

Tenier, Jacques, Acad, Political Science, France, Paris, “*Regionalisation and globalisation: a way to public action*”-P7

Jacques TENIER
Conseiller maître à la Cour des comptes française
Enseignant à l’IEP de Rennes

The event of Cancun

The meeting of WTO in Cancun in September 2003 was a great opportunity for the developing countries to make them heard on the world stage. I suspect the USA and the EU will not anymore be able to control the whole process of commercial negotiations. The European countries, the United States and Canada had plenty of time during the 19th and the 20th centuries to develop their industry, their agriculture, their services and to make them competitive worldwide. It took Western Europe forty years to organize its internal market and to provide its companies with increasing returns. The US have enlarged its market to Canada – which now exports 90 % of its products to the US – in 1988 (bilateral free trade agreement) and to Mexico in 1994 (NAFTA). Both movements have attracted to foreign investments and have increased the economic weight of these regions on the world market. At the same time, most developing countries have gone on trying desperately to increase their share in the world market. Some have greatly succeeded, particularly in Eastern Asia thanks to national policies favourable to investment in technology. Between the sixties and the eighties, this region of the world has been economically integrated by foreign and particularly Japanese investment. It has to be emphasized that commercial and financial regional integration does not need necessarily the creation of a legal organization. Some countries have not managed to compete in the world market, particularly in Africa but also in South America, in the Middle East, in Central and South Asia. China and India have made great progress in the nineties, China with a greater share of foreign investment, India on a more national basis. But their ability to make themselves heard on the world stage and in the international institutions (UNO, IMF, World Bank, WTO) still proves to be modest. The situation is far more uncomfortable for the less developed countries, such as most African countries but also states such as Bangladesh or Nepal. The mere continuation of the current state of play – ever increasing competitiveness of the most powerful economies – without any serious prospect for LDCs, looks perilous for world equilibrium and peace. Indeed, world inequalities have never been so great. According to UNDP, the income gap between the 20 % people living respectively in the richest and the poorest countries has increased from 30 to 1 in 1960, to 60 to 1 in 1990 and to 74 to 1 in 1997. Globalisation creates wealth but very unequally both between the countries and inside them. The richest 1% inhabitants of the US controlled 20 % of the wealth of the country in the 70s, they control about 40 % now¹.

I. THE ROLE OF THE ECONOMY

1.1. World economies and Worldwide economy

Globalisation is a powerful movement. It is not new. According to Fernand Braudel², both capitalism and globalisation were born around the 12th century. *World economies* appeared approximately at the same time in Europe, in the Indian Ocean, in the Islamic world and in China sea. A *world economy* is “*a piece of planet economically autonomous, with the ability to provide for its own needs and with internal relations bringing with them an organic unity to the regional space.*” A *world economy* is a hierarchized space with a kind of colonial relationship between centre and periphery. Before the great European conquests, these four *world economies* coexisted, meeting one another, particularly in the crossroads of “Insulindia”. The Swiss economist Sismondi gave the first definition of *worldwide economy* : “*mankind or part of mankind trading together and building today a single market.*” I think both definitions of *world economy* and *worldwide economy* are still relevant.

¹ Lester THURLOW, New York Times, 1st of August, 1996.

² Fernand BRAUDEL, “Material civilisation, economy and capitalism, 15th – 18th century. III. Time of the world”, Armand Colin, Paris, 1979.

We witness the acceleration of the building of the *worldwide economy* through a mix of technological innovations, political decisions and free movement of capital. Nowadays, more than 1 500 billion dollars are daily exchanged on currency markets versus 10 or 20 billion \$ in the 70s³. At the same time, *world economies* have not disappeared. On the contrary, they have increased or renewed their cohesion in the past ten years :

- The Americas are likely to build a global free trade area in the forthcoming years, gathering about 40 % of world GDP ;
- In May 2004, the European Union enlarged itself to ten Centre, Eastern European and Mediterranean countries (450 million inhabitants) ;
- Giving birth in 1995 to the Indian Ocean Rim Association for Regional Cooperation (IOR – ARC) with Eastern and Southern African countries, Australia, ASEAN, Southern Arabian countries and Iran, India renewed in some ways an Indian “world economy” ;
- Both the growing influence of China in the China sea and the objectives of the Asia Pacific Economic Caucus (APEC) – free trade between developed countries in 2010, between developing countries in 2020 – contribute to draw a Chinese – or Chinese- American – world economy.

