of thoughtful and committed policy makers from the region. The potential for genuine confidence building in different regions will be difficult to realize unless policy makers and area specialists have a good understanding of the confidence building approach *and* how its implementation could serve the security interests of states within the region.

A secondary aim of this paper has been to suggest that confidence building — and its use in new areas of application — is more complex than some might suspect. Simply copying existing applications — for instance, transferring a simple version of the Vienna CBM agreement to a new region — probably will prove inadequate. The provision of information about military forces (both structures and activities), the opportunity to observe military activities, the provision of direct communication lines, and some modest deployment constraints (the basics of a modest CBM package) do little on their own to change the security relationship of a group of states. Information is as likely to stir concerns as it is to resolve them. One simply acquires more data to support existing conceptions of adversaries and threatening neighbours. While some measures can be useful on their own terms — "Hot Line" communication links, for instance — they are of limited utility. The understanding of confidence building guiding this paper maintains that a true confidence building arrangement taps into broader processes of transformation, both in the perception of security relations and perhaps in even broader terms.

Although this security management approach has great promise, its adoption must be tempered by caution and pursued with imagination. Confidence building is not simply the negotiation of a collection of CBMs. As we are increasingly coming to appreciate, it involves more fundamental processes of change. This paper has attempted to stress the importance of the relationship between the negotiation and implementation of CBM agreements on the one hand and, on the other, the fundamental transformation of perceptions of threat. *If* confidence building means facilitating transformation — if it means more than simply compiling a collection of discrete measures — then the use of the confidence building concept must be linked with a genuine transformation process. And, of course, the process of change must be attainable and imminent. Timing — when to begin exploring the negotiation of CBM agreements — will be important and the identification of the roots of change or transformation will be crucial. But most importantly, policy makers and analysts must understand the basic nature of the confidence building approach in order to use it effectively and productively. If they do, the promise of confidence building surely will be realized.