

necessary to determine what norms are desirable in the context of a regime.

A sub-theme in discussion was the debate concerning whether the objective of a security regime is the management or resolution of regional conflict. It was strongly felt by many participants that the mere management of conflict in Southern Africa is an inherently biased and conservative act which inhibits the search for solutions. It was felt that management does nothing to redress the severe power imbalances in Southern Africa which is the prerequisite to conflict resolution.

In response to challenges to the analytical utility of the notion of security regime, Professor Hampson argued that regime theory contained considerable utility as a descriptive device. Summing up discussion, Hampson observed that there appeared to be agreement on the existence of a hegemonic-exploitative situation in Southern Africa which is governed by a number of identifiable rules. The question being debated was whether these rules constitute a regime. The discussion prompted many questions which deserve further examination. What kind of regimes should third parties try to promote and how should they go about it? In this regard, it was suggested that mediation be viewed as merely one of a number of possible instruments to affect regime formation (other possible instruments being the use of economic or military force). What should the objectives of a regime be? It was suggested that, at a minimum, a security regime in Southern Africa should embody the principle of the non-intervention of South Africa into the SADCC states.