

Constructing a Mediterranean Region: A Cultural Approach

Emanuel Adler and Beverly Crawford

**To be presented at the Conference on "The Convergence of Civilizations?
Constructing a Mediterranean Region," Arrábida Monastery, Fundação
Oriente, Lisboa, Portugal, June 6-9.**

May 2002

Abstract

Culture and identity lie at the heart of the world's most intricate security problems. But to what extent are they components of a solution to those problems? How can culture and identity contribute to peace? Increasingly, both analysts and politicians associate regional security with regional integration that encompasses the development of regional identities and a common political culture. To explore the security-enhancing role of culture and identity as an integral part of regional integration, we develop here a framework for the analysis of the process of "region building" in the Mediterranean area. Post "September 11" events, and the nefarious prospects of a "Clash of Civilizations" between the West and Islam, make the exploration of the relation between culture and security, and the fate of the Mediterranean integration, even a more urgent and necessary endeavor.

Introduction: The Volume's Main Goals

This volume seeks to achieve three related and ambitious goals. First, it purports to suggest **a cultural approach to the study of regional security and peace** by means of regional pluralistic integration. As such, the volume uses a cultural, "non-conventional," scholarly approach, for the sake of analyzing regional security, which is now being promoted in Europe and other parts of the world, by means of culturally-driven "non-conventional" security practices of "cooperative security" and region-building. Second, the volume aims at taking stock of recent efforts by the European Union (EU) to promote the construction of a Mediterranean regional identity, with the aim of promoting regional security, stability, and peace. We thus tie this volume's theoretical and empirical objectives by asking **what was, is, and will be of, the European Mediterranean Partnership** (EMP), or "Barcelona Process," born in the city that bears its name in November 1995. We hope that preliminary answers to the above question will shed light on the potential of new security practices to promote a shared sense of security in, and peoples' regional identification with, spaces and socially constructed regions that transcend cultural and civilization borders.

Third, we place this volume's theoretical and empirical content in the historical context of post-"9/11" events. These events, only a decade after the international system was shaken by a major transformation due to the end of the Cold War, seem once more to be changing the way we understand security practices, agendas, coalitions and goals. The question, then, is what will happen now to security practices that European institutions, such as the EU and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)

helped promote at the closing days of the Cold War and after? And, directly following the above question, what will happen then to attempts to promoting security and peace by means of regional integration around the Mediterranean Sea? Furthermore, "9/11" events did not "prove" right Samuel Huntington's (1993,1996) "clash of civilizations" thesis, that post-Cold War conflicts are more likely to become inter-civilization rather than inter-state, and that the Mediterranean Sea lies just where civilizations are expected to "clash." However, they may have accelerated, nonetheless, the prospect of political and religious conflicts alongside two Mediterranean axes: on one hand, modern West vs. dissatisfied Islam, and, on the other hand, rich North vs. poor South. Said otherwise, since 9/11 there is an enhanced danger that a "clash of civilizations" will be socially constructed along the lines of the West vs. Islam. Recent violence in the Middle East only made this prospect more ominous. These events, therefore, cry for the development of both theoretical and practical suggestions as to **how to promote a "convergence of civilizations" around the Mediterranean Sea**. The task of bridging these two regional cleavages between rich and poor and between the West and Islam is thus urgent and long overdue. All of the above, of course, means that the importance of constructing a Mediterranean region by far now transcends the regional boundaries of the Mediterranean itself, and the interests of European states and their Mediterranean partners. Instead, a convergence of civilizations around the Mediterranean Sea is also becoming a critical issue of global security, as well as of global security governance. By global security governance we mean the development of collective ideational and material resources -- including collective identities, practices, and institutions -- for dealing with the global security challenges of a post-9/11 world.

A Cultural Theoretical Approach to Regional Security and Peace

New theoretical perspectives on the role of culture, identity, social communication, and regionalism in international relations lead us to suggest that the EMP process may be an important case of international change (Adler, 1998b, Attina, 2001, Calleya 1997). To a great extent these new theoretical perspectives are related to a recent "constructivist turn" in International Relations (IR) theory (Adler, 1997, Checkel, 1998, Finnemore, 1996, Katzenstein, 1996, Onuf, 1989; Ruggie, 1998, Wendt, 1999). Constructivism suggests that cultural and normative factors are critical to the development of international cooperation. Moreover, peaceful change may depend on the development of mutual trust and shared identities. Mutual trust and shared identities develop through transactions, socialization processes, and common institutional developments (Adler and Barnett, 1998).

These ingredients of international change are central to new theoretical frameworks of regionalism in international relations (Acharya, 2001, Checkel, 1999, Katzenstein, 1996). Theorists of regionalism point to regional integration in the post-cold war context as a key indicator of international change because regional integration changes the character of state sovereignty and national identity. Thus, the new literature on regionalism no longer conceptualizes regions in terms of geographical contiguity, but rather in terms of purposeful social, political, cultural, and economic interaction among states which often (but not always) inhabit the same geographical space (Calleya 1997). Theorists of the new regionalism hypothesize that the purposeful guidance of these

interactions can lead to the creation of a regional political culture and a regional “identity” that will have important implications for peace and stability (Jong Choi and Caporaso, 2002).

Identity, Security, and Peace

A central premise of the new regionalism theories is that states’ interests and their sense of security are relative and dependent on their identities (Wendt, 1994, 1999). The definition of an actor’s identity (“we”) is always in reference to another actor (“them”), and this need for an identity defined in opposition can lead to conflict (Mercer, 1995). As new regions are created and existing regions are enlarged, a new “we” may be created. A common identity can ease negotiations and compromises among conflicting interests, provide a basis for shared interests, and thus create a more solid basis for political stability. New social identities are constructed around commonly agreed attributes, norms, and principles of legitimate behavior. The identification of shared identities and mutual interests can thus replace threat perceptions. “Talk-shops,” “seminar diplomacy,” and confidence-building measures, widely practiced by the OSCE, NATO’s Partnership for Peace (Adler, 1998a), and a variety of Asian institutions (Acharya, 2001), are strategic interactions aimed at creating an environment that can lead to the creation of shared meanings, social reality, and mutual trust (Attina, 2001).¹

Identity, however, is neither a “cause” of security in any positivist sense, nor it is a necessary or a sufficient condition for its existence. Rather a shared identity is a collective meaning that becomes attached to material reality, thus helping to constitute practices, which make people feel more secure within their national or their transnational “borders.” Shared social identities thus play a constitutive role in that they account “ for

the properties of things by reference to the structures in virtue of which they exist.” (Wendt, 1998). In this sense shared identities can be learned by agents, whose intentions can then play a causal role in the construction and reconstruction of security practices. (Adler and Barnett, 2000). In addition, identity always works in relationship to and interacts with other social processes and variables, including material resources. This is why it is mistaken and futile to artificially separate between “ideas” and interests and to stick to a purely materialist understanding of power. Of course interests are usually articulated with the help of material resources, but identity enters the power equation in the way people set agendas and talk about the world. It also enters in the ability of people to make their identity-based understandings of reality "stick" as taken-for-granted collective reality (Cox, 1983, Barnett and Duvall, 2002).

This “identity” approach to security is consistent with a "social communication" theoretical understanding of regional integration. This theoretical understanding suggests that a regional political identity does not emerge from the convergence of pre-existing actors' interests, but through conceptual bargaining and argumentative consensus. Over time, as key concepts and norms are accepted as a part of collective identity, the spread of that identity arises from active persuasion and socialization rather than solely from instrumental bargaining and the exchange of fixed interests (Deutsch et al., 1957; Habermas, 1984, Risse, 2000). Instrumental agreements are not unimportant, however, and political actors often use normative understandings in a rhetorical fashion for instrumental reasons (Schimmelfenning, 2001). However, instrumental use of norms and instrumental agreements may in time become the structures within which deeper processes of social communication and the internalization of values and norms develop.

