peoples of several cultures can self-determine and aspire to build up their shared state. Ernst Haas has shown that, while liberal decision-making procedures are better equipped than other types to accommodate multiculturalism, in practice liberal nation-states have still not learned to cope with it.[113]

Finally, to deal adequately with the pressures caused by economic globalization and unsustainable development, international society must develop a practice of preventing and managing global and regional economic crises. By managing economic crises, I do not necessarily mean interference with global and regional markets, but the development of improved routines of international cooperation that are better suited to foresee, prevent, and manage the undesirable effects of globalization on individual states and security communities. Concomitantly, the strengthening of the practice of sustainable development may not only help states and societies coordinate their development and environmental policies, but also, and more importantly, become an important resource for the social construction of transnational collective identities and thus of security communities.[114]

As we approach the new millennium, and in light of my analysis of the state of and conditions for peace, I find no better way to conclude this article than by referring to Carr's final statement in *The Conditions of Peace,* which is still relevant today, both morally and practically: 'The future lies with those who can resolutely turn their back on [the old world] and face the new world with understanding, courage and imagination'.[115]

[111] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

[112] Haas, *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress*, p. 40.

[113] Ibid., pp. 21 and 336.

[114] Philip Shabecoff, *A New Name for Peace: International Environmentalism, Sustainable Development, and Democracy* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1996).

[115] Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, p. 275.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021059800165X Published online by Cambridge University Press