Both movements – globalisation and *continentalisation* or *oceanization*⁴ – are powerful. It is both necessary and feasible to control and to balance them at a medium level between the nations and the world. *The regions of the world* constitute the level relevant to conceive and to enforce political priorities in a globalised economy. They offer the opportunity – maybe the last one – to take into account in our social organizations, not only economy but also the other three wealths “co-sharing” of space and time described by Fernand Braudel : Culture, society and politics. On these terms, it will be possible to preserve cultural diversity in the world and to progress towards a better world.

1.2. Current events in regional integrations

Events of the past few months prove the growing visibility of regional integrations and even of the relations they develop between them :

- 2004, January the 25th, agreement between India and Mercosur
- 2004, January the 6th, 12th summit of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Islamabad, Pakistan
- 2004, May, enlargement of the European Union (EU)
- 2004, October, summit of APEC, Santiago de Chile
- 2004, December, opening up of the negotiations for the adhesion of Turkey to the EU
- 2003 - 2005, installation of the Commission of the African Union (AU) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and of the Parliament in Johannesburg, South Africa
- 2004, May, Summit between the EU and Latin America in Guadalajara, Mexico
- 2004, October, 5th Asia – Europe Meeting (ASEM), Hanoi, Vietnam
- 2005, April, 50th birthday of the Bandung Conference, Afro – Asian Summit, ASEAN + 3 Meeting, Djakarta, Indonesia
- 2005, May, First Arab – South American Conference, Brasilia, Brasil

1.3. Free trade without politics

What is “the principle” of regional integration ?

The most obvious is a principle of opening up connected to a change of scale in capitalism. Free trade of goods, services and capital, increases market opportunities and gives a stimulus to foreign investment. *Regionalism and free trade have been closely linked*, particularly since the eighties. Even a regional customs union does not bring with it a decrease in the external trade. For instance, exchanges between the EU and Japan have grown faster than internal European trade since 1957. Free traders make a bad process to customs unions. Spain membership to the EU has been compatible with the development of its external trade. On the contrary, Mexico membership to NAFTA has brought with it a greater dependency on the United States (more than 80% of Mexican trade). In

³ UNDP, 2000.

⁴ Cf. JM Aznar’s project of a free trade area between the Americas and Europe.

the history of regionalism, it is true that some experiments have been driven in a protectionist way. I mean in Latin America in the sixties and in the seventies, under the impulse of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) with the concept of protective regionalism. The restart of regionalism in the eighties and in the nineties was organized under the auspices of free trade. Let us just take the example of the 90s :

- Signing of the treaty of Asuncion, March 1991, creation of Mercosur,
- opening of the European internal market, precisely, the 1st of January, 1993,
- signing of NAFTA in 1992,
- new free trade objective for ASEAN (Singapore agreement, January 1992) in 2008,
- December 1995, enforcement of SAPTA, the South Asian Preferential Trade agreement with the final objective of SAFTA (South Asian Free Trade Area).

The issue is, many organizations, particularly under the influence of the US (NAFTA, AFTA, APEC) take free trade for full settlement. For ideological reasons, they refuse any common policy and any strong institution. The market has to find itself its own equilibrium. But in which conditions ? Chapter 11 of NAFTA makes it possible for a company to sue a Member State, not only in case of nationalisation but also in case of a law which could bring with it a decrease in the forthcoming annual profits. Without any public correction, free trade between the strong and the weak further sharpens regional inequalities⁵. Investment goes into the more competitive areas (localisation, qualified labour, infrastructures), in Northern Mexico rather than in the poorer South, in Southern Brasil rather than in the poorer North-East. Capital is far more favoured than labour. In contradiction with liberal thought, free movement of workers is often prohibited. The result is, in Mexico, in the past ten years, a sharp increase in the concentration of national wealth : the richest 1% of the population increased its share of national GDP from 14 % up to 30 %. The wages share in Mexican GDP decreased from 40 % down to 24 %.

II. A WAY TO PUBLIC ACTION

There is one way to go beyond or beside free trade. That is, to make work another principle, complementary and, if necessary, rival to the principle of the opening up of markets, I mean, a principle of political foundation. In some regional integrations, one can see at work a principle of mind broadening, beyond national enclosures. I am no opponent to free trade but I guess that this possible intellectual disarmament – and not only tariff disarmament - contained in a regional project is far more important for the future of mankind. We have no right to miss this chance. One can ask some key questions to discover whether the regional project contains or not the seeds of a political ambition.

