An Empirical Test of Theories of World Divisions and Globalization Processes: An International and Comparative Regional Perspective

Paulette Lloyd
Princeton Institute for International & Regional Studies
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ
plloyd@ucla.edu

Paper presented to the conference "Regionalisation and the Taming of Globalisation", University of Warwick, Coventry, England, 26-28 October 2005

******* WORK IN PROGRESS *******

Draft Version: October 14, 2005

PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT AUTHOR'S PERMISSION

Abstract

This study examines the new world divisions and polarizations that have emerged in the post-Cold War era. We draw on Michael Mann's model to distinguish four key areas of social power—ideological or cultural, economic, military, and political—one or more of which are privileged in competing theories of world division. The empirical evidence centers on United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) roll call votes in the decades before and after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and on state memberships in important international and macro-regional organizations. Two approaches to measuring similarity were used: social network and correspondence analysis. The former focused on the eigenvector centrality method recently modified to incorporate negative relations. A new graphing algorithm that distinguished negative and positive ties revealed both the network of power and the particular pattern of polarization in each of the four areas. These networks were compared within and across regions to explore whether globalization has impacted regions differentially or uniformly through a predominant globalization process.

In addition to creating a new dataset on UNGA voting, the study reaches several important conclusions. First, the Cold War structure has transformed into more complex alignments than others have argued. The data show a North-South division, not just about economic issues but about human rights, with development issues central to both. Second, while there is an Islamic bloc, it is primarily based on two issues—Israel/Palestine and gender. Third, there is a very solid, expanding EU, while the United States is somewhat isolated except as a military coordinator. Fourth, several other macro-regional organizations are becoming important mechanisms of economic integration, cultural diffusion, and enhancement of security and democratization. Finally, globalization processes are having differential effects within and across regions. (Europe is strongly integrated while Latin America is less cohesive.) The implications are that globalization processes are too complex and in flux to support a single paradigm such as clashing civilizations. Oversimplifying the dimensions of global structure is misleading, with potentially disastrous consequences for foreign policy.

INTRODUCTION

What is the structure of the post-Cold War world? The dissolution of the Soviet Union marking the end of the Cold War authority structures intensified the search for a new paradigm or theory to explain new world divisions and polarizations. It is assumed that the end of a rival bloc to Western power created a vacuum in political relations that led to wide-scale political changes on the national and international levels. It is also assumed that the removal of structural impediments to global capitalism reignited globalization processes that had been stymied by Cold War power relations. Social scientists have offered a broad range of theories in an attempt to describe the complexity of the post-Cold War world. The term globalization is most often used. The number of scholarly articles and mass media references to globalization has grown consistently since 1990—with a notable spike in 2001—but the phenomenon remains poorly defined. In general, those seeking to explain globalization privilege one social dimension such as culture or the economy—although several social scientists argue for multiple globalization processes (Held and McGrew, 2000; Guillen, 2001; Mann, 2001, 2004). Competing theories of world division generally privilege one dimension. Most notable are the cultural explanations of Samuel Huntington and world polity theorists and the economic explanations of world systems theorists. All theories hypothesize about the changing role of the state, from the more state-centric arguments of Huntington or world polity theorists to globalization theorists who see the demise of the state in the face of various transnational forces.

The goal of this paper is to mediate among these theories of world divisions using an empirical and structural approach as a first step in a larger project to develop a theory of globalization. It is assumed that globalization processes have impacted all levels of social life, and has given rise to new conflicts and divisions. Given the policy implications of acting on assumptions about what is driving conflict and social upheaval, it is critical to empirically test these assumptions. Given the complexity of globalization processes, no single study can provide more than a glimpse into one aspect of post-Cold War social change. Therefore, I limit the scope of this paper to examining changes in divisions among states while reflecting on hypotheses derived from competing theories of world division to see how well they might explain new cleavages. I begin with a brief review of competing theories of world division.

COMPETING THEORIES OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization remains very much of a black box. There have been several attempts to categorize the major themes and debates (notably Guillen 2001 and Held and McGrew 2000). Many of the debates center on whether globalization is singular—frequently privileging culturalistic or economistic explanations—or plural. Debates also center on the origin of globalization processes. Some argue that globalization dates back to the 19th century but was not defined until the 1960s as a way to explain "rapidly expanding political and economic interdependence" especially between Western states (Held and McGrew 2000:1). Others argue that globalization is a process involving the extension of social relations over the globe that has proceeded for centuries (Mann 2004). Although the starting point is debated, it is generally agreed that the collapse of the Soviet Union and the consolidation of capitalism combined with the rapid spread of the

information revolution intensified globalization processes making this a good focus point for our paper.

It is also generally agreed that globalization has material, spatio-temporal, cognitive and structural aspects. Material aspects include flows—trade, capital and people across national borders which are facilitated by infrastructure, norms (trade rules for example), and cultural symbols such as language. These establish regular conditions for global interdependencies. Spatio-temporal aspects denote the "stretching of social relations and activities" across states and macro regions which create local impacts of global transactions and the consequences of "distant occurrences and developments" domestically and vice versa (Held and McGrew 2000). Mann identifies "five socio-spatial networks of social interaction" in the contemporary world: local networks (subnational networks of interaction); national networks (bounded by the nation-state); international networks (these include inter-state relations regarding "hard geopolitics" such as alliances, war and peace as well as negotiations between states on "soft geopolitics" like tax treaties, air pollution, etc.); transnational networks (these include religious sects organized across countries or distinctions such as Christian Democratic or corporatist forms of contemporary social organizations—both 'forms' are unaffected by national boundaries); and global networks such as the feminist movement and the Catholic Church which are present in most countries but may be located in small groups within a country or in certain regions. These are distinguished from capitalism which is diffused more globally through economic and social life (Held and McGrew 2000:137). The cognitive aspect includes an awareness of the effect of distant events on different levels of life from the local to the national (and vice versa) and a sense of time and space compression (Held and McGrew 2000). Structural aspects include changes in power networks, and assumptions about the separation between national and inter-national spheres as well as between the local and the global (Held and McGrew 2000).

These concepts suggest a structure to globalization processes which includes the idea of multiple, interrelated sociospatial networks interacting together across all dimensions of social life. This structure is suggestive of Michael Mann's theory of society as constitutive of "multiple overlapping and intersecting sociospatial networks of power" with differential effects and principles of integration which are not likely to be changed by globalization processes (Mann 1986:1-3). These networks of power are based on the interrelations of what he refers to as the four sources of social power: ideological, economic, military, and political ("IEMP"). "These are (1) overlapping networks of social interaction, not dimensions, levels, or factors of a single social totality… (2) They are also organizations, institutional means of attaining human goals. Their primacy comes not from the strength of human desires for ideological, economic, military, or political satisfaction but from the particular organizational means each possesses to attain human goals, whatever these may be"…The four sources of social power offer alternative organizational means of social control (Mann 1986:1-3).

Ideological power derives from meaning and norms; organizations such as religion incorporate shared understandings required for stable social cooperation. Economic power derives from social organization focused on the satisfaction of subsistence needs. The social organization of extraction, distribution and consumption varies historically. Marxists focused on labor as the source of social power while neo-Weberians focus on the organization of economic exchange. Military power is derived

from organized physical defence while political power derives from state power. Political power is "sociospatially dual"; nationally it is territorially-bounded; inter-nationally it is focused on geopolitical diplomacy (Mann 1986, 1993). We use Mann's conceptualization of separate socio-spatial networks of power as an organizational and analytical frame to examine competing theories of ideological, economic, military and political globalizations.