We are not naïve to think that, across cultural and civilizations and among states that have conflicting interests, processes of social communication free of power politics and instrumental considerations can easily develop. Nor do we believe that it is possible to think in the context of regional conflict resolution and conflict prevention about social communication processes that resemble Habermas's ideal type of dialogue aimed at shared understandings (Habermas, 1984). The reason is that a necessary condition for such processes to occur is the previous existence of a "life-world" of shared understandings, meanings, and discourse. But these are precisely the missing elements in conflicts that pit states, not only with different interests and power capabilities, but also with different cultures and civilization backgrounds.

Where lies, then, the potential of social communication for constructing collective identities and thus helping to promote security and peace? Persuasion which appeals to the scientific truth of statements, as in epistemic communities (Adler and Haas, 1992), will not do. Moral persuasion also is very unlikely, not only because many of the most intractable conflicts are about the location of the just and moral point, but also, because people do not agree on the meaning of justice. Thus, the potential of social communication to change identities, promote trust, and help change interests in the direction of security and peace, relies on social communications' effect on people's practices. Said otherwise, social communication may motivate people to practice the same practices. And it is the practical or pragmatic agreement on practicing the same practices, for example, the rule of law, which, in time can lay the basis for conflicting actors to develop reciprocal peaceful dispositions.

The most obvious example of this process in which the purposeful shaping of a

common identity is expected to lead to regional stability is the enlargement of the European Union. The Cold War had created a “we-versus-them” dynamic in Europe built on a perception of threat that raised the odds of violent conflict to levels deemed unacceptable. The integration process, however, rested on a common cultural basis and was driven by expectations of enhanced security and economic welfare. The accession of the Visegrad countries into the EU, for example, is a deliberate attempt to bring these countries into a shared identity called “Europe” that has already been constructed around a specific set of norms, principles, and behaviors spelled out in the Accession criteria. These criteria are intended to construct a new liberal, capitalist, democratic identity in former Communist countries through a set of specific practices. Those countries that desire to be part of the European “region” must demonstrate that they have built new institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. They must develop a functioning market economy and show that they have the ability to take on the obligations of community membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union. The architects of the criteria that leads to and enforces these practices believe that they create a common identity necessary for regional integration and thus, for regional security.

The belief that security is built on a common identity is nowhere more obvious than the EU’s unexpected decision to accept a second wave of applicants for EU entry. That decision was taken under the pressure of events surrounding the wars of Yugoslav succession and the Kosovo crisis (Tovias, 2001). When war broke out in Croatia in 1991, policy-makers recognized it as the first war since 1945 on what they considered to be European soil. The failure of various European efforts to contain the crisis—from

offering aid to a united Yugoslavia to the creation of a European Monitoring Mission to oversee various cease-fires led to important “learning” on the part of EU elites. EU intervention in conflicts on European soil would not be enough; a common European identity was the surest road to a stable peace on the continent. At the end of the Kosovo crisis in 1999, EU elites believed more than ever before that war in Europe could only be prevented through the creation of a common European identity deeply embedded in EU membership. (Crawford, 2000).

We must be careful, however, not to push the generalization potential of the European case too far. Conditions in Europe may not be replicable elsewhere, and it would be unwise to argue that what was good for fifteen European countries will necessarily be good for the West and Islam, or for Israel and Palestine. We do not mean by this that a social communication theory cannot be applicable to other regions, such as the Mediterranean. We mean, rather, that we first need to understand better the conditions under which pluralistic integration may develop in the Mediterranean. And we also must be aware of the huge obstacles that Mediterranean integration effort faces and will continue to face.

Pluralistic integration may be so difficult to achieve, not only because it takes time for people to change their identities. As shown by the examples of Europe (Checkel, 1999), and, to a lesser extent, South East Asia (Acharya, 2001), people may be able to develop new transnational identities, which overlap with, and stand on top of, deeper and older national and ethnic identities. The difficulty is rather one of agency, because, for pluralistic integration to succeed, agents must first seize material resources and constitutive norms (Kratowich, 1989), and develop reasons and the political will, which

then makes possible the construction of collective identity transnational spaces. Once such cognitive regions (Adler, 1997) are socially constructed, however, people can then imagine that they share their destiny with people of other nations, who happen to share their values and expectations of proper action in domestic and international affairs. This is why social communication and pluralistic integration may be conducive to peace. Karl Deutsch called these regions, security communities, in which integration leads to a "real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way" (Deutsch et al., 1957: 5).

Pluralistic Security Communities

Adler and Barnett (1998:30) have recently defined security communities as “transnational regions comprised of sovereign states whose people maintain dependable expectations of peaceful change.” Some examples of security communities include Scandinavia, Canada and the US, the EU, the Euro-Atlantic community and, to a lesser extent, the southern cone of Latin America and ASEAN. The concept of security community goes back to Karl Deutsch, who defined security community as “a group of people who has become integrated.” According to Deutsch, security communities may be either “amalgamated” or “pluralistic.” In an amalgamated security community, two or more (sovereign) states formally merge into an expanded state. On the other hand, a pluralistic security community retains the legal independence of separate states but integrates them to the point that the units entertain “dependable expectations of peaceful change.” A pluralistic security community develops when its members possess a compatibility of core values derived from common institutions and mutual responsiveness – a matter of mutual identity and loyalty, a sense of ‘we-ness,’ or a ‘we-feeling’ among states. (Deutsch et al.,

1957: 5-6). Pluralistic security communities, in turn, may be loosely or tightly coupled. Loosely coupled pluralistic security communities maintain the minimum properties of the Adler/Barnett definition. Tightly coupled pluralistic security communities, on the other hand, possess a political regime that lies between a sovereign state and a centralized regional government. (Adler and Barnett, 1998: 30). The North Atlantic Area, for example, is a loosely coupled security community, whereas the EU is a tightly coupled pluralistic security community, with a propensity to become amalgamated.

To understand what security communities are about, it is important to take community, not only as a group of people, who interact on the basis of common values and understandings. Rather, community refers to a social structure that constitutes the identities and interests of community members. Community “we-feeling,” therefore, is not only in people heads, but it is also institutionalized in community practices. Second, security communities are neither just a geographic place nor solely a cognitive region. Rather, ontologically speaking, they also represent **the** condition or state of peace. In other words, peace is an ongoing condition or state in which peoples and states constituting pluralistic security communities find themselves. Third, security communities amount to a mechanism of international security that is different, and, in some ways antithetical, to the balance-of-power mechanism. Whereas achieving security by means of the balance of power warrants the use of deterrence, compellence, and force, a security community mechanism, because of shared norms and identities, enables states to become secure in relation to one another. It therefore relies on a different and more benign set of practices, such as ideational contest, dialogue, and persuasion. Security, thus, seems increasingly to be related not only to how many tanks and missiles a state has

in relation to other states, but also to whether the states inhabit a common space characterized by common values and norms (Adler, 1998a, Adler and Barnett, 1998).

How Security Communities are created

Only those states that learn how to achieve and maintain a "we-feeling" develop into security communities. Learning and not balancing thus becomes part of the mechanism of change, in other words, by learning we do not mean exclusively the internalizing of some idea or belief by individuals. Rather, we also mean an active process of collective redefinition and interpretation of reality, which, based on new causal and normative knowledge, becomes institutionalized and, thus, has practical effects. It is therefore the change, not only of individual minds, but, primarily, of background knowledge, institutionalized in practice, which leads to the enlargement of the group of people who practice peaceful change.