2.1. Peace is the first question

There is something else than free trade when two or several long belligerent countries contemplate developing in a coordinated way.

1950, May the 9th⁶, five years only after the end of World War II, the French Prime minister Robert Schuman urged the French and the Germans to join their productions of coal and steel, i.e. the means of their mutual destruction. It was an unprecedented initiative. The following year, France and Germany but also the three countries of Benelux and Italy decided to create the CSEC (Coal and Steel European Community). In fifty years, a war between Germany and France has become unthinkable. School exchange programmes such as town twinnings have developed. A French – German Youth Office was created in the sixties. A French – German TV Channel (ARTE) was launched in the eighties. The French president and the German chancellor meet at least once every three months and both countries have got an ever growing common legislation through the adoption of the European laws – approximately 60 % of the French legislation in economic matters and 80 % in environmental matters -.

It does not mean all problems have disappeared and recent history proves it may be difficult to overcome some obstacles, particularly when “ancient” history surfaces again. Unification of Germany in 1990 frightened French President Mitterrand and British Prime Minister Thatcher during a few months. War between Croatia and Serbia awoke the sympathy of Germany and France for their former allies during World Wars. But the European

⁵ French philosopher Lamennais, 19th century : “ *Between strong and weak, freedom oppresses and law makes free.*”

⁶ May, the 9th is now Europe feast-day.

countries decided precisely to overcome these difficulties by signing the Maastricht treaty and laying the foundations of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP).

What has still to be achieved is a europeanization of history and history teaching. European countries were at war during centuries. They stopped war but they go on magnifying great figures of national histories. I do not mean they have to forget their past. I just mean they still have to make the efforts to analyse it in a non-nationalistic way. French and German historians have created an Institute⁷ in order to develop a common approach of historical events. They did it for instance concerning the responsibilities in the starting of World War I. Polish historians have begun to join them and Polish politicians have begun to inspire themselves from the French - German experience as far as their relationship with Ukraina is concerned. For the first time in 2006, French and German teachers will be allowed to use a handbook written by historians of both countries. I pretend this is more important than the project of a constitution which was rejected this year by French and Dutch voters. The matter is no more to build Europe but to build Europeans.

What is at stake with regional integration is *the ability to share past and future.*

Twenty years ago, the South Asian Countries signed in Dacca the Charter of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. Just like in Europe, the merit of the leaders was great after the bloody partition of the British empire and after three Indo-Pakistanese wars. It is interesting to note that Bangladesh, born from two successive disintegrations, played a role of mediator between the forty year-long enemies. Peace opens the future. SAARC summits are a rare opportunity for Indian and Pakistanese leaders just to meet. I do not underestimate the gravity of matters in dispute between both countries. There was no summit of the Heads of State or Government between 1998 and 2001 whereas the Charter of Dacca deals with annual meetings⁸. India and Pakistan are nuclear powers with heavy territorial disputes. That makes a big difference with Europe. There is no common vision of strategic partnerships with the regional powers and particularly with China. However there is some change with the new common interest of struggle against terrorism. The easing of the relationship between India and China contributes to making a peaceful future for South Asia more realistic. The Charter of Dacca is already close to the Kuala Lumpur declaration (1971) and to the Treaty of amity and cooperation (1976) signed in Bali by ASEAN countries. The Treaty of Bangkok (1995) makes South East Asia a zone free of nuclear arms. One reason of hope is the participation of India to the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF, 1994) trying to remedy the absence, contrary to Europe, of a collective security mechanism in Asia. The Forum has invented, particularly in China sea, a preventive diplomacy and has taken *confidence-building measures*. Southern Asian countries but also Central Asian countries could take some inspiration from the diplomatic machinery of ARF. It could play the role of laboratory for whole Asia.

2.2. Diversity of objectives is the second question

The Treaty of Rome (1957) aims at an ever closer proximity between the peoples of Europe. The economic development is the outcome of free trade but also of common policies : competition, agriculture, regions, environment, infrastructure ... The Charter of Dacca (1985) aims at the well-being of the peoples of South Asia through : economic growth, social progress and cultural development, scientific and technical cooperation, promotion of common interests within international institutions. Free trade is neither the first, nor the only objective. It appeared only in 1995 with the signing of SAPTA. The evolution is close to ASEAN's, which was founded in 1967 on security grounds and which adopted in 1992 a free trade objective. This makes a big difference with NAFTA which is only interested in free trade.