Ideological globalization

World polity theory and Samuel Huntington's clash of civilizations thesis represent two are examples of ideological power. The first sees the evolution of a universal cultural norm of human rights while the latter sees world divisions and potential conflict based on cultural differences. Although there are other perspectives, our data limits our focus to evidence of divisions based on culture and shared norms.

World Polity Theory

While many theories of globalization assume the declining importance of the state, World Polity Theorists ("WPT") believe states remain central rational actors in the globalization process but they are shaped by a world culture that "is highly rationalized and universalistic" (Meyer, Boli, Thomas and Ramirez 1997:153). This world culture is shaped by a "central world organizational frame" that developed following World War II, which includes the UN system and related organizations such as the IMF, World Bank, and GATT/WTO, all contributing to at least limited international security, economic development, individual rights and advances in medicine, science, and education (Meyer et al. 1997:163). This is combined with a large number of nongovernmental organizations ("NGOs") that have "a social movement character" promoting human rights, social and economic development, and a range of issues covering social life at the world level. Counter to arguments that international nongovernmental organizations ("INGOs") have undermined the state, world polity theorists believe they have contributed to a world polity that helps shape the nation state (Boli and Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2002; Meyer, Boli, Thomas and Ramirez, 1997).

WPTs assume that any emerging state will embrace all of the "features of the rational actor: territorial boundaries and a demarcated population, sovereign authority, self-determination, and responsibility; standardized purposes like collective development, social justice, and the protection of individual rights; authoritative, law-based control systems; clear possession of resources such as natural and mineral wealth and a labor force; and policy technologies for the rational means-end accomplishment of goals" (Meyer et al. 1997:153). This occurs through multiple mechanisms. First, they would likely adopt a constitution legitimized through the international community, such as the United Nations, of which they are likely to become a member. This institution has multiple agencies addressing, advising and monitoring human rights, development, education, health, weapons and a number of other areas of global importance. Second, educational systems have a widely accepted form and curriculum that can be adapted to local cultures but have highly similar structures and goals. They note that world society impacts nation-states through three processes: construction of identity and purpose; maintenance of voter identity; and legitimation of sub-national units such as individuals and organized interests (Meyer et al. 1997:157). These global processes affect both core

and peripheral states but the impact can vary depending on both local resources and organizational capacities of the state.

World polity theorists admit that rejection of world cultural principles does occur, especially by nationalist or religious movements, but their "oppositions to modernity are seen as a threat to geopolitical stability" providing evidence that these movements intensify isomorphism more than they resist it (Meyer et al. 1997:161). This gives rise to conflict centered on contradictions and inconsistencies between individuals and groups or organizations and national collectivities and in "cultural goods" such as "equality versus liberty, progress versus justice, standardization versus diversity, efficiency versus individuality" (Meyer et al. 1997:172). These contradictions are mediated at different levels—local, national and world society—creating different variants of world cultural models.

World polity theorists have undertaken considerable empirical studies which they believe supports their world-society model. For example, studies have found that "nation-states are more isomorphic than most theories would predict and change more uniformly than is commonly recognized" (Meyer et al. 1997:173). They do not believe any other social theory can account as well for a system of autonomous, formally equal nation states which adopt standard identities and structural forms with a minimum of coercion or control (Meyer et al. 1997:173). They believe part of the evolution was in the level of devastation of World War II and the Cold War, both of which pushed for global models of progress and justice "rooted in universalistic scientific and professional definitions that have reached a level of deep global institutionalization" (Meyer et al. 1997:174). They conclude that recent evidence of violations of world-cultural principles such as genocide and stagnant development only bolster world-cultural institutions because of global reactions to correct them. They cite this as evidence of integration rather than disintegration.

I derive the following hypotheses from world polity theory:

H_1: As states become members of the UN, they are pressured and influenced to adhere to international norms of human rights. This is evidenced in an increase in Freedom House scores of political rights and civil liberties.

H_2: States will become increasingly similar on voting on resolutions related to human rights across all cultural and regional boundaries, regardless of levels of development.

Samuel Huntington's clash of civilizations thesis:

Samuel Huntington (1993a, 1993b, 1996) also believes that nation-states remain central actors in the world, but that they are increasingly divided into competing civilizations as a way to maintain their cultural, political and economic boundaries—a type of protection in a world stretched by advances in technology and the removal of Cold War political constraints. Embedded in this view are the idea of potential conflict and the realist's anarchical view of the international system. Huntington believes that "culture and cultural identities, which at the broadest level are civilizational identities, are shaping pattern of cohesion, disintegration, and conflict in the post-Cold War world" (Huntington 1996:20). These civilizational identities have replaced Cold War polarizations and represent potential for major conflict, but that it is possible to create a peaceful world order based on "civilizational détente" (my interpretation of his argument; see Huntington 1996:321). Huntington believes the end of the Cold War brought essential

changes in the identities of people, evidenced by a the number of local and national expressions of inter-group rivalry—Muslims in Sarajevo in 1994; Mexicans (and presumably Mexican-Americans) in Los Angeles asserting Mexican nationalism (which he feels resulted in the Proposition 187 backlash; see Huntington 1996:19). These illustrate the importance of cultural identity on the local and national levels, with ethnicity dominant at the local level and civilizations at the national level. He does not examine the counter-thesis that ethnic conflict and internal wars are evidence of the continual salience of nationalism (see Mann 2005).

Huntington defines nine major contemporary civilizations: Sinic, Japanese, Hindu, Islamic, Orthodox, Western (including Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand), Latin America, Buddhist and African (possibly). He notes that most civilization scholars do not recognize a distinct African civilization. The North and East coast of Africa belongs to the Islamic civilization; Ethiopia, like Japan, is a lone-state civilization; most of the south of Sahara is Christian as a result of European colonization, and there are strong African tribal identities through out Africa. Nevertheless, he sees an emerging African identity with the potential of sub-Saharan Africa evolving into a distinct civilization with South Africa a possible core state (Huntington 1996:47). Of these nine civilizations, Huntington focuses on potential clashes between the West and Islam and the West and China. Huntington is careful to note that he has not developed a theory, merely attempted to establish a new paradigm that can account for the post-Cold War conflict. Others have undertaken empirical studies in an attempt to test several of his claims. Several of these studies focused on examining a rise of inter- as compared to intra-civilizational conflict (Russett, Oneal, and Cox, 2000; Henderson and Tucker, 2001; Gurr, 2000).

Bruce Russett and colleagues found greater support for "traditional realist influences" such as "contiguity, alliances, and relative power, and liberal influences of joint democracy and interdependence" as explanations for interstate conflict than civilizational conflicts (Russett et al. 2000:583). Overall, they found that similarity in language and ethnicity is more likely to increase the likelihood of inter-state conflict (Russett et al. 2000:588).They found that geographical contiguity, military allies, having strong military capability, and economic interdependence (modest effect) inhibits conflict. They also found that two democracies are the least likely to fight while a democracy and an autocracy are more prone to fight in the post-WWII era. They did not find evidence of conflict over civilizational boundaries, whether contiguous or not. In fact, they found that civilizational conflicts decreased as the Cold War waned (Russett et al. 2000:594-5). Huntington criticized the study for not including more post-Cold War years in the time period studied (see debate in Foreign Affairs, 1993a, b).