Although security communities first develop due to factors that encourage states to orient themselves in each other's direction, they are not spontaneous creations. They are actively promoted by regional international and transnational institutions. These institutions, in turn, are backed by materially powerful states, which infuse the institutions with the shared meanings around which new identities evolve. These states provide the material resources (and expectations of increased welfare and security in the future) and normative concepts of proper and legitimate domestic and international behavior (democracy, human rights, sustainable development, "the Asian way to development," etc.) to "socially construct" transnational identities. Thus, power plays a major role in the creation of security communities. This role may be understood as a magnetic attraction of periphery states to the core. It is the dynamic and positive

relationship between power, ideas, increased interactions, international organization, and social learning, which are the wellsprings of both mutual trust and collective identity, which, in turn, are the proximate necessary conditions for the development of dependable expectations of peaceful change (Adler and Barnett, 1998).

Although some international institutions, including the EU and NATO, have helped set up some of the building blocks of security communities, none has gone as far as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in transforming itself into an explicit and distinct security community-building institution. When taken together, the OSCE's innovative security community-building practices became the epitome of a redefined understanding of international security. Seen thusly, security is increasingly "*comprehensive*," for it links classic security elements to economic, environmental, cultural and human-rights factors). It is also "*indivisible*," in the sense that one state's security is inseparable from that of other states. Most important, it is "*cooperative*," i.e. security is based on confidence and cooperation, the peaceful resolution of disputes, and the work of mutually reinforcing multilateral institutions). This is the model of security that EU practitioners have adopted when devising the EMP and Barcelona Process. Indeed, we can view the diffusion of the OSCE's community-building practices to other multilateral institutions as one of its most important and lasting legacies to international security and peaceful change in Europe and elsewhere (Adler, 1998a).

To wrap up the theoretical section, we do not believe that security communities can develop under all conditions. Thus, the development of security communities may require a minimum of trust and collective understandings, which are absent in many cases of serious and protracted conflicts, such as in the Middle East. For this reason, do not

expect a security community to develop between Israelis and Palestinians any time soon.

Moreover, we bring security communities in our social communication theoretical framework, with an eye of applying it to the Mediterranean, not because we believe that soon there will be a Mediterranean security community. Frankly, **we believe that a Mediterranean pluralistic security community will not happen in our lifetimes**, if only because it may take so long to develop. Rather, the point of bringing security communities in the context of Mediterranean integration is that, even if European and Mediterranean partner practitioners' do not explicitly aim to construct a Mediterranean security community, the Barcelona Process has nonetheless been framed around pluralistic security community **processes, institutions, and practices**. In other words, because of the logical, historical, and practical congruence and relationship between a redefined understanding of security as comprehensive, indivisible, and cooperative on one hand, and the development of security communities on the other, security community building already has consciously or unconsciously become part of Mediterranean integration practice.

What was, is, and will be of, the European Mediterranean Partnership?

The Evolution of the EMP

The Barcelona Process, or EMP, is a wide multilateral framework of political, economic, and social relations that involves 700 million people in 27 countries or territories around the Mediterranean. In addition to the 15 EU states, the EMP includes Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, and the

Palestinian Authority. Like the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, which set in motion the CSCE, on which the Barcelona Process was modeled, the EMP established 3 baskets. These baskets deal, respectively, with: (a) security on the basis of mutual confidence and partnership, (b) a zone of shared prosperity through economic integration, and (c) the rapprochement between peoples through social and cultural links and the creation of a Mediterranean civil society. The political element of the Barcelona declaration includes a list of principles concerning respect for democracy and the rule of law, human rights, the right of self-determination, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, and peaceful resolution of disputes. It also stipulates cooperation to combat terrorism. On the economic front, the Barcelona document provides for a regional partnership to promote economic development by means of a free trade zone to be created by the year 2010. Basket three of the Barcelona Declaration refers to the building of cultural bridges between Mediterranean civil societies.²

We may regard the Barcelona Process primarily as part of the EU growing and more pro-active Middle East policy. Thus, the EU was moved to start the Barcelona Process primarily because of fears of immigration from the South, and of xenophobia in the North. It also perceived security threats arising from the South, such as terrorism, and weapons of mass destruction, and felt anxiety arising from the growth of militant Islamic fundamentalism. The EU also regards the Barcelona Process as a strategy to compete with other trade blocks, without having to invite non-European Mediterranean countries to join the EU. The EU says, “take this money, the norms, and the practices, go create your own region and, thus, give us your stability.” To the South, however, the Barcelona Process has so far meant, at best, "Euros," and, at worst, a neocolonialist plot. All of the

above, however, is not incompatible with the notion that, in order to achieve these instrumental goals, the EU chose to practice what it knows best, regional security through partnership and mutual confidence. As such, Mediterranean integration may be considered as a laboratory for an important experiment that is taking place today in international relations. This entails the invention of a region that does not yet exist and the social engineering of a regional identity that rests, neither on blood, nor religion, but on civil society, voluntary networks and civic beliefs. Although the Barcelona process was born out of instrumental necessity and calculation by European states, decades from now, this experiment may result in the construction of a Mediterranean security community. The concept of building future peace in the Mediterranean, thus, goes through building present community.

Before the EU became involved in Mediterranean pluralistic integration, efforts to create a Mediterranean “region” were severely limited or failed altogether. The first multilateral effort was launched in 1972 among the foreign ministers of Italy, Libya, Malta, and Tunisia, who held a series of meetings with the goal establishing cooperative programs in communications, tourism, fishing, and trade among the nonaligned countries of the Mediterranean. Due to limited representation, however, cooperation did not materialize. In 1973 the CSCE identified a Mediterranean component to its program, and throughout the 1970s and 1980s, it called together regional experts in economics, science, culture, and the environment to explore cooperative efforts that would build mutual trust and contribute to regional stability. The meetings accomplished little, however, and did not attract the attention of the United States, which was focused primarily on the East-West conflict. The Euro-Arab Dialogue began in 1974, in the wake

of the oil crisis in order to establish cooperation between members of the European Community and members of the Arab League. These efforts, however, also remained frozen in the context of the Cold War, and the insistence of the Arab League that the Palestinian issue be placed on the agenda, a condition that was unacceptable to the Europeans. The Action Plan for the Mediterranean which was formulated within the framework of the Barcelona Convention of 1976 to combat pollution of the Mediterranean Sea was indeed successful, but the focus of cooperation has remained limited to technical environmental issues, without “spillover” effects on other areas of concern (Haas, 1990).

In a post-war world dominated by East-West confrontation, the creation of a Mediterranean area of cooperation and stability was clearly a low priority for the world’s powerful states. The end of the Cold War, however, promised to eliminate the obstacles to regional cooperation, and in 1990, the CSCE initiated the Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean (CSCM). Like earlier efforts, the aim was to boost regional economic development and social conditions through cooperation, and to increase regional trust and transparency. The WEU and the Council of Europe have also been involved in regional trust promoting activities. In addition, the French put forward in 1990-1991 a plan for a Western Mediterranean CSCM and NATO formulated a Mediterranean policy in 1994, promising to work with non-members to strengthen regional stability. Encouraged by progress in the Arab-Israeli peace process, the European Union became formally involved in the project of creating regional stability. The first major steps were given at the European Council Summit of 1992, which were followed by the EMP initiative in 1995; it included the largest financial commitment

outside the EU to launch economic, cultural, and social initiatives for the region.³

The objectives of the Barcelona Declaration were slated to be confirmed by twenty-seven Mediterranean states in Malta in 1997. But the stalled Middle East peace process and ensuing tensions in the Middle East overshadowed the meeting and cast grave doubts on the partnership's success. Subsequent meetings, including at Stuttgart, Marseille, and Valencia, did very little to get the EMP out of its failing path, or, worst, irrelevance. True, some economic agreements were signed, and the idea of having a free-trade area by the year 2010 still stands. Moreover, there has been a great deal of activity at the level of civil society networks, mainly about promoting common cultural and security understandings, including EuroMeSCo, a security think-tank, which has become an important example of "seminar diplomacy" in the region.

