

reason the ASEAN members have resisted the formation of a larger organization or the addition of any new members to the existing organization. The CSCE therefore has been a more adequate forum to discuss regional security issues than ASEAN has been.

Another important difference between the regions has been one of threat perception. Impetus for the CSCE process came from Europe's desire to avoid war between its two ideological blocs. The main security threat within the ASEAN region was the threat of internal subversion, guerrilla activity and civil war. One might ask how effective CSBM's and arms control can be in preventing and controlling these situations. The answer may very well be "not at all". Arms control and confidence-building measures between governments can not be expected to prevent or reduce internal subversion or civil war as the leaders of these movements are not legitimate governments and are therefore not included in the negotiations. However, insofar as confidence-building contributes to better coordination and cooperation, there may be benefits which affect the intensity of internal disputes. In addition, confidence-building and arms control measures were designed to help prevent wars not to end them. As the security threats to ASEAN members continue to evolve from those of an internal to an external, nature however, the use of confidence-building measures may become more applicable.

## **IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

This brings us to the present and the future. Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the European situation has become far more similar to that which South-East Asia has endured. Its single East-West conflict has been replaced with a resurgence of the national, ethnic, religious and boarder conflicts which plagued Europe in the pre-Cold-War era. The confidence-building, disarmament and verification measures of the CSCE saw Europe safely through the Cold War, which was no small feat. However, whether or not they are equipped to deal with Europe's post-Cold War problems, such as the civil war in Yugoslavia, has yet to be seen. As mentioned above, arms control and confidence-building measures were developed to help prevent wars not to end them.

Should the CSCE measures prove themselves capable of handling present day European security dilemmas, then perhaps they will have developed some truly transferrable characteristics. But this remains to be seen. So far, the CSCE has proven to be most ineffective in dealing with the conflicts that have risen out of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

In the mean time, it appears that the CSCE has begun to call for an approach to conflict resolution which has traditionally been more characteristic of ASEAN. The 1992 Helsinki Document calls for the parties to existing conflicts within Europe to seek out