Russett et al also compared levels of conflict between civilizations and found that overall, the West is the most internally peaceful civilization, and the Sinic, Buddhist, Islamic and African civilizations have the most conflict among their members (Russett et al. 2000:596). The Islamic states were the most dispute prone—both on its borders and internally. They also found support for Huntington's claim that the "most dangerous division is between the 'West and the rest'" but they found that the real issue between the West and Islam "is simply the familiar Arab-Israeli conflict" (Russett et al. 2000:597). Finally, the authors found that civilizations help shape the pattern of alliances but variations in formal security arrangements are unaccounted for. They also did not find

sufficient impact on trade or the degree of democracy of a state to support the claim that civilizational differences and similarities are major indirect influences on the incidence of militarized disputes. They conclude that civilizations do not make the difference; but liberal and realist influences do (Russett et al. 2000:601). Finally, they found that in general, military, political and economic interests provided a better explanation of interstate violence; democracy and economic interdependence accounted for more than culture (Russett et al. 2000:602). They conclude that these results are encouraging, as civilizations can be difficult to change, but extending democracy and economic interdependence is possible.

Inglehart and colleagues (Norris and Inglehart, 2002; Inglehart and Norris, 2003) took a different approach to empirically examine Huntington's claims. They tested hypotheses derived from Huntington's thesis using survey data on attitudes, with a particular focus on the correlation between Islam and democracy.[1] They concluded that culture does matter and that religious legacies play a role in contemporary values. The dividing issue for Islamic and non-Islamic societies, however, was not democracy but gender equality and sexual liberalization. They also found cross-cultural differences regarding the role of religious leaders in politics and society between the West and many other countries. Countries sharing a Western Christian heritage, especially those with representative democracy, have sharp cultural differences in core political values from countries which lack these traditions, particularly Islamic states. Unique to and defining Western civilization are the combination of "separation of religious and secular authority, the rule of law and social pluralism, the parliamentary institutions of representative government, and the protection of individual rights and civil liberties as the buffer between citizens and the power of the state" (Norris and Inglehart, 2002:3; Huntington 1996:70-71). They also found sub-regional divisions within major world religions, noting that different historical traditions and political legacies made a difference in the impact of Catholicism on Western Europe and Latin America (Norris and Inglehart 2002:3).

Finally, the authors found several alternative explanations for deep inequalities within societies and demographic characteristics such as a preponderance of youth that could influence political attitudes. They note that Middle Eastern area specialists attribute the diversity of attitudes between and within Islamic states such as Pakistan, Jordan, Azerbaijan, Indonesia, Bangladesh, and Turkey and to levels of economic development, ethnic cleavages, and historical traditions. This is not unlike the level of diversity in countries defined by Western Christianity (Norris and Inglehart, 2002: 4). They concluded that the factors accounting for changes in prevailing values as well as differences in levels of democracy were related to economic development (Inglehart and Norris 2003:71). Kenneth Bollen (1983) also found economic development had a positive effect on political democracy.

The data in this study is not suited to examine interstate conflicts but we can explore what factors appear to influence voting similarity through state attributes like level of democracy and economic development. We also examine military, political and economic alliances that reflect common values, norms and state interests. These factors can address Huntington's claims that differences in economic and political progress between former Soviet bloc countries are based on religion, i.e., greater progress is attributed to states possessing a Western Christian heritage than to states with dominant

[1] Huntington claimed that Islam lacked an affinity with democracy (1996).

Muslim populations. Of course, deeper historical studies are required to establish why the Former Soviet Union ("FSU") Central Asian countries were not invited to become members of the EU. The case of Turkey implicates cultural and religious factors as an impediment to solidarity, not to acceptable levels of democracy. It also reflects historical alliances, natural resources, prospects for trade, demographics, and degree of integration with other countries in the region, reflecting the complexity of state relations and bases for conflict. An example of this is reflected in a case Huntington tries to make regarding the impact of civilizational differences in the Cold War period. He notes that the Cold War paradigm did not account for the Sino-Soviet split, attributing it to cultural differences, but it can as easily be explained by traditional balance of power interests. China sought ties with the West (counter to a civilizational argument) to reduce Soviet influence in the region when the Soviet Union involved itself in conflicts in Cambodia, China's traditional ally. The US policy of "trilateral diplomacy" played off of these differences to advantage US interests.

In summary, the studies testing Huntington's thesis offer counterfactual hypotheses based on different empirical studies centered on militarized disputes and values. We derive the following (data specific) hypotheses from Huntington's thesis:

H_1: Countries with greater cultural affinities will cooperate economically, militarily, and politically, and this will be reflected in shared memberships in economic, military, political and cultural organizations.
H_2: There is a correlation between democracy and level of development.
H_3: The Cold War Sino-Soviet split was due to cultural (civilizational) differences rather than balance of power concerns.
H_4: There is a greater tendency for states to vote similarly based on levels of development than on cultural or civilizational issues.
H_5: There will be a clear division in voting between Western and non-Western states, particularly on ideological issues.
H_6: There is greater cooperation (and therefore similarity in voting on resolutions) between countries which share cultural affinities. Therefore, we expect to see voting similarity between Islamic countries across regions on all issues than among countries within the same region containing more than one civilization. About 53 percent of African states are Islamic, therefore we expect to see divisions in voting between Islamic and Christian African states. Similarly, we expect to see a strong voting similarity among former Soviet Union (FSU) Islamic Central Asian countries and other Islamic countries, net other factors such as historical alliances and political history.

Economic globalization

Like globalization in general, there are disagreements over the conceptualization of economic globalization. Although not specifically an economic globalization theory, world systems theorists have adapted the theory to address globalization arguments. World systems theorists Chase-Dunn, Kawano, and Brewer (2000) define economic globalization as "greater integration in the organization of production, distribution, and consumption of commodities in the world economy" with an increasing worldwide density of large-scale interaction networks relative to the density of smaller networks" (Chase-Dunn et al. 2000:77-8). These include increasing global and interregional

political, military and economic organizations (such as the World Bank and IMF) underlined by a hegemonic political ideology—neoliberalism—that promotes "marketization and privatization as solutions to the world problems" (Chase-Dunn et al. 2000:77). Although they include noneconomic institutions in their framework, they argue that all institutional structures are "fundamentally cultural inventions" and that distinguishing between them is useful only for heuristic purposes (Chase-Dunn et al. 2000:77). Not all world systems theories are as economistic; we explore other world systems perspectives below and then focus on more general economic globalization theories.

World Systems Theory

Traditional world system theory posits core, periphery, and semiperiphery states which have power-dependence linkages. The core (comprised of Western Europe, Japan, and North America) dominates global economic networks. Peripheral states (comprised of the majority of less developed states in Latin America, Africa, and Asia) are dependent and disadvantaged relative to the core. These states typically have weak domestic economies and tend to have commodity exports highly concentrated in primary products. They also experience higher levels of poverty, environmental problems, and higher population growth relative to the core, and they are technologically and educationally disadvantaged with significant segments of labor force engaged in agrarian activities. This combination results in economic stagnation and a lack of mobility. The ties they share with the core are asymmetric. Semiperipheral states (comprised of the Middle East, parts of Latin America and Asia) occupy an intermediate position in the global structure and therefore have characteristics of both the core and periphery. They have asymmetric ties to the core but "favorable power asymmetries with the periphery" (Kick and Davis 2001:1563). These states are rapidly industrializing, they exchange finished goods for raw products of periphery and they are economically dependent on the core through foreign investment. Their citizens are moderately well educated and technically advantaged.