After only seven years, however, the "spirit of Barcelona" is almost gone, and, the main reason, other than the failure of the Oslo process, is that the Barcelona Process focused too much on form and procedure and too little on content. To survive, the Barcelona Process will thus require that all of its members agree to endow the concept of partnership with shared content, meaning, and to spend material, political and symbolic capital to develop shared understandings about the purposes of Mediterranean partnership. The purposes of a meaningful Mediterranean partnership should reflect the interests neither of the West nor Islam. Rather they should aim at producing a new multicultural space, which does not come at the expense of national cultures and religions. A new EMP content will require the development of shared narratives and myths, which, in this case, may develop only from thick social communication between civil society members and social networks. In addition, only Mediterranean peoples can

and will determine, in practice, the meanings and content of their regional endeavor. We believe however, that, a good place to start is the rule of law, regardless of whether different national laws are compatible or incompatible across national borders.

Discussion and Main Research Questions about the EMP

The path to peace chosen at Barcelona was indeed an ambitious one, for it did not rest on traditional security measures. The stated purpose of this effort was to extend southward the European zone of stability. It relied on the notion of “partnership” to signal the intent to create more interdependence between the EU and non-EU Mediterranean countries, to create a multilateral framework of relations, and to thereby create a Mediterranean “region.” This is especially curious, because the Mediterranean is arguably the world’s most volatile region: it is here that the cultural cleavages between Islam and the West are most apparent and where the North-South economic gap is intolerable.

It is this self-conscious effort to construct a “region” in this explosive area of the world that we find most intriguing. Thus, we do not interpret the fact that the Barcelona Declaration explicitly uses the language of community building to express its goals as irrelevant to its ultimate purpose. For at least some of the designers of the EMP must have subscribed to the haunting idea that the best way to achieve security, political stability and economic welfare in the Mediterranean is neither an elaborate system of alliances, collective security systems, or mere functional economic integration schemes. Rather, they probably thought that the best way to achieve security in the Mediterranean is to invent a region that pools its resources and slowly develops a shared regional identity.

The above discussion of the Barcelona Process's goals leads us directly to the

analytical questions and hypotheses, which guide the research of subsequent chapters. Unlike most edited volumes, we did not ask the authors to "use" the editors' theoretical framework, historical analysis, and discussion. Rather, we asked them to assess our framework, analysis and discussion, taking into account that this volume is about the role of culture in promoting the development of peace and security. In this regard we ask, what was the Barcelona Process all about? Was it only an instrumental means of European states, which, becoming increasingly conscious of their combined influence, and of their security needs beyond their borders, decided to "talk the Mediterranean region into existence?" (Neumann, 1994) Or was it an attempt to seize an important historical moment in the Middle East with the signature of the Oslo process, in order to promote peace, but also to gain influence there? And why did the EMP architects use the experience of European integration to promote Mediterranean security and prosperity? Did they not suspect that what worked in the continent may not work across cultures in the Mediterranean? And why use CSCE like security practices? Because Europeans thought that these practices were successful, or because there were no other practices available, which fitted the regional problems at hand?

From the above questions, we deduce the ("realist") null hypothesis. None of the new security understandings or practices have really much to do with, or to add to, the Barcelona Process; they are just a front for imposing European interests and discipline over non-European Mediterranean states, and are aimed at promoting southern-European stability. The alternative (constructivist or constructivist-liberal) hypothesis, however, is that the construction of a Mediterranean Partnership is "for real," mainly, because it is the corollary of the step-by-step creation of the EU on the rubble of World War II. In fact,

transnational partnerships are not unprecedented outside Europe. For example, the recent ASEAN initiative to start a Regional Forum as the basis for a regional security system suggests the possibility of region building in non-western areas that are not culturally homogeneous (Attina 2001). Further, in the larger international context, traditional arrangements among states to ensure their security are beginning to disappear. As Attina (2001) has noted, national armed forces are increasingly used in multilateral peace enforcement and the number of military alliances in the world has diminished. Even NATO, the last remaining military alliance, has also developed into a security community institution (Adler, 1998a, Weber 1990). Why would then states around the Mediterranean change their identities, if they did not experience the traumatic experience European countries experienced at the end of WWII? To answer this question, we suggest two additional -- non-mutually exclusive -- hypotheses. First, as noted in the theoretical section, it is collective learning processes, which may drive the integration process forward. Second, identity change may take place due to a process of foresight, or what may be called "forward learning," the notion that integration may be needed to prevent a terrible tragedy like Europeans experienced in WWII.

Finally as we look into the EMP's recent past, gloomy present (2002), and clear negative balance,⁴ we ask the authors of this volume to address the following questions about the EMP's future. First, may the EMP process be able to bridge the gaps between the West and Islam, and the North and the South in the region? Second, can a regional "identity"—that would not replace, but only supplement national identities—be consciously constructed? And if so, to what extent is the construction of a Mediterranean region able to ensure stability and prosperity? Third, as Claire Spencer notes, the original

Barcelona template treats security as an ‘organic’ and intrinsic aspect of regional development. (Spencer 2002). How is this "organic" view of security related to the processes, practices, and institutions that follow a security community perspective? Is "social engineering" possible at all, and, can a region be constructed "from scratch?"

Facilitating and Constraining Factors for Region Building in the Mediterranean

In order to guide the empirical analysis of the volume questions and hypotheses, we end this section with a brief analysis of some of the factors that may facilitate and constrain region building in the Mediterranean.

Facilitating Factors. The experiment in long-term security community building around the Mediterranean is facilitated, first, by the region's geo-strategic importance, which is intertwined with its importance in terms of a source of energy supply for Europe (Joffe 2001). Paradoxically, despite Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the potential dangers harbored in the region, the odds of all-out war among the countries of the Mediterranean are low. Indeed, as Attina (2001:35) notes, “Mediterranean international politics is not focused on military confrontation and nuclear deterrence as much as European international politics was during the Cold War.” Unlike the situation during the Cold War, there are no fixed alliances facing one another and no open nuclear standoff. And unlike during the cold war, the geo-strategic realities in the region suggest that no state could credibly threaten others with nuclear missiles and expect to remain unharmed. The spread of weapons of mass destruction in the region has been slower than the general Western fear of that spread would indicate. All of this considerably eases the task of constructing confidence-building measures and adopting new concepts of security.

The emergence of the EU as a major player in world politics is another facilitating

factor. As the EU consolidates its common foreign and security policy and institutions, it is likely to redouble its efforts to engage Mediterranean partner states in cooperative measures. This will leave the US with the choice of cooperating with Europe over the Mediterranean, of course, without neglecting NATO, or losing ground with Mediterranean partner states.

In the long term, however, there are other more fundamental changes that might facilitate Mediterranean pluralistic integration. For example, in spite of the fact that the state is here to stay, state practices and identities are nonetheless changing, for example, human rights, environmentalism, and multilateral diplomacy. Becoming part of "who we are", as opposed as "who they are," these practices are beginning to shape new state identities. Mexico and Australia are good examples. The former recently "moved" from Central America to North America and the latter worked out regional policies, in order to legitimate its newly acquired "Asia-Pacific" identity. Moreover, changes in the scope and depth of interaction and interdependencies and new technologies, such as the Internet, facilitate the creation of transnational society, networks, and community, which, in turn, help produce changes in state practice and identity. This is also true with the increasing globalization of trade, finance and labor markets, despite its share of corrosive and disintegrating effects. Collective identities are also on the move, for example, a change in collective identities in Europe and South East Asia is engendering new security practices based on inclusion, rather than on exclusion, on persuasion, rather than on deterrence. And regions are also changing. ASEAN, Asia-Pacific? These regions did not exist forty years ago. Regional borders seem to be characterized not only by geography but also by shared identity. Is all this related to globalization, which forces states to create larger

markets, with spillovers affecting political and security arenas? We believe it is, but, as we will see below, globalization also has a darker side, which breeds disintegration.

