

For most of the Cold War, external control or influence over regional security issues and lack of internal political cohesion within regional organizations precluded the development of indigenous regional security instruments which went above and beyond pacific settlement of disputes methods. Other conceptual and internal constraints, such as state-centred security doctrines, the nature of the political role of militaries in many Third World countries, and often scarce defense resources, also impeded the development of cohesive regional security "thought". Today's renewal of interest in regional organizations and regionalism has not *ipso facto* transformed the institutional realities of the past. At present, Chap. VIII organizations remain cash-strapped, under-resourced institutions with little organic capacity to plan for and launch anything more than small monitoring or "preventive diplomacy" missions.

A second conception, based on the principle of collective self-defense enshrined in Art. 51 of the UN Charter, is represented by traditional alliances and collective defense pacts which were originally designed to contain global, regional or systemic threats (Rio Pact, NATO, ANZUS, SEATO, Warsaw Pact, CENTO, FPDA, etc.). These structures were designed to face external threats rather than deal with intra-regional disputes through Chapter VI-like methods. With the exception of NATO, which developed both an intricate system of political consultation mechanisms and an extensive multinational military infrastructure, such alliances often lacked the inward region-building character which is one of the hallmarks of regionalism. In many cases these were more an expression of the great powers' security interests rather than a political vision emanating from within the regions themselves. History has not been kind to postwar regional alliances. Only a few survived both decolonisation and the end of the Cold War. However there is an interesting case in the form of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). Although its achievements have not always been impressive, it functions essentially as a sub-regional security alliance.

In a third conception, the primary purpose of the regional security organization is the enhancement of the security of member states through cooperation and collective action in the political-security field writ large. Such types of organizations appear to share two major attributes: 1) broad and inclusive membership, either at the regional or sub-regional level, and; 2) consensualism. The OSCE - a bit of a hybrid since it is now a recognized Chapter

---

actively supported the UK instead. This effectively sounded the death-knell of the treaty and it is now largely considered to be a Cold War relic. Probably of more relevance for the Americas today are new OAS norms regarding democracy. OAS objectives and statutes were recently modified - through the 1991 'Santiago Commitment to Democracy' and the 1992 Washington Protocol - to allow the organization and its collective membership to assume greater responsibility for defending democratic regimes in the hemisphere.