There have been many variants of world system theory which are not solely focused on the economic dimension (Chase-Dunn, 1989; Chase-Dunn and Hall, 1991; Chase-Dunn, Kawano, and Brewer, 2000; Chirot and Hall. 1982; Kick and Davis, 2001; Snyder and Kick, 1979; and Wallerstein, 1974). Ronald Breiger (1981) explored the macro-structural conception of WST by investigating whether core, peripheral and semiperipheral positions can be determined solely by their structural position in international exchange networks. He questioned if the same pattern would occur in other types of exchange such as capital flows, military interventions and trade and how these patterns might interlock. He found competing cores within a group of 24 OECD countries.

In a similar vein, Kick and Davis (2001) examined eight different ties reflecting economic, political, military, sociocultural and technological dimensions for two periods: 1960-5 and 1970-5, reflecting the postwar colonial era and the "truly modern world system" respectively (Kick and Davis 2001:1562). They found a world structure that varied from the conventional world system described by Wallerstein, prompting them to evaluate the implications for domestic economic trajectories. First, they found a core of Western industrial countries and their ties dominated the world system in economic,

transportation, communications, sociocultural, political and military networks. Members of the core are the primary exporters and importers; they provide central aid, represent a cultural center and they are the focus of communication and world transportation (Kick and Davis 2001:1566-8). Second, they found that the world economy is just one dimension of several transnational interactions of the world system which includes trade flows, economic, diplomatic, and sociocultural treaties which impact political and military relations (Kick and Davis 2001:1565). For example, the flow of information regarding political, economic and strategic conditions depends on political ties. In times of political conflict, there is a reduction of information flows. Third, they found an important difference in the structure of the world system in the two time periods, suggesting the importance of historical factors. In the first time period, they found divisions within the semiperiphery based on distinctions between capitalist and socialist countries. In the second time period, they found relations between states were consistent with more standard world-system theory. The core was again composed of Western industrial states, and there was a socialist and capitalist semicore; with the remaining states part of the "true" semiperiphery and periphery. This time period revealed "significant transideological trade ties that integrated socialist states into the capitalist world economy" suggesting the importance of non-economic factors (Kick and Davis 2001:1568).

Alternative views of Economic Globalization Processes

Several recent studies suggest a core group of Western countries (or the "global North") dominates economic activities, suggesting trilateralism or Northernization is a better description of global economic structures. Mann found that most capitalist activity is concentrated in the three regions of the advanced 'north': Europe, North America and East Asia (Held and McGrew 2000:139). These three areas "contain over 85 percent of world trade, over 90 percent of production in advanced sectors like electronics, plus the headquarters of all but a handful of the top 100 multinationals (including banks)" (Held and McGrew 2000:139). He also notes growing inequalities within nation-states, except that most citizens of the global North enjoy more wealth and protection than citizens of the global South; that nation-states provide some of the "stratification structure" of the global capitalist networks; that the global economy is loosely regulated by international organizations like G7, GATT, the World Bank and the IMF which are northern-dominated; and that the struggle between free trade and protectionism continues, marked by negotiations of trade liberalization and followed by the raising of non-tariff barriers by governments (Held and McGrew 2000:140).

A recent study by Centeno, Curran, Galloway, Lloyd and Suresh (2005) comparing the changes in the structure of world trade at three time points (1980, 1991, 2001) also found a consistent core of Western industrialized states. They also found an increased marginalization of African countries after 1990. They did not explore reasons for this further marginalization, but it correlates with the Kick and Davis finding that African states were not integrated into the global economy, speculating their lack of ties to states in other positions was partially responsible. More recent arguments speculate about changes in the core, periphery and semi-periphery structure of trade due to globalization processes, specifically, the fragmentation of production processes that cut across national boundaries (Held and McGrew 2000:251). This and arguments about

globalization resulting in a new global division of labor are beyond the scope of this paper to test. Because of our data, we limit our focus to exploring structural patterns of interaction and the bases for similarity in voting on economic issues. We are interested in whether there is regional variation, a general North-South divide or whether other more spatially delimited processes better describe current economic divides, such as Northernization, trilateralism, or regionalization. We examine these in more detail below.

Trilateralism. Some skeptics posit a "triadization" of the world economy, represented by three core blocs (Europe, the Americas and Asia-Pacific), each with its own center and periphery, and marked by more interdependence within the three blocs than integration between them (Held and McGrew 2000:20). They believe this trend is reinforced by the growing regionalization of economic activity from organizations such as ASEA, NAFTA, EU, MERCOSUR and APEC. Manuel Castells believes this triad of tightly interdependent networks between the USA, Japan, and Western Europe is a better representation of the global economy than the WST concept of a center, semi-periphery, and a periphery. This is due to an increasing concentration of technological capacity, capital, markets, and industrial production in the OECD countries (Held and McGrew 2000:265). Others argue that there is an increasing differential of economic growth and social conditions in all areas and within all countries and this spells an end to the Third World (Held and McGrew 2000:267). They see an increase in development processes which are improving the lives of people in many parts of Asia and Latin America but note that there continues to be large segments of the world which are left out of the economic process altogether. They also believe new international divisions of labor are not located within countries but "organized in networks and flows, using the technological infrastructure of the informational economy" (Held and McGrew 2000:268). Countries left out of the technological infrastructure of the informational economy are presumably further marginalized by the global economy.

Northernization. Mann believes the growth of Japanese and European economies has created what he calls "macro-regional trilateralism" resulting in a "Northern" rather than US economic hegemony. These Northern countries composed of North America (dominated by the US), the European Union and Japan-led East Asia "provide over 80% of world production, trade and finance—and over 95% of economic research and development" (Mann, 2004:8). He sees global capitalism as a "complex mix of the local, the national, the international (…northern trilateralism)—and the truly transnational" (Held and McGrew 2000:140). He notes that until recently, the US controlled the World Bank, and it continues to hold the only bloc vote in the IMF, allowing it to veto any policy.

This situation occurred through three waves of economic development and has resulted in exploitation—essentially economic imperialism—of parts of the South. The first wave of economic development occurred after 1945 and involved Southern Europe, Japan and the "Little Tigers of East Asia." This transformed "a privileged and fairly integrated 'West' into a privileged and fairly integrated 'North'" (Mann 2004:10). The second wave began in the late 1980s and included China and India with China absorbing over half of the Northern investment into the South. The third wave incorporated much of Asia but also several Eastern European economies (the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary) and a few South and Central American countries like Chile and Mexico (Mann 2002:3). These countries have not really prospered as a result of integration because of

neoliberal policies forced on their economies and because of unequal exchange due to trade rules more favorable to the North. Debt from interest rates has resulted in structural adjustment programs which affect states expenditures, welfare programs, labor market regulation and tariffs, creating at times a negative net economic effect. Mann notes a "third tier" of Southern countries including Sub-Sahara Africa and some Middle Eastern and South American countries which are essentially excluded from economic integration because they are poor credit risks for foreign investment and international trade.