Constraining Factors

The EMP process can be considered a “hard case” of regional integration for five reasons. First, because cultural differences and economic inequalities in the Mediterranean are so explosive, the integration process will be much more difficult than the process of European integration or even integration in the Asia-Pacific region, where national cultural differences and economic inequalities are smaller and less volatile. This instability is exacerbated by the exclusion from the process of the “outer ring” (Solingen, 1999) of states facing some of the same explosive dilemmas than other states in the region, e.g. Libya, Iraq, Sudan, and Iran.⁵

Secondly, the Western- oriented social engineering inherent in the EMP process will make it difficult for some Arab participants to claim legitimacy at home for the region that they create. In Northern Africa and the Middle East, poor and predominantly Islamic states are deeply suspicious of Western attempts to impose on them "a regional identity." Indeed, the identity that the theory of pluralistic security communities predicts as a key ingredient in “region-building” is distinctly derived from Western Enlightenment principles and values. It depends not only on shared norms that create a civil and tolerant culture, but also on institutions that embody those norms with the backing of materially powerful states. In the Mediterranean region, these norms, institutions, and powerful states all are located in or spring from the West. This problem is especially acute in the post-9/ 11 climate. Furthermore, as George Joffe (2001) argues, power relationships embodied in economic interdependencies are profoundly asymmetrical. It is no secret that

the EMP was taken in response to perceived threats to Europe stemming from the Middle East and North Africa, and as the most powerful partner, the EU is in a position to impose its interests and desires on its Mediterranean neighbors. Therefore, many in Arab nations view the EMP attempt at "region building" as threatening neocolonial machinations. Indeed, the last time that the Mediterranean was united as a region was as the "Mare Nostrum" under the Roman Empire. A forced common culture grounded in asymmetrical power relationships can only exacerbate conflict.

Third, many of these poor, Islamic states are torn by internal schisms and blurred territorial definitions. Their very existence is tenuous, and their own national identities are uncertain. It is questionable whether, without a secure national identity, these states will be able to assume the regional identity believed to be necessary for regional security.⁶ Fourth, conventional wisdom suggests that the fate of the EMP process is linked to that of the Middle East peace process. Since the EMP's inception in 1995, the Middle East peace process has been halting and uncertain, and, in 2002 it seems dead. It is widely believed that the EMP process will always lag behind, and that it may even be shelved if the Middle East peace process completely disappears.

Finally, there is the dark side of globalization. We mentioned above that, in part, globalization is driving the process of Mediterranean globalization. However, disparities in the globalization process that have been found to exist at the global level may also express themselves markedly between southern European states and Israel on the one hand, and poor non-European partners on the other (Joffe, 2000). We will expand on this theme below.

A Mediterranean Region in the Context of a "Post- 9/11" World

"November 1995" and "September 2001"

Since the tragic events of 9/11 in New York City, many analysts have argued that the world has changed, that what was will not be again, and that we now confront a brave new world. In other words, the main characteristics of world politics in the mid-1990s, which made possible the development and implementation of CSCE-like practices, and their diffusion to the Mediterranean, may not exist anymore in a post-9/11 world. It is thus pertinent to inquire about the relevance of the Barcelona Process today, not only as a regional security and economic affair, but also as a small, albeit not insignificant, means of preventing a "clash of civilizations" of global proportions. Said otherwise, in this volume, we would like to explore the notion that the promotion of a shared Mediterranean identity, as it becomes a means for transforming the discourse and practices of the region, from a "clash of civilizations" to a "convergence of civilizations" may have global security implications.

By convergence of civilizations, we do not mean what in EMP discourse and practice is generally regarded as "cultural cooperation," for example, well-intended meetings between the clergy of the three major Mediterranean religions, or cultural contacts involving music, theater, and literature, however important they may be. Rather, we primarily mean the creation of a process aimed at generating shared normative and epistemic understandings and meanings about political, economic, and social life, for example, about social order, the rule of law, human rights, social and political justice, peace, and security. Most important, however, we mean by it the creation of a

Mediterranean shared narrative. On the basis of this shared narrative, multicultural traditions, dispositions, identities, practices, and policies may thus become established. This idea builds on the notion that the Mediterranean has always been the meeting place of different civilizations and religions. The question we thus pose in this volume is, whether, due to post 9/11 conditions, Mediterranean integration will be overtaken by the new security concerns with terrorism, or whether it will be strengthened by interests in the prevention of a global wide confrontation between Islam and the West. We now turn to analyze the pre- and post-9/11 "worlds."

The Barcelona Process was the result of a liberal "world view." When the Barcelona Process started on November 1995, the Cold War had just ended, not as a result of military victory by the West over the East, but due to processes of identity and interest change, that the Helsinki process and the CSCE helped to unleash (Thomas, 2001). Moreover, the human rights and CBM practices, which the CSCE had helped place on the agenda of world politics were being diffused to other parts of the world, most importantly, South East Asia and the Middle East (Adler, 1998a). In general, multilateral diplomacy was flourishing and security increasingly was being defined as comprehensive, indivisible, and cooperative. This redefined view of security was built on conceptual premises -- then prevalent in the academic community -- that persuasion and socialization were more efficient means than deterrence and power politics to bring about conflict resolution. We should recall that when the Barcelona Process started, the Middle East "Multilaterals" (Peters, 1996, Kaye, 2001) were already well established and getting nearly to their unfortunate end.

In parallel, and in zigzag fashion, western European nations were slowly but

surely turning functional economic cooperation into shared identities and into notions of a liberal European space, constituted by democracy, the rule of law and human rights norms. Conceptions of European citizenship were on the move and a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFDP) had become a real possibility. Moreover, eastern and central European nations were standing "in line" to be admitted to the EU and to NATO; the latter, after adopting CSCE practices, was turned from a military alliance to a security community-making institution (Adler, 1998). Also, the EU was devoting most of its attention and resources for eastward expansion, thus forcing southern Europeans to demand the EU to pay equal attention to southward expansion.

In the 1990s, it also became evident that the US had turned into the sole superpower. To the US, however, the Mediterranean was not "worth" more than NATO's "Mediterranean dialogue," a low-key seminar diplomacy endeavor, with hardly any policy behind. At the same time, the success of European integration was engendering in European minds the notion that Europe too can become a superpower in its own right, with growing strategic and economic interests in its southern flank. If it was to secure these interests, however, the EU needed to diffuse southward the stability it had achieved in the North. Thus, rather than promoting new power balances (against whom?), or a collective security system (with whom?), the EU put some of its material and normative resources where its experience was, and, with the aim of creating security and economic stability in the region, it initiated a pluralistic Mediterranean integration process.

In the meantime, Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat had already shaken hands in the White House and had launched the Oslo process. In an incremental fashion, this process was supposed to bring to an end the century's bitter conflict between the

Zionist movement and the State of Israel on one hand and the Palestinian people and the Arab states on the other. Expectations of peace were very high and the irony was that, when the Barcelona Process was launched, Rabin had already been assassinated, and the Oslo process, without most people being aware of it then, was itself dying.

Finally, during the 1990s, the world discovered globalization, meaning that if states did not join economic forces with other states, they would have a hard time to make ends meet. This meant that the name of the game became, as in NAFTA and MERCOSUR, to bind domestic markets in a thick web of economic interdependence. In addition, this was the time when we first realized that human rights were slowly challenging sovereignty norms and, that, from now on, when a state violated people's human rights, it would need to be accountable to the international community. NATO fighting Serbia over Kosovo fitted this trend. Moreover, from a security perspective, the main danger in the horizon became a veiled threat of weapons of mass destruction, and soft security threats, such as drug-trafficking and illegal immigration. This is the world that was before 9/11.