2.3. Movement and settlement of people is the third question

All free trade agreements deal with free movement of goods, services and capital. There is a big difference between these agreements and the treaties which also deal with free movement of people. Economic prosperity may be sought through mobility of capital looking for comparative advantages, with the Member States keeping control of their nationals. NAFTA only deals with visa facilities for businessmen. In the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM), such facilities are granted to artists, musicians, sportsmen and graduates of the university. SAARC has extended the facilities from businessmen to cricket players. This cultural dimension is very important because it makes people dream together. It is the beginning of something else.

⁷ Georg Eckert Institute.

⁸ The 2005 Summit has been postponed because of the political situation in Nepal.

Free movement and free settlement of people in a regional space are the clear signs of a common political will. It just means the Member States are ready to contemplate their political future in a common way. Beside nationality, there appears something like a regional citizenship. I make the bet that is the way through politics in the globalized economy of the 21st century. The European Union began with free movement of workers and generally speaking, regional integrations working as common markets go up this way, such as the Common market of the South (Mercosur). They can go on deciding free movement of all nationals of the Member States within the regional space and even free movement of all people regularly established in one Member State. Only on these terms is a regional space effectively built. The Member States have to manage their outside border in a common way, such as in Europe with the Schengen treaty. That is not an obvious question in this time of terrorism. But one can also emphasize that terrorism takes profit by free movement of capital. One has not decided to end it in order to struggle against terrorism within national borders. On the contrary, international cooperation has got an impetus. I guess we can act the same way as regards movement of people.

2.4. Solidarity is the fourth question

Movement of workers brings with it comparisons of wages and social legislations, giving thus a new impetus to regional action through the harmonization of laws. On the contrary, a strictly commercial agreement leaves these matters aside. The market is also supposed to provide less developed countries and regions with a faster growth. In fact, that does not happen and investment concentrates in already favoured regions such as the industrial and urban heart of Western Europe, from London to Milan. *Only a policy of regional solidarity can balance the power of market.* Structural funds have highly contributed to development of Spain, Portugal, Greece and Ireland. Special investment in networks, in training of youth and workers and in the support of public authorities prove to be highly efficient. American style integrations deny the legitimacy of this kind of public action.

2.5. Financing of solidarity is the fifth question

One has to study the regional process according to the means devoted to it by the Member States. Most of regional integrations have no specific resources and have to work with contributions of the Member States just like any international organization. In case of a customs union, a part of common external tariffs is often devoted to the working and to the policies of the organization (EU, Western and Eastern Africa). Internal free trade brings with it a decrease in the budget resources of the Member States. In developing countries, it is often balanced by an increase in purchase taxes, particularly unfavourable to the workers. One cannot elude the debate about taxes in the States belonging to a regional organization as tariffs are sharply reduced, particularly in developing countries. Regional integration has a relationship with financing of solidarity both at a national level and at a regional level. In most countries, the taxation of capital has been severely alleviated in the past years at the expense of labour. Regional integration provides with the opportunity of defining *the different scales of solidarity and the different means of its financing.* The regional organization can tackle cross-border issues such as diseases, poverty, regional development, equality between men and women, protection of environment, struggle against natural disasters. It has thus to define the means of the financing, *either through regional banks or through regional budgets.* The question is whether the Member States are ready to provide the regional level with truly own resources such as regional taxes which could be part of value-added tax (Western Africa) or part of corporate taxes (still a project in Europe). A Common approach of taxation can be contemplated only if the Member States have agreed to take steps towards supranationality. It is a rather dramatic issue, making a big difference between the regional processes at work in the world.

III. THE ISSUE OF SUPRANATIONALITY

“Nations are not eternal. They begun, they will end. A European confederation will probably replace them. But that is not the law of our century.” The French politist Ernest Renan opened a European horizon to the French nation in a speech at the university La Sorbonne, March the 11th, 1882. The European project became a reality in the second half of the 20th century but only after two World Wars and a genocide. I believe in the promise of a continental horizon for the peoples of the world in the 21st century, *saving new wars between nations.*

3.1. Regional institutions building

There are few regional integrations which openly contain the vision of a shared supranational future. But I think this vision is going to spread in the forthcoming years. The Argentinian and Brazilian presidents have fixed the objective of a progressively united South America. The African Union has set up the first supranational institutions, a Commission and a Parliament.

