

a security regime: "the principles, rules, and norms that permit nations to be restrained in their behaviour in the belief that others will reciprocate." The essential point was that security regimes refer to something more than simply short-term self-interest. However, certain short-comings in the literature were argued to require further examination: Who sets the rules in a security regime? What are the characteristics of regimes--where do exploitative "regimes" fit in? What are the situations in which adversarial states may cooperate, especially in the shadow of a hegemon?

The question of the role of hegemony in a regional security relationship was also addressed. "The security relationship among a group of adversaries may well display a degree of 'cooperation' because of the presence of a regional hegemon which has the power to impose its will on smaller states." The relationship between South Africa and the Front Line States was cited as an example of simultaneous military conflict and high levels of economic cooperation. The economic dependence of Front Line States on South Africa was argued to limit their ability to manoeuvre in the realm of both economic and security issues. However, this type of relationship "is hardly the sort... that one wants to see continue or emulated in other regions."

Professor Hampson tentatively suggested a typology of security regimes (refer to matrix in Appendix D). Regimes were argued to be distinguishable by their degree of "institutionalization," i.e., "the degree to which norms, rules and principles are formally set down somewhere and the degree to which there are monitoring agencies and institutions to promote cooperation and deal with verification, enforcement and non-compliance." Also stressed was the importance of being sensitive "to the possibilities for more modest cooperation and 'partial' regime building efforts."