Regionalization. Regionalism can have multiple meanings which include geographical; representative of a social system (implying translocal relations); a "security complex" where states depend on one another for political stability and security; organized cooperation in cultural, political or military fields (example is SAARC--South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation--but not ASEAN which organized capitalist countries in contradistinction to communist countries); as regional civil society representing a convergence of values throughout the region; or as "*acting subject* with a distinct identity, actor capability, legitimacy, and structure of decision-making" as in the transformation of the EC into the EU. The ultimate outcome at this level would be a "region-state" comparable to classical empires but involving "voluntary evolution of sovereign national political units into a supranational community to which certain functions are transferred" (Hettne 2000:157-8). There are also differences in the meaning of regionalism in the Cold War context (bipolar) and the post-Cold War context (multipolar) centered on whether super-powers imposed it "from above" or whether nation-states impose it "from within". An example of the latter is Europe, which Hettne uses as his model or paradigm for the "new" or post-Cold War regionalism (Hettne 2000:159).

Hettne views the relationship between globalization and regionalization forces as central to a situation where economic action is now on a global scale but where formal political authority is lacking. He sees regionalism as a possible approach to 'a new multilateralism' and in contrast to the bilateralism promoted by the US which discourages regionalism out of fear of trade protectionism. The end of the Cold War security order changed economic organizations such as EC, EFTA, and COMECON, opening the way for greater regional cooperation and providing stability to an international system assumed to be anarchic—or under US hegemony (Hettne 2000:162). Regionalism is also seen as a mechanism to help national economies compete in global markets and manage challenges brought by the growth of multi-national corporations and world financial markets and issues of global environmental degradation. They believe this can reorder traditional North-South divisions and the core-periphery model of economic relations (Held and McGrew 2000).

International organizations such as the UN promote regionalization through the Economic and Social Council Regional Economic and Social Commissions. The 1999 United Nations Development Project ("UNDP") Report expressed the belief that stronger local, national, macro-regional and global governance is needed in order for all countries to benefit from globalization (Held and McGrew 2000:341-7).

This study will focus on what divisions emerge from economic structures created out of voting similarity among states on economic issues. We are interested whether the divisions represent the greatest difference between the global North or global South, whether there is evidence of regionalization, or whether there is evidence of a core group

of Western or "Northern" countries and on what bases these divisions rest. We derive the following hypotheses that can be tested with our particular data set:

In the Cold War period,

H_1: There will be greater similarity in voting among countries based on political ideologies, with the strongest division between Communist and Democratic states.

In the post-Cold War period,

H_1: There will be greater similarity in voting among countries with shared memberships in international and regional economic organizations such as ASEAN, CARICOM, COMECON, EU, FSU, G7, G77, MERCUSOR, and NAFTA.

H_2: There will be a strong similarity in voting among the "triad", e.g., US-led North American, EU-led Europe and Japan-led East Asia.

H_3: Western industrial countries and their ties dominate the world system in economic, communications, sociocultural, political and military networks, evidenced by common memberships in the major institutions of power, such as IMF, WTO, World Bank, NATO, EU, NAFTA and dominance in global telecommunications and world trade. This will be evidenced by shared organizational memberships and greater voting similarity.

H_4: The core, periphery, and semi-periphery structure will be replaced by a global North ("the Triad") and all other countries. The countries of the global North will be integrated through memberships in economic, political and military networks.

H_5: There will be evidence of macro-regional variations in economic policy based on the degree of cohesion of states resulting from organizational memberships and trade agreements.

H_6: Islamic states will share similarity in voting with developing states rather than form a distinct cluster.

Military globalization

There has been little focus on this area of globalization because most theorists subsume military under state power. This was true for both Marx and Weber because they viewed the state as "the repository of physical force in society" (Mann 1986:11). Mann separates military and political power because military organization is institutionally separate from state agencies. He also notes their separation historically, as military groups have conquered states and more recently, we note two demilitarized yet powerful states—Japan and West Germany (Mann 1986:11). Currently, illegal arms transports allow "organized gangs to challenge states, contradicting Max Weber's claim that the modern state monopolizes military power" (Mann 2004).

The primary arguments in this area center on whether the world is integrated militarily, primarily through US hegemony and whether there are any threats to this hegemony. Mann believes that the military is currently the one area where a power source has achieved global integration because of US military hegemony. He notes that military power relations represent the "greatest world-historical changes in the period since 1945" adding that the North "is a single military network of interaction" which "accepts US military dominance as necessary for its own defense" representing "an unprecedented degree and form of military hegemony in history, for it rests on consensus" (Mann 2001:4). Martin Shaw agrees with the uniqueness of this era arising from the destruction of WWII, replacing "rival, autonomous imperial nation-states in

Western Europe and Japan, by powerful post-imperial national entities which were nevertheless deeply dependent on the United States" resulting in a "pan-Western military organization." He thinks this was more important historically than the changes that occurred from 1989-91 (Hobden and Hobson 2002:88).

The combination of the devastation of World War II and developments in technology resulting in nuclear weapons made war among the Super Powers irrational and contributed to the North's acceptance of US military dominance. Other technological changes have contributed to the increased importance of global and regional security institutions, such as NATO, and the loss of unilateralism as a legitimate or credible defense strategy. In addition, new military threats from terrorism and other sources of non-state organized violence has meant that states have to pool resources, technology, intelligence, power and authority (Held and McGrew 2000:12). States are now a part of a larger regional and global interdependence that requires international cooperation.

This is a significant historical change from the Westphalian system where states controlled the means of organized violence, and is unprecedented in history. Mann notes that US military hegemony is hegemonic in the Gramscian sense. The 2003 military budget for the US exceeds the military spending of the next 15 powers and is "26 times greater than the combined spending of the seven 'rogue states' it identifies as its enemies" (Mann, 2004:12). The US military has global reach through its ability to transport troops and weapons and refuel at any of the 132 bases in foreign countries--with the consent of all of the host governments (except Cuba) (Mann 2004:13). The United Nations also tacitly consents to US hegemony since the US has the only global strike force and is needed for world order. In general, states support the US in the interest of maintaining sovereignty over their own territory. When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1991, states from both the North and South gave support to US intervention based on this principle. Many member states also receive military and economic benefits from cooperating with the US on military matters such as providing bases and rights to air space.

The collapse of the Soviet Union deepened US military hegemony but there are still major regional powers out of US reach (e.g., China and Russia, although Russia is now an associate member of NATO). The US does not have significant influence over India and Pakistan, both of which now have nuclear weapons. Mann notes several other areas of vulnerability. The volume of illegal arms transports has meant a large growth in "weapons of the weak" which threaten state stability through terrorism and guerilla war as has occurred in many Western countries and in Chechnya. Mann notes that the arms industry is the most transnational of all. In 2001, over 600 companies in 95 states were involved in manufacturing small arms. Illegal arms transfers allow "organized gangs to challenge states, contradicting Max Weber's claim that the modern state monopolizes military power" (Mann 2004:14). States in the South are most vulnerable to these groups and to disaffected elites with the ability to acquire these weapons; the combination of these factors undermines global stability and challenges the ability of the US to maintain global order.

In addition, although US hegemony rests on consensus, this is not assured because this hegemony is primarily in the service of US interests. The US not only has the option of unilateral action, but it went against the majority of the international community and against UN negotiations in its recent invasion of Iraq. This action has hurt its legitimacy

with both its allies and the international community. This is likely to continue to be a problem because of the traditional difficulties with coordinating through the UN Security Council whose members rarely agree on anything. In addition, the US has only directly intervened militarily when both sides to a dispute agree. It has not stepped in to stop genocide in cases such as Rwanda or now in Sudan. The US is also vulnerable to "rogue" states whose leaders may not hold as rational a view regarding the use of nuclear weapons. All of these factors combine to impede the ability of the US to subdue the South militarily and politically. This has been exacerbated by the rise of fundamentalist movements from areas of widespread poverty.