Some processes just tackle commercial and financial integrations. But such integrations can be achieved without any geographical proximity. They are just an anticipation of worldwide free trade. The agreements can be driven by the foreign and trade ministers with a modest administrative secretariat. The national administrations and political systems remain untouched. The purpose is quite different when the Member States want their peoples to live in peace and to share the future. The Heads of State or Government are more solicited in the definition of the political direction of cooperation. But they can rely on intergovernmental cooperation mechanisms without creating specific institutions. That is the case for the moment with the SAARC Council of Foreign ministers acting as the political organ of the association and taking its decisions by consensus. In the diplomatic context of South Asia, it is quite difficult to contemplate the immediate creation of supranational institutions such as the European Commission, the European Parliament or the European Court of Justice. Meanwhile, the Member States have created Regional agencies (for meteorology, against tuberculosis, for documentation) which can pave the way to common policies and, through them, to a *common interest*⁹ which could be, at one time or another, driven by communitary institutions. SADC (Southern Africa Development Community) countries have decided to communitarize the institutions of the organization (Windhoek Summit, 2001).

3.2. Public action beyond national borders

Regional integrations can bring with them universal values and public action.

According to the philosopher Jean-Marc Ferry¹⁰ (Brussels University), the crucial issue is the ability of the citizens to have a regional claim against their government. This possibility puts an end to the face to face dialogue of the national citizen with his government. It means both the insertion of the Member States in a supranational legal order and a partial denationalization of citizens. Behind the technocratic appearances of regional processes, JM. Ferry discovers the formation of a "*cosmopolitan state of law*" which can contribute to the creation of new kinds of peoples. We have to agree on the definition of these new kinds of peoples : "*Speaking of a European people, I do not mean the abolition of national differences but the building of a common mind.*"

This is the point. Strengthening Europe versus North America is not sufficient to provide us with a global equilibrium. We need on the world stage the expression of other regional common minds. *National minds are not enough*. Mere efforts to strengthen China, India, Japan, Brasil, Mexico is not in itself a promise of a better world. The history of nations is too much a history of struggle and warfare. We need a mediation between the local and universal levels. The regional process can be that mediation, teaching the countries how to work together in order to increase their wealth but also to tackle the common problems of their populations (natural disasters, diseases, illiteracy, inequalities between men and women ...). Opening up of minds will have to be achieved in South Asia, in South America, in Western Africa, in East Asia and even in the Middle East. Building up the world on fairer bases requires the expression of these new common minds, partly denationalized, and in any case, disarmed. These regional minds will have to express themselves both at a regional level and on the world stage.

At a regional level, this means the formation of a public space. According to the philosopher Jürgen Habermas (Tübingen University), "*It is not illogical to think that the great movement of abstraction, so rich in its historical consequences, which lead from local and dynastic conscience to national and democratic one, will go on (...)*" A regional space needs institutions to organize it and actors to make it live. We do not have to create a full Regional State but rather to make different national institutions and regional networks work together, creating something like a "*grouping of communitary and intergovernmental institutions getting the initiative of the coordination of public policies*"¹¹.

If the organization remains in the hands of governments, it will not make a big difference from international organizations. There will be no "regionalisation" of minds, behaviours and then, policies. The NGOs, the trade unions, the students, the movements for equal rights between men and women can be actors on this new stage. They have to get into touch with their partners across the borders in order to start analysing the issues at stake and comparing the ways to cope with them. The regionalisation of minds will developed through sports, exchange of students, cities twinning, binational youth offices, people using bus and train lines across the borders. The decision of the Indian and the Pakistani governments to reopen bus lines in the North through Cachemire and train lines in the South between Gujarat and Sind is of great signification.

⁹ Inspired by a common spirit, according to JM. Ferry, *La question de l'Etat européen*, Gallimard, 2000.

¹⁰ JM. Ferry, Op. Cité.

¹¹ JM. Ferry, Op. Cité.

3.3. The renovation of the international system, partly on a regional basis

According to Jürgen Habermas, world population builds now “*an involuntary community of shared risks.*” Let us just think of terrorism, climate change, SRAS, Aids and chicken disease. Regional integrations provide the Member States with a greater influence on the world stage. Many countries have begun to speak “regionally” in the forums of WTO. This is the case of SAARC, IOR-ARC, the Community of East Africa, the CARICOM and the Gulf Cooperation Council.

