

turbulent transformations; the transformations in world politics are so profound as to not be relegated merely to the status of epiphenomenal changes; the changes in world politics cry out for a new/different conceptual lens in order to get a handle on what is actually occurring; the emerging structures and processes of this changing world are still in the process of taking shape; the outlines of the new circumstances/paradigm are not yet clear-cut enough to be easily cast as a distinctive phase/theory.

As Rosenau and Durfee explain, the label "post-internationalist" reflects the decline of long-standing patterns without at the same time indicating where the changes may be leading. It is therefore suggestive of flux, uncertainty, and transition, while at the same time indicative of the continued existence of certain stable structures. In addition, the term is a reminder that "international" matters are sometimes indistinguishable these days from "regional", "national", and "local" ones. Thus, the way to address such matters may have to be different from methods used in the past.<sup>27</sup>

Traditional multilateralism focused on government-to-government or state-to-state mechanisms or regulatory regimes. One of the first emancipatory moves of the post-internationalists was to recognize the changing elements of the Westphalian system.<sup>28</sup> Some of those elements are easily discernible: e.g. some states are having difficulty with the exercise of sovereignty (i.e., *inter alia* maintaining strict control over the flow of people, goods and money in and out of their borders); civil society has been revived in several parts of the globe posing a direct challenge to the sovereign state; the intergovernmental system, particularly the most universal one -- the UN system, is no longer the locus merely for state power plays; the principle of state sovereignty continues to be eroded as a result of economic and media globalization, the international divisions of labour, supranational arrangements, regional and free trade arrangements, advances in transportation, computer and telecommunication technologies, mass migration, external intervention, ethnic and other internecine violence, sub-national and anti-systemic forces, the phenomenon of state collapse, etc.. Furthermore, it was discerned that many existing multilateral bodies are finding it difficult to adjust their structures and processes in a way that would adequately address the emerging problems arising as a result of the turbulence in the international system.<sup>29</sup> Those that have tried to do so with some success (like NATO) still seem anachronistic.

The paradigmatic shift to the post-internationalist approach is linked to the above changes and what appears to be a movement towards establishing a post-Cold war global agenda that privileges items such as demilitarization, democratization, sustainable development, environmental protection, cultural pluralism and other civilizational issues, human rights and justice, and generally bottom-up multilateralisms (as a means of dealing with the "new world dis-order"). This refocusing of inquiry has given rise to what Richard Falk calls a potential "counter-project" to that of post-Cold War geo-politics.<sup>30</sup> At the base of this counter-project is a normative pre-occupation with strengthening the role of civil society or sovereignty-free actors in matters of world affairs at local, regional and global locales to balance the influence of sovereignty-bound actors. This is generally viewed as an essential counter-balance to state-centric views of world order, multilateralism and global governance that are so deeply entrenched in neo-realist and liberal institutionalist thinking and scholarship.

One of the most important contributions of post-internationalist scholarship is th