Although statisticians disagree whether wars diminished slightly in the late 1990s (Gurr 2000) or whether they just leveled off (Sollenberg and Wallensteen 2001), the period after 1945 has been rife with wars and civil wars (Mann 2004:12). The majority of the wars have also been in the global South marking a world divided by "zones of peace" (in the North) and "zones of turmoil' (Mann 2004:12). The majority of these wars were intra- rather than inter-state with roughly equal numbers fighting to control the government or the territory (Seybolt 2001). It is speculated that these conflicts arise in the peripheral areas because they have been left out of the integrative processes of globalization. Some ascribe a more leftist interpretation, describing it as a backlash from "American/Western/Northern imperialism, the essence of globalization" (Mann, 2004, p. 12).

Mary Kaldor argues that these "are 'new wars', characterized by state breakdown, a parasitic political economy, 'ethnic' cleansing, privatized forces and international humanitarian intervention. Martin Shaw counters that her model "understates the continuities in modern warfare" (Hobden and Hobson 2002:96). He asserts that nonwestern states are focused on the "survival, or even development, of the historic national monopoly of violence, and the pursuit of state interest including to the point of inter-and intra-state war (Hobden and Hobson 2002:93). He believes that "genocide has developed from being a secondary form of violence, in the period of the classic total war, to the principal mode in many conflicts of the global era" (Hobden and Hobson 2002: 96). It is generally "relabeled by the perpetrators as 'ethnic cleansing'" and that these local wars are "reproduced as 'global crises', which call for global political responses. Mann identifies genocide as violence arising from two rival ethnonational movements claiming their own state over the same territory, noting it is the "dark side of democracy" and part of the process of modernization and statehood (Mann 2005). Samuel Huntington overlooks "ethnic" identity favoring religious identity as the central factor causing post-Cold War conflicts and giving rise to a "clash of civilizations". He believes this explanation accounts for the rise in Islamic fundamentalism and related conflicts, developments in South East Asia, and an increase in inter-ethnic violence. None of these authors directly address development issues which conceivably add to situations creating "black holes" such as Somalia that allow for an increase in genocide, ethnic cleansing and religious conflict. It is my belief that a crisis of legitimacy is centered on developmental problems.

I derive the following hypotheses:

In the Cold War period,

H_1: Countries sharing the same political ideology belonged to the same military alliances and this influenced their voting similarity on security issues.

In the post-Cold War period,

H_1: Countries with greater cultural affinities will cooperate militarily, and join the same security alliances.

H_2: There will be differences in voting similarity between the global North and the global South.

H_3: Voting similarity in the global South will be based on ethnic, not civilizational conflicts.

Political globalization

The central debate on the effects of globalization processes on political power centers on whether and how the state has been transformed as states are the institutionalized form of political power. States regulate the many aspects of social life that is "territorially centralized and territorially-bounded" (Mann 1986:27). States are also the center of a second form of political power organizations: geopolitical diplomacy, also essential to social life, but often ignored by sociological theory (Mann 1986:27). States are presumed to be autonomous in both spheres. This idea is rooted in the 1648 Treaties of Westphalia, which established the "core principles of the modern international order." These principles are: "territorial sovereignty, the formal equality of states, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other recognized states, and state consent as the foundation stone of international legal agreement" (Held and McGrew 2000:9). The idea of equality and reciprocity were eventually incorporated as part of the core principles (Held and McGrew 2000:106). Yet states have always varied in size, power, geography, degree of centralization and of democracy, level of development, infrastructural and geopolitical power and national indebtedness to name a view. It follows therefore that the effects of globalization will vary across states, challenging the idea of wholescale transformation of state power and state sovereignty.

Undoubtedly, globalization processes including capitalist transformation, environmental limits, identity politics and "post-militarism" bring new challenges to state power. Global capitalism is presumed to be undermining the nation-state's macroeconomic planning ability, its ability to provide a redistributive welfare state, its ability to provide a sense of collective identity to its citizens and its general ability to "cage social life" (Held and McGrew 2000:136). Environmental threats from global warming, depletion of natural resources and over-population are seen as beyond the realm of states' control. New social movements and 'identity politics' (related to gender, sexual orientation, ethnic groups for example) that receive support from transnational movements are presumed to undermine national and class identities traditionally mediated by the state. Finally, post-nuclearism is believed to undermine "state sovereignty and 'hard geopolitics', since mass mobilization warfare underpinned much of modern state expansion yet is now irrational" (Held and McGrew 2000:136).

These threats to state sovereignty are not unique. Human rights, minority rights, democracy, communism and fiscal responsibility have all been imposed on states (Held and McGrew 2000:124). The international sanctioning of South Africa helped bring an end to apartheid policies and the state regime promoting them. Women and minority groups within states have appealed to international governmental organizations, transnational social movements and international law to enforce and legitimate their rights as individuals. This has affected state sovereignty and international law in two key

ways. First, it now recognizes it has changed the focus from law between states (excluding individuals) to a focus on intrinsic individual rights and their right to be protected from states. Second, it established the idea that individuals have rights and obligations beyond those of being a citizen. These have been codified through international institutions such as the League of Nations and the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Rights (1948). This evolution has changed the form and dynamic of states and civil society.

State autonomy has been challenged in other areas as well. For example, the Catholic Church influences population policies; the IMF imposes policies on developing states; major powers control the foreign policy of their protectorates; international organizations imposed protection of minorities on central and eastern European states after the first Balkan Wars and WWI; and a constitutional structure was imposed on Soviet satellites during the Cold War (Held and McGrew 2000:125). States are presumed to have control within their borders, and to be able to control transborder movements but the flow of persons, ideas and goods are difficult to regulate as is evident in current immigration crises. Krasner argues the Westphalian model of the international order has never been an accurate representation as many states lack autonomy and territorial integrity (Held and McGrew 2000:106). Held and McGrew note that decolonization did not create free states because Western influence continued through "commerce, trade and political organization" and an "'invisible government' of corporations, banks and international organizations" such as the World Bank and the IMF" (Held and McGrew 2000:10). Development programs for states are generally shaped by political necessity and include "market liberalization, welfare cut-backs, minimal regulation of private capital flows, [and] deregulation of labour markets" (Held and McGrew 2000:11).

Krasner notes the meaning of sovereignty is neither singular nor invariant. Keohane refers to it as an institution ("a set of persistent and connected rules prescribing behavioral roles, constraining activity, and shaping expectations"), and notes that institutions change. The development of the Rome Treaty, the European Community's constitutional document includes a provision for shared or pooled sovereignty. This has not meant that the EC has become a sovereign state (Keohane refers to it as "an unprecedented hybrid") nor has it meant a loss of sovereignty for individual member states as they retained their right to veto amendments to the EC's constitution and to secede without fear of war (Held and McGrew 2000:110). Others point to supranational organizations such as the EU as representative of a threat to state authority at the regional level. Martin Shaw refers to it as competing layers of international organization that begin during the Cold War. The first layer was comprised of military bloc bodies such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The second layer was comprised of international bodies such as the Bretton Woods Institution which was dominated by the Western bloc. The third layer was comprised of more inclusive bodies such as the UN, even though the blocs dominated it. This system was legitimated and constituted by nation-states interacting with a more universal "legitimation framework" comprised of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention and other aspects of the evolving framework of international law, providing a foundation for a "global order" based on individuals and states (Shaw 2000:198).