The tragic events of 9/11 changed the situation from the root. Once the American people and leaders recovered from the shock, their first reaction was to redefine the ideological lines in the world. Because the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist attack were Muslims, it now appeared to many that Huntington was right after all, and that the new divide in the world would become the West versus Islam. Many political leaders in the West and the Muslim world tried to prevent this social construction, but, in fact, many did not, or, did everything to promote it. But it was not only the West that went into shock on 9/11; the Muslim world too began to feel its effects and to enter a period of

introspection, whose consequences are still not clear.

By then, the "El-Aksa Intifada" in the Middle East was already under way, the Oslo process was in shambles, Ariel Sharon was Prime Minister of Israel, and Palestinians had already started in kind to practice suicide bombing against Israeli civilians. Although it is doubtful whether the 9/11 events had much to do with what was happening in Israel and Palestine, it was unavoidable that the two events would be linked. For example, many Muslims still believe that it was the Israeli "Mossad" that blew up the New York Twin Towers, and, to this day, Prime Minister Sharon is persuaded that since 9/11 both the US and Israel are partners in the war against the Muslim world.

Since 9/11, the concept of "terrorism" became a commodity out for grabs; predictably, there was a run to socially construct one's enemies as "terrorists." For example, Israelis referred to Palestinians as terrorists, Palestinians referred to Israelis as terrorists, Indians referred to Pakistanis as terrorists, and Pakistanis referred to Indians as terrorists. Reflecting American material and discursive power, however, al-Qaeda and the Taliban became everyone's or "global" terrorists. Subsequently, the empire (with or without quotation marks) struck back; after several months the Taliban was out of Afghanistan and al-Qaeda was on the run. This showed that, from now on, the US would not hesitate to send its "legions," in order to uphold its values. The "war on terror" also led to a redefinition of alliances around the world, pitting the forces of "freedom", which included the US, Europe, Russia, China, and moderate Arab countries versus the forces of "evil", all countries unwilling to join the US in its war against terror. One of the most important changes after 9/11, then, was turning the war against terror into the central issue of international security, thus, threatening to leave behind or push aside human

rights and cooperative security practices.

All this may strain the Barcelona Process to the limit. As Spencer (2002) notes, despite the objections of individual European leaders to distance themselves from a “clash of civilizations” explanation for 9/11 events, the suspicion of Europeans and Americans of the Muslim world in its “war against terrorism” has weakened EU efforts to develop ‘Partnership Building Measures.’ The “vagueness of the targets of this ‘war’ and the mis-targeting of a number of cases have damaged the reassurances of the EU as a whole” (Spencer 2002, 3-4). Needless to say, the Intifada and subsequent Israeli incursion into the Palestinian Authority territories effectively froze the Barcelona Process and produced a deep cleft, not only between Israel and moderate Arab countries that were promoting the Barcelona Process, but also between Israel and Europe. The triangular partnership between Europe, the Arab world, and Israel, is now in total turmoil.

In addition, once a growing transnational movement "discovered" the dark side of globalization, it began a concerted campaign against multilateral diplomacy, free markets, and corporate Capitalism. Thus what was supposed to be a unique attempt to bring Northern and Southern countries under one economic Mediterranean roof, may now be seen by the growing anti-globalization movement as one more move by global Capitalism to impose economic and political discipline on poor countries.

The prospect that, in spite of the fact that the West and Islam need not, and may not, necessarily confront each other across battle lines, a "clash of civilizations" would nonetheless be socially constructed should give us pause. It thus raises the question whether the Barcelona Process can and should become a means to prevent this ominous social construction. In other words, can and should resources and practices, which the

Barcelona Process helped create, be used to achieve a better understanding between the West and the Muslim world, and between the North and the South?

We would like to suggest a small yet significant measure in this direction, i.e. the institutionalization of a long-standing seminar in the Mediterranean, modeled after similar seminars that met for several decades between the superpowers on nuclear arms control. This seminar, which would include a mixture of academic experts from a variety of disciplines as well as national, international, and transnational political actors from around the Mediterranean, will meet regularly to discuss issues and problems concerning the EMP. It will also serve as a bridge between academicians and practitioners to help build bridges between civil societies, a process intended to help build the substantive infrastructure for a better understanding across cultural divides. It is our hope that this seminar would become a model for additional bridging exercises, and for movements on both sides of the cultural divide to provide meaning to the Barcelona Process in ways that promote inter-cultural understanding.

An Exercise in Scenario-Building

To end this section, and for heuristic purposes only, we would like to suggest four scenarios on the EMP's future.⁷

(1) Failure of Region-building and Deepening Fragmentation

Seen from the Summer 2002, and with little hope for peace in the Middle East anytime soon, the first likely scenario is the shelving of the EMP process and a failure to create a Mediterranean region. Neo-liberal economic reforms stimulated by the EMP process, in this scenario, will lead to economic hardship, unemployment, and growing gaps between rich and poor, North and South. Meanwhile, authoritarian governments in the South fail

to establish the rule of law and the institutions of democratic governance, widening the gap between the masses of people and the regimes in power. Under these conditions, militarized security policies dominate the region, blocking the re-conceptualization of security envisioned in the Barcelona Declaration.

In this scenario, the enlargement of the EU undermines and ultimately destroys the process of region building in the Mediterranean. First, trade dependence of non-member Mediterranean countries on the EU will increase, leading them to perceive the EU as a more formidable trading bloc. And if the EU looks eastward for products that currently come from non-member Mediterranean countries, EU trade sanctions will “bite” more than before (Tovias 2001). This will deepen Arab suspicions of European neo-colonial intentions in the Euro-Med process. And as Tovias also notes, as the EU turns its focus eastward, interest in the Mediterranean will continue to wane, and the Barcelona process will lose steam.

Second, as the EU enlarges, most Direct Foreign Investment (DFI) will flow to eastern Europe (Tovias), and without an infusion of capital, MENA countries will remain low-wage raw materials suppliers and export platforms for the European Union’s industrial machine. To the extent that foreign direct investment flows into the region, it will be attracted by low-cost labor and will concentrate in labor-intensive production methods across the industrial spectrum. In modern sectors, plants in these countries might be simply “screwdriver factories”--assembling final products, importing key components, and using few local suppliers. Other foreign investments might be in “services”--sales, marketing, and distribution outlets for imports produced in the EU. Or investments will flow to low-technology extractive sectors, like oil and gas. All

innovative activity would continue to be concentrated in the EU as the “core.” Under this scenario, prospects for rapid economic development of the non-member Mediterranean states are bleak. Growth will continue to decline, thus undermining support for political liberalization, thus undermining the growth of democracy and civil society in the region. Because weak democracies reinforce old systems of patronage, funds devoted to regional integration are squandered.

The income gap between the North and South Mediterranean will contribute to a condition of chronic political instability, weakening regimes further because populations experience a sense of relative deprivation that further undermines the legitimacy of their governments. Highly visible social and income inequalities lead to intermittent political crises, giving rise to intermittent mass migration northward. If these migrations are perceived as too disruptive, the Barcelona process will be shelved in favor of closing EU borders. Also, in this scenario, the strife between Israelis and Palestinians will continue and probably will worsen, and the practice of suicide bombers will diffuse to Europe and other parts of the West. Under such circumstances, people may even forget that a Mediterranean partnership was ever on the European agenda.

(2) Growth of a Mediterranean Culture and Security Community

Under this scenario, conditions of increasing globalization and the spread of markets and liberal ideas will provide the spark for identity change that reinforce new concepts of security envisioned in the Barcelona Declaration. And when the various regional actors have developed a culture of dissent without having to resort to violence in the Mediterranean, they will have built a stable Mediterranean culture with its multiple identities and beliefs. Indeed, if regional integration is achieved in the Mediterranean, it

will not follow the European model. It is likely to be constructed in such a way that it can neither be mistaken for a Northern economic hegemonic design nor for an attempt on the part of Southern states to impose a new economic order on their Northern “partners.” Other empirical cases of integration, such as ASEAN suggest that such a development is necessary to forge a new path to integration: political elites have begun to change the way they understand security and their concept of “home” (Acharya, 1995; Mack and Kerr, 1995). And they are discovering that it has become imperative to their security and welfare to “co-bind” (Deudney, 1996) their destinies into larger political entities that do not come at the expense of their existing cultural identities and allegiances.

