

security regime as a "good thing," others view it simply as a non-normative analytical construct which can exist whether its content is desirable or not. In contrast to Nye's analysis, Leyton-Brown contended that there was, in fact, a security regime (albeit minimal) with Nazi Germany during World War II. Similarly, a minimal security regime was argued to exist in Southern Africa. Leyton-Brown felt that it would be wrong to discount the analytical utility of regime theory merely because one does not agree with the particular nature of a security relationship.

Elaborating on this point, Professor Doug Anglin (Carleton University) emphasized the need to distinguish between hegemonic regimes and those in which power is more equally distributed, regardless of whether a regime is "liked or not." In his view, there are clearly identifiable rules which govern the conduct of actors within Southern Africa. The pre-eminent rule is that South Africa sets the rules, but is not compelled to abide by them. Further rules suggested by Anglin are: there is to be no interference in the domestic politics of South Africa; South Africa can, and will, police the other states in the region; no non-regional power may interfere in the region without first going through Pretoria; and regional problems must be solved regionally.

Professor Keith Krause (York University) contributed to further critical analysis by arguing that the question of regime formation may depend on the existence of norms, as much as on the existence of rules: "what are the underlying norms that make general tacit rules in a regime?" Krause observed that discussion had presented two points of view: one holds that where there are rules there is a regime (Leyton-Brown); the other holds that rules are necessary but not sufficient determinants for regime formation (Brown). Leyton-Brown agreed with Krause's observation, but added that it is