The dissolution of the Soviet Union ended a rival to Western dominance and gave it "increasingly worldwide legitimacy" (Shaw 2000:224). It also transformed the Western

bloc into a single center of military and state power comprised of North America, Western Europe, Japan, and Australasia. A defining feature is its global role, as it "operates militarily, politically and juridically beyond its territorial base." It is composed of a "complex, overlapping set of relations and institutions" (Shaw 2000:201). He feels this system of states represents a global layer of state power legitimized by the United Nations as the international forum of states. This global layer has four elements: an institutional framework of legitimate global power through the UN and associated bodies and normative structure represented in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; an institutional framework of global economic power represented by the Bretton Woods system, the IMF, World Bank, OECD, Group of 7, and other essentially Western institutions; an evolving body of international law, and means of enforcement; and an ideological element of the "commonality of humankind, with common values of human freedom and democracy" legitimated in "the founding documentation of the United Nations System" (Shaw 2000:218). This global layer of power incorporates all states, even "rogue states" which "in principle" accept the legitimacy of these layers of state power. But this is not to imply there are not deep conflicts of interest—even between national and regional centers of Western states. He sees this global layer of the state as causing a change in social relations including state power.

Both Mann and Shaw believe that globalization operates through states; that they are still the central organizational sources of political power. Both acknowledged threats to state sovereignty but differ in their interpretation. Mann sees threats from capitalist transformation, environmental limits, identity politics and post-militarism but notes these are not uniform across states. He believes that global interaction networks are strengthening states overall but does not believe they have a singular principle of interaction or integration. Shaw believes political power structures have been transformed resulting in a "global layer of state power" as a first step towards achieving a global state.

Our data can only address this debate in a very limited way. Our data on voting similarity can give an insight into the effect of identity politics on inter-state and inter-regional voting, and whether cleavages are based on civilizational divides or reflect the domination of the West over "the rest". The contents of the resolutions can also give us insights into challenges to state sovereignty including identity politics, capitalist transformation, post-militarism, environmental limits; an increase in international law, resistance to international law (who benefits and who loses) and whether there is evidence of a global layer to the state, represented by such inter-national groupings as regionalism, trilateralism or Northernization.

Political resolutions during the time period studied focused on issues such as state sovereignty and international law. Examples of the former include resolutions aimed at decolonization, right of Palestinians to self determination, questions relating to non-self-governing territories, granting independence to colonial countries and peoples, and issues related to occupied Syrian Golan and Palestine refugees. Examples of the latter include resolutions aimed at the establishment of the International Criminal Court ("ICC"), continual development of laws centered on human rights, international convention against reproductive cloning of human beings, measures to eliminate international terrorism, and responsibility of states for internationally wrongful acts.

Based on the content of resolutions, during the first time period, we expect to see differences in voting between democratic and communist and other authoritarian

governments. The basis is the ideological divide between the West and other countries with many NAM member states choosing to stay neutral. We expect to see this reflected in three clusters within and across regions. We also expect to see ideological polarization and isolation of some countries based on human rights issues as many of the resolutions were directed at particular countries. For example, a resolution regarding human rights in Afghanistan (occupied by the Soviet Union since 1979) would divide the Soviet Union and its allies from the Western cluster of countries. South Africa was prevented from participating in any voting because of international objection to apartheid policies. Several Latin American countries were named in resolutions relating to human rights abuses. During the second time period, we expect to continue to see a divide between democratic and non-democratic countries based on human rights issues. If Huntington is right, we would expect to see differences between Islamic and other states. If WST are right, we expect to see differences between developed and undeveloped states. We expect to see some isolation of the US based on its hegemonic status and concern for state sovereignty issues vis a vis the ICC and other international law. Based on claims of state transformation, we expect to see greater coherence among EU members in voting representing increased regionalization; greater intra-regional cohesion overall based on cultural similarity, treaties and memberships in common organizations aimed at greater regional integration. From the content of the resolutions and post-Cold War changes, I derive the following hypotheses:

In the Cold War period,

H_1: States will be polarized by political ideology. There will be three clusters of states: one of democratic, largely Western states, one of Communist states, and one of states with memberships in the non-aligned movement.

H_2: There will be divisions between developed and developing states based on decolonization and independence.

In the post-Cold War period,

H_1: States will vote according to civilizations. There will be clusters of Western states, Islamic states, and Asian states in particular.

H_2: There will be an increase in regional clustering signaling the transformation of the state or the adding of a global layer to the state. (Counterfactual: An increase in the number of newly independent states seeking membership in the UN and other international bodies.)

H_3: The salience of international law will be signaled by isolation of states violating human rights law, not signing international law treaties such as the International Criminal Court.

H_3: The strongest clustering of states will occur in the European region representing increased regionalization. There will not be an increase in similarity among North American states representing economic but not regional integration.

H_4: The Former Soviet Union Central Asian states will vote most similarly to other Islamic states.

H_5: States in Africa will be divided according to Islamic and Christian states.

H_6: Turkey will vote similarly to Islamic states indicating adherence to OIC membership requirements to support Palestine as a separate state.

H_7: Voting similarity in the global South will be based on ethnic, not civilizational conflicts indicating continual salience of state sovereignty and real power politics.

Summary

Mediating among these theories is challenging as they vary on dependent and independent variables, assumptions, and conceptions of globalization processes. It is generally agreed that empirical studies are required for a deeper understanding of post Cold War changes in social structures and the underlying processes involved. It is my belief that multiple empirical studies are needed because of the range of data required to test all of the hypotheses. Therefore the scope of this paper is quite limited, nevertheless, I believe it is a good starting point. My central question is has an overriding cleavage replaced the Cold War political ideological polarization? More specifically, has a clash of civilizations replaced the conflict between political ideologies as postulated by Samuel Huntington? Have there been any changes in the core-periphery structures of world systems theory? Finally, are states still the central political actors or has a different form of global governance evolved? The rationale for this study is to understand globalization processes, help develop a theory of globalization, and develop a framework for analyzing the major social changes since the end of the Cold War. This is intended to provide a foundation for an in-depth empirical exploration of globalization processes that looks at changes across all four sources of social power (ideological/cultural, economic, military, and political) through a structural and comparative historical approach. Several assumptions underlie my motivation. My first assumption is that understanding how the structures of power have changed in the post Cold War world order will provide a foundation from which to begin to explore the processes of change involved. My second assumption is that globalization processes happen through states and therefore, states are still salient organizations.

Transnationalists argue that state sovereignty is threatened by transnational social movements and corporations but the growth of UN member states from 51 at its founding in 1945 to the current 191 indicates that the number of people claiming a territory as a state has not abated, and lends support to arguments for the continual salience of the state. Most transnational corporations, NGOs and social movements work with and through states—world polity theorists argue that they strengthen states. Finally, many theories of world division examine different grouping of states—regionalization, trilateralism, civilizations—but assume states as their unit of analysis. I agree with the assertions of internationalists that state sovereignty has undergone a constant transformation since the Treaty of Westphalia, but that this has not threatened the state as a central institution. Reasons for the transformation are many but of particular importance is the increase in the number of inter-state problems that require inter-national solutions. These include environmental threats like global warming, the need to monitor and control the spread of nuclear weapons, resource depletion, and extra-state violence such as terrorism which has led to a growing body of international law that constrains state behavior. These factors reveal a dialectical process whereby states create international laws in their own interests, but then become subject to them. Similarly, states may be members of inter-national and trans-national organizations with membership requirements (such as democracy clauses) that may constrain their behavior or influence their relations with other states. My third assumption, therefore, is that empirical analysis should involve a system of states interacting in an international forum that includes the influence of non-state actors.