International relations are likely to transform progressively in “interregional relations”. For instance, Europe has organized its relations with three continents : East Asia since 1996 with ASEM (Asia Europe Meeting), Latin America and the Caribbean since 1999¹² and Africa, in Cairo, 2001. In the Indian Ocean, interregional relations have also developed dramatically, between COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa), GCC (Gulf Cooperation Council of the Arab States), SAARC and IOR-ARC. This movement has to be recognized at the world level. We cannot go on as if the *regions of the world* did not exist and as if the nations were still the only actors of the global play. This is the best way to reinforce their submission to private interests.

Africa has decided to unite itself progressively making subregional groupings in Western, Eastern, Central, Southern and Northern Africa work together. The Member States have already decided to transform the African Unity Organization (AUO) into the African Union. The achievement of the African Economic Community (AEC) is forecast for 2025. This means the African countries have understood, forty years after their independence, that they cannot make themselves heard separately on the world stage. The average GDP of an African country amounts to the wealth of a town of 60 000 inhabitants in a North country. The equilibrium and the justice of the world need the voice of Africa just as the voices of South America and of the Indian subcontinent. We should reform the international system, at least partly on a regional basis. Africa, South Asia and South America becoming specific actors and developing relations with North America and with the European Union, the international role of the nations is likely to fade away or, more precisely, to intertwine with the world role of the regional integrations.

The UNO should be reorganized, opening up to continental or subcontinental integrations. One could imagine something like a federal parliament of the world. The first step could be the creation of a World Higher Assembly with a representation of regional integrations taking into account both the diversity of the continents and the number of the inhabitants. Such a creation could clear the way to a transformation of the composition of the Security Council. I cannot be satisfied with the project proposed in September 2005 to the General Assembly of the United Nations. To increase the number of big nations having a permanent seat in the Security Council is not a novation for the 21st century. The logic is very close to the 19th century balance of powers. The European Union should set the example. One day or another, France and Great Britain should accept to surrender to the EU their seat as a permanent member of the Security Council. To start with, France should share her seat with Germany. Taking this example into account, the issue of the access of new permanent members to the Council would not be considered in the same terms as today. This would not be the matter of India or of Brasil but the matter of South Asia and of South America. SAARC and the grouping of Mercosur and of the Andine Community as regional integrations could become permanent members of the Security Council. Just as they already prepare WTO meetings, the Member States of the regional integrations would prepare UN meetings to speak with a common voice. I imagine that these proposals still seem unrealistic. But realism is also on the side of the arms salers. Once again in 1945, the French and the German coal and steel producers would not have put together their means of production with a peaceful purpose if they had not been compelled to do so by inspired leaders. In the same way, the creation in 1985 of a common regional organization of the South Asian States was not very realistic. Whatever the difficulties, this project has proved to be well inspired and to lead the peoples of the region in a future of peace and common understanding. Sixty years after Hiroshima, India and Pakistan have decided to inform one another about any nuclear missile test and to set up a hot line between the ministries of foreign affairs. I am convinced that we can progress pragmatically and methodically towards a more balanced and a fairer organization of the world. We have just to make the choice of mind disarmament and of conscience broadening.

Jacques TENIER
Associate Professor

¹² Three summits were held, in Rio de Janeiro in 1999, in Madrid in 2002 and in Guadalajara in 2004. Next will be held in Vienna in 2006.

Institute for political studies
Rennes (Bretagne)
France

jacques.tenier@wanadoo.fr

INITIALS

AFTA : American Free Trade Area
APEC : Asia Pacific Economic Caucus
ARF : ASEAN Regional Forum
ASEAN : Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEM : Asia Europe Meeting
CARICOM : Caribbean Community and Common Market
COMESA : Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa
ECO : Economic Cooperation Organization
EU : European Union
IOR-ARC : Indian Ocean Rim – Association for Regional Cooperation
NAFTA : North America Free Trade Agreement
SAARC : South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BECK Ulrich, *Pouvoir et contre-pouvoir à l'ère de la mondialisation*, Flammarion, Paris, 2003.

BRAUDEL Fernand, *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme – 15^{ème}/18^{ème} siècle*, Armand Colin, Paris, 1979.

FERRY Jean-Marc, *La question de l'Etat européen*, Gallimard, Paris, 2000.

HABERMAS Jürgen, *La constellation post-nationale et l'avenir de la démocratie*, Fayard, Paris, 2000.

SENARCLENS Pierre (de), *Mondialisation, souveraineté et théories des relations internationales*, Armand Colin, Paris, 1998.

TENIER Jacques, *Intégrations régionales et mondialisation*, La Documentation française, Paris, 2003.