In this scenario, the fate of the Middle East is tied to the fate of the development of a Mediterranean region, and not the other way around. National, transnational, and international actors around the Mediterranean Sea, empowered by the EMP initiative, have continued to lay the foundations of dense social networks that we believe are necessary for the development of a “region.” If they continue to grow, we suspect that the EMP can begin to cast a shadow on the Middle East conflict. We have seen some positive indicators of this trend: despite the failure of the peace process and the failure of Syria and Lebanon to exclude Israel from the EMP process, Arab states remained in the negotiations and meetings (Weinber, 1999). Furthermore, in spite of the fact that in 2002 Israelis and Palestinians fought out their differences, and in spite of symbolic protests against Israel, as scheduled, the EMP met in Valencia for its yearly meeting. As a result, with the purpose of putting the Barcelona Process back in business, an Action Plan was agreed.

(3) "More of the Same": Open Regionalism, Interactions, and Stagnation

In this scenario, the EMP process is neither shelved nor deepened; it remains encapsulated in bilateral agreements and shallow multilateral contacts. Because the region has a low level of integration due to the focus on oil, (the only integrating force), import substitution, political Islam, and self-sufficiency, this scenario envisions that many of the region partners will become marginal in the process of globalization and the EMP will barely linger. Vasconcellos (2001) has described the EMP process to date as one of "open regionalism." This term suggests primarily economic, but also political, and even security linkages among Mediterranean states without the development of a growing shared identity. Open regionalism, however, obscures the notion that the EMP actually may be a cover for center-periphery relations in the region, Europe being the center and the Mediterranean partners being Europe's "periphery." If the current structure of mutual economic dependencies—i.e. European dependency on Mediterranean energy supplies and MENA dependency on trade with the EU—continues, this scenario, perhaps, is more likely to be realized in the near term than the other scenarios.

(4) Triage

According to this scenario, the EU grows impatient with the chronic situation in the Middle East and decides to perform "triage," which refers to a medical technique of classifying the wounded in battle. According to triage, the slightly wounded need no immediate help, mortally wounded are not worth the time and effort, and only those seriously wounded, for whom immediate help can make a difference, are treated. A continuation of the Middle East conflict may lead European countries, specially France, Italy, Portugal, and Spain to favor triage. On the one hand, because of their robust

economies, southern European countries need no treatment. On the other hand, the Eastern Mediterranean is regarded as being too "sick" to be saved and Europe's attention will thus turn mainly to the Western Mediterranean. This effectively will mean ending the Barcelona Process and replacing it with a smaller but more manageable Arab-European partnership. This partnership will involve mainly southern European countries and Maghreb Arab countries, such as Morocco and Tunisia, with whom southern European countries had long standing and important economic relations (Gillespie, 2001).

Chapters' Descriptions

Endnotes

¹ "Adler shows how the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) uses its legitimacy and perceived impartiality to carry out "seminar diplomacy" among its members—teaching them new values and new models of behavior. The mechanisms for social construction elaborated here draw heavily on Max Weber's work and on organization theory in sociology. Organizations are effective agents of social construction in part because the rational-legal authority they embody is widely viewed as legitimate and good. Further, the perceptions that these organizations are merely technical (not political) and that the social models they push are chosen because they are efficient and effective add to the power of these norms" (Finnemore and Sikkink, 2001: 401).

² *Barcelona Declaration Adopted at the Euro-Mediterranean Conference* (Barcelona, November 28, 1995)

³ The European Council Summit of June 1992 recognized for the first time that "The southern and eastern shores of Mediterranean and the Middle East are both areas of interest to the Union, in terms of security and social stability." Indeed, with the Cold War's end and Germany's achievement of unity and sovereignty, France feared that Europe would drift eastward; the EMP would help achieve a new power balance between France and Germany (Weinber, 1999). And the wars of Yugoslav succession reminded Europeans that the post-war peace on the continent could again be threatened. The EU longed to be an actor on the world stage, and, at the very least, a regional hegemon (Nicolaidas 1999). In November, 1995, the Spanish presidency of the EU organized a conference in Barcelona, with the 15 members of the EU and 12 countries of the South Mediterranean. The outcome was the Barcelona Declaration or Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) Initiative. Backed by the largest EU financial commitment ever made outside the Union, the Declaration launched a set of economic, political, cultural, and social initiatives, intended to reinforce one another in an open-ended process of regional integration.

⁴ This includes setbacks in achieving agreement on confidence building measures (CBMs) and a Peace and Stability pact, the suspension of the Arab-Israeli multilateral negotiations and the MENA economic summits, and the recent eruption of violence between Israelis and Palestinians. Because of these mishaps,

critics, and even supporters, have increasingly become skeptical about the EMP's long-term and even short-term potential for success.

⁵ The Libyan government eagerly joined the EMP process when it was granted observer status in 1999 (Weinberg 1999).

⁶ Scenario building has lately been portrayed in the IR literature as a very useful technique of foresight and understanding (Bernstein, et al., 2000).

⁷ We thank Raffaella Del Sarto for this insight.

References

- Acharya, Amitav. 1995 "A Regional Security Community in Southeast Asia?" *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 18.
- Acharya, Amitav. 2001. *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order*. London: Routledge.
- Adler, Emanuel .1997. "Imagined (Security) Communities," *Millennium* Vol. 26/2.
- Adler, Emanuel. 1998a. "Seeds of Peaceful Change: The OSCE Security Community-Building Model," in Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, ed., *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adler, Emanuel.1998b. "Condition(s) of Peace," *Review of International Studies* 24/5: 165-191.
- Adler, Emanuel and Peter M. Haas. 1992."Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program." *International Organization*, 46/1: 367-390
- Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett, eds.1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett. 2000. "Taking Identity and Our Critics Seriously," *Cooperation and Conflict* 35/3: 321-329.
- Aggarwal, Vinod. 1998. *Asia Pacific Crossroads: Regime Creation and the Future of APEC*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Aliboni, Roberto, et al. 1996. *Security Challenges in the Mediterranean Region*. London: Frank Cass.
- Aliboni, Roberto, George Joffe, and Tim Niblock, eds. 1996. *Security Challenges in the Mediterranean Region*. London: Frank Cass.
- Aliboni, Roberto, Abdel Monem Said Aly and Alvaro Vasconcelos. 1997. *Joint Report of EuroMeSCo's Working Group on Political and Security Co-operation* (second version). April.
- Aly, Abdel Monem Said. 1996. "The Shattered Consensus - Arab Perceptions of Security." *The International Spectator* 31/ 4: 23-52.
- Avineri, Shlomo and Werner Weidenfeld, eds. 1999. *Integration and Identity: Challenges to Europe and Israel*. Bonn: Europa Union.

Anderson, Lisa. 1992. "Remaking the Middle East: The Prospects for Democracy and Stability." *Ethics and International Affairs* 6.

Artawi, Hisham and Ephraim Kleiman. 1997. "Economic interactions among participants in the Middle East peace process." *Middle East Journal* 51/2.

Attina, Fulvio. 2001. "Partnership and Security: Some Theoretical and Empirical Reasons for Positive Developments in the Euro-Mediterranean Area," in F. Attina and S. Stavridis, eds, *The Barcelona Process and Euro-Mediterranean Issues from Stuttgart to Marseille*. Milan: Giuffre: 17-49.

Barnett, Michael. 1996-97 "Regional Security After the Gulf War." *Political Science Quarterly* 111/4:1996-97.

Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. 2002. "Power and Global Governance." Paper presented for the Conference "Who Governs in Global Governance" Madison, Wisconsin, April, 19-20.

Bernstein, Steven, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Stein and Steven Weber. 2000. "God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World," *European Journal of International Relations* 6/1: 43-76.

Bin, Alberto. 1997. "Multilateral Diplomacy in the Mediterranean" *Mediterranean Quarterly* 8/3.

Boulding, Elise. 1994. *Building Peace in the Middle East: Challenges for States and Civil Society*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Bowker, Robert. 1996. *Beyond Peace: The Search for Security in the Middle East*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Braudel, Fernand. 1972. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. English translation of second revised edition, London: William Collins Sons & Co.

Calleya, Stephen C. 1996. "Post-Cold War Regional Dynamics in the Mediterranean Area", *Mediterranean Quarterly* 3/7: 42-54.

Calleya, Stephen C. 1997. *Navigating Regional Dynamics in the Post-Cold War World: Patterns of Relations in the Mediterranean Area*. Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Checkel, Jeffrey. 1998. "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations," *World Politics* 50/1: 324-48.

Checkel, Jeffrey. 1998. "Social Construction and Integration," *Journal of European*

Public Policy 6/4: 545-60.

Choi, Young Jong and James. A. Caporaso. 2002. "Comparative Regional Integration," in *Handbook of International Relations* eds. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons. London:Sage: 480-99.

Cox, Robert W. 1983. "Gramsci, Hegemony, and International Relations: An Essay in Method," *Millennium* 12/2: 162-75.

Crawford, Beverly and Peter W. Schulze, eds. 1990. *A New Europe Asserts Itself: Europe's Changing Role in International Relations*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies

Crawford, Beverly. 2000. "The Bosnian Road to NATO Expansion," in *Journal of Contemporary Security Policy*. 21/2.

Deudney, Daniel. 1996. "Binding Sovereigns: Authorities, Structures, and Geopolitics in Philadelphian Systems," in Thomas J. Biersteker and Cynthia Weber, eds., *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:190-239.

Deutsch, Karl W., Sidney A. Burrell, Robert A. Kann, Maurice Lee, Jr., Martin Lichterman, Raymond E. Lindgren, Francis L. Loewenheim, Richard W. Van Wagenen. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fenech-Adami, Edward. 1995. "Mediterranean Security: A Maltese Perspective," *Mediterranean Quarterly* 6/1.

Fenech, Dominic.1997. "The Relevance of European Security Structures to the Mediterranean (and Vice Versa)", *Mediterranean Politics* 2/1:149-176.

Finnemore, Martha. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 391-416.

Ghebali, Victor-Yves. 1993. "Toward a Mediterranean Helsinki-Type Process," *Mediterranean Quarterly*. 4/1.

Gillespie, Richard, ed. 1994. *Mediterranean Politics*, London: Pinter.

Gillespie, Richard. 2001. "Spain and the Western Mediterranean," Working Paper 37/01 Economic and Social Research Council, Sussex European Institute.

Haas, Peter. 1990. *Saving the Mediterranean: The Politics of International Environmental Cooperation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. I, Trans. By Thomas MacCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Huntington, Samuel. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72/3: 22-49.

Huntington, Samuel. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Indyk, Martin. 1991/92 "Beyond the Balance of Power: America's Choice in the Middle East." *The National Interest*. Winter.

Jentelson Bruce W. and Dalia D. Kaye. 1997. "Explaining the Scope and Limits of Regional Security Cooperation: The Middle East ACRS Case." Paper prepared for the Annual Conference of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D. C., August 28-31.

Joffe, George. 1997. "Southern Attitudes Towards an Integrated Mediterranean Region", *Mediterranean Politics* 2/1:12-29.

Joffe, George. 2000. "Europe and the Mediterranean: The Barcelona Process Five Years On," RIIA Briefing Paper NO.16.

Joffe, George. 2001. "European Union and the Mediterranean," in Mario Telo, ed., *The European Union and the New Regionalism*. Burlington Vt.: Ashgate: 207- 225.

Katzenstein, Peter J. ed. 1996. *The Culture of National Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Katzenstein, Peter. 1996. "Regionalism in Comparative Perspective," *Cooperation and Conflict* 31/2: 123-59.

Kaye, Dalia Dassa. 2001. *Beyond the Handshake: Multilateral Cooperation in the Arab-Israeli Peace Process, 1991-1996*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kirisci, Kemal. 1997. "Post Gulf War Politics and Prospects of Cooperation in the Middle East." Paper presented to International Studies Association Annual Meeting, March.

Kramer, Martin. 1997. "The Middle East, Old and New." *Daedalus* 126/2.

Kratochwil, Friedrich. 1989. *Rules, Norms, and Decisions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Larrabee, Stephan F. and Carla Thorson. 1996. "Mediterranean Security: New Issues and Challenges." Conference Proceedings Brussels, October 15-17, 1995 Santa Monica, CA.

Lempert, Robert J. and Farnsworth, Gwen. 1994. "The Mediterranean Environment: Prospects for Cooperation to Solve the Problems of the 1990s," *Mediterranean Quarterly* 5/4.

Lynch, Marc. 1997. "Peace and the Construction of Regional Order." Paper presented to International Studies Association Annual Meeting, Toronto. March.

Mack, Andrew and Pauline Kerr. 1995. "The Evolving Security Discourse in the Asia-Pacific," *The Washington Quarterly* 18.

Marks, John. 1996. "High Hopes and Low Motives: The New Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Initiative," *Mediterranean Politics* 1/1 (Summer 1996).

Mercer, Jonathan. 1995. "Anarchy and Identity," *International Organization* 49: 229-52.

Neumann, Iver B. 1994. "A Region-Building Approach to Northern Europe," *Review of International Studies* 20: 53-74.

Onuf, Nicholas. 1989. *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. Columbia. University of South Carolina Press.

Peters, Joel. 1996. *Pathways to Peace: The Multilateral Arab-Israeli Peace Talks* London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Ruggie, John. 1998. *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization*. London: Routledge.

Salame, Ghassan. 1994. "The Middle East: Elusive Security, Indefinable Region." *Security Dialogue* 25/1.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2001. "The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union," *International Organization* 55/1: 47-80.

Selim, Mohammed al-Sayed. 1996. "Mediterraneanism: A New Concept in Egypt's Foreign Policy." Cairo: Al-Ahram Center for Strategic Studies.

Selim, Mohammed El-Sayed. 1997. "Egypt and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: Strategic Choice or Adaptive Mechanism?" *Mediterranean Politics* 2/1: 64-90.

Spencer, Claire. 1997. "Building Confidence in the Mediterranean", *Mediterranean Politics* 2/2: 23-48.

Tanner, Fred ed. 1994. *Arms Control, Confidence-Building and Security Cooperation in the Mediterranean, North Africa and the Middle East*. Valletta: The Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, University of Malta.

Tanner, Fred. 1996. "An Emerging Security Agenda for the Mediterranean", *Mediterranean Politics* 1/3: 279-294.

Thomas, Daniel C. 2001. *The Helsinki Effect: International Norms, Human Rights, and the Demise of Communism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tovias, Alfred. 1997. "The Economic Impact of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area on Mediterranean Non-Member Countries", *Mediterranean Politics*. 2/1:113-128.

Tovias, Alfred. 2001. "On the External Relations of the EU 21: The Case of the Mediterranean Periphery." *European Foreign Affairs Review* 6: 375-394.

Vasconcelos, Alvaro. 2001. "European Union and MERCOSUR" in Mario Telo, ed. *The European Union and the new Regionalism*. Burlington Vt.: Ashgate: 135-152.

Wendt, Alexander. 1994. "Collective Identity Formation and the International State," *American Political Science Review* 88: 384-96.

Wendt, Alexander. 1998. "On Construction and Causation in International Relations," *Review of International Studies* 24/5: 101-17.

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yetiv, Steve. 1997. "Peace, Interdependence and the Middle East." *Political Science Quarterly* 112/1.