RESEARCH DESIGN

My assumptions regarding the importance of understanding structural changes and the continual salience of the state guided the data and methods selected. Given the systemic nature of the theories, it was important to choose data representing a system of states. I believe the best representation of a system of states is the United Nations ("UN") system composed of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Commission ("ECOSOC"), the UN economic summits. Former United Nations Secretary-General U Thant once remarked that "the General Assembly is a 'realistic representation of the present day world'" (Alker and Russett 1965:3). There has been a tradition of studying United Nations General Assembly ("UNGA") voting data to understand changes in political relations—and the balance of power in international relations, particularly after significant events such as decolonization and the subsequent incorporation of newly independent states (Alker, 1964; Alker and Lijphart, 1963; Marin-Bosch, 1998; Russett, 1965; Russett, 1966, 1997; Stokman 1977; Tihhomirov 1981).

Although the UNGA data is state centric, it represents a system of states interacting in an international forum that also includes the influence of civil society in the form of numerous international non-governmental organizations ("INGOs") and national non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"). The UN is credited for contributing to the evolution of a body of international law centered upon human rights which is seen as the foundation of a global culture. The UN is also active in global economic development, and its related institutions—the WTO, IMF, and World Bank—are at the center of economic globalization processes. The UN continues its founding role as the arbiter of peace, diplomacy and mediator of international disputes. It has also expanded its role as the number of problems exceeding state borders—environmental crisis, monitoring of weapons and preventing the spread and development of nuclear weapons, controlling the spread of disease to name a few—make it evident that an inter-national body is needed to manage the "global commons." Today's UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, acknowledged in his "Millennium Report" (a central statement of international policy on development) that states are not the only global actors; NGOs and multilateral agencies also play an important role working with states to find solutions to global problems (Basic Facts 2001). He encouraged the UN to work with international institutions and civil society in the pursuit of common goals. Analyzing how states align on issues of global importance can provide important insights into the current structures of power. Therefore, my primary data source will be UNGA roll call votes.

Data

The study includes 2114 resolutions representing 21 years of UNGA roll call votes. The data was obtained through UN depositories at Yale and at UCLA, the UN Library in New York, and through UN online sources.[2] Because this data is state-centric, we will supplement this data with information on state memberships in key ideological/cultural, political, economic and security organizations and how these networks of membership compare with the networks of power created by the voting data. As membership in organizations are generally based on similarity in political ideology, levels of development, geographical location, common history and shared boundaries, the

[2] The UN digitized voting records beginning in 1984. Earlier years have only paper copies.

third data set will be a compilation of important state attributes such as political regime, economic indicators such as GNP per capita, dominant religion and civilizational category (relevant for Huntington's thesis) and colonial history among others. These additional data sets will be particularly useful in examining the other theories as they incorporate inter-national and trans-national groupings of states and will illustrate the major sources of division and cohesion[3].

Analytical Frame

The UNGA is the primary deliberative branch of the UN, and is more democratically structured than the Security Council. It is composed of representatives of all member states each of which has one vote. The scope of the UNGA is quite extensive, and includes the maintenance of international peace and security (addressing issues such as disarmament and arms regulation), developing and codifying international law, and international collaboration on economic, social, cultural, health and environmental issues. There are six permanent committees which raise issues for discussion, draft resolutions and vote on which resolutions will be voted on and then passed to the plenary meeting for adoption without a vote or with a roll call vote.[4] The six permanent committees are the First Committee (Disarmament and International Security); the Second Committee (Economic and Financial); the Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural); the Fourth Committee (Special Political and Decolonization); the Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary); and the Sixth Committee (Legal).

Mann's IEMP model of power maps very well onto the structure of the permanent committees; therefore we will use it as an analytical frame with which to organize the data. We will classify the resolutions according to the power source they represent in order to create four separate power networks which can be compared within and across regions over time. Resolutions from the First Committee will be referred to as military

---

[3] There are limitations to the data, however. First, it privileges states, thereby limiting our ability to independently examine changes in state sovereignty. Our inclusion of state memberships in important inter-national and macro-regional organizations (and state attributes such as political regime and level of wealth) is an attempt to overcome this limitation by demonstrating that states continue to be important centers of policy-making through these organizations. Second, there is a narrow focus on economic issues based on the focus and structure of the UNGA. We believe polarizations will be revealed in the economic resolutions and, other than budgetary issues, the remaining issues are of particular significance to member states and reveal real divisions among states. The UN encourages trade summits and economic forums organized by UN organizations such as the WTO, the IMF and the ECOSOC regional economic commissions. Issues raised in these venues are generally discussed (and voted on) in the UNGA permanent committees. Third, UNGA resolutions related to security issues are not enforceable but are important in shaping policies regarding nuclear weapons, disarmament, small arms control, weapons in space and general international security. Despite these limitations, we maintain that this is a good dataset from which to begin our exploration of world divisions.

[4] Unlike the Security Council, UNGA resolutions are not legally binding for states, nevertheless, they are considered to "carry the weight of world opinion, as well as the moral authority of the world community" (Basic Facts 2000:8). They also give each nation-state a voice, a chance to express its country's interests, to plead for help from the international community in eradicating diseases such as AIDS, ending institutionalized racism such as occurred with apartheid, and in making ties between violence and development issues. During an interview, the head of NAM expressed great gratitude to the UN for ending apartheid. He was convinced it would have taken many more years of violence otherwise. He expressed conviction that the UN is a place for less powerful states to turn for social justice domestically and internationally.

resolutions; from the Second and Fifth Committees, economic resolutions; from the Third Committee, ideological resolutions; and from the Fourth and Sixth Committees, political resolutions. Structuring the data in this way will allow us to examine theories of world divisions including those that argue for multiple-levels of governance and how these have changed over time. We also interpret Mann's model of power as a modified social network approach and use this approach to create four separate networks of power which we examine over time using structural and comparative historical methods.[5]

Methodological Approaches

The study uses three structural approaches to find coalitions or alliances based on similarity in voting that can provide insights into divisions and whether there is any overarching polarization among states. The primary method used to analyze the data is the eigenvector measure of centrality, a measure of similarity that takes into account the degree of similarity and dissimilarity between two states as the best test of coalitions and alliances. The second method is a graphical representation of the structure emerging from the voting relations using a graphing program recently modified to address the data in this study. The third method is an alternative graphing approach—Correspondence Analysis—that incorporates a different algorithm to find similarity in voting.[6] The three methods were chosen to overcome the shortcomings of each as well as to "test" the validity of each approach and the robustness of the results by comparing the groups found using each method.

Eigenvector Centrality

The first method, eigenvector centrality, begins with a matrix of voting relations. For example, suppose we have a symmetric adjacency matrix, A, where $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 1$ if i and j are connected in a network and $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 0$ otherwise. The eigenvector measure of centrality x is the solution to the following matrix equation:

$$Ax = \lambda x .$$

It is a measure of status that weights each node's choices by the number of choices that node receives exemplified by the following equation:

$$\lambda x_j = a_{1j}x_i + a_{2j}x_2 + \ldots + a_{nj}x_n$$

The measure has traditionally been used to examine positive relations among nodes but the logic of the measure was recently extended to include negative relations to determine its effect on status (Bonacich and Lloyd 2004). It was assumed that because the eigenvector centrality measure takes into account the status of those an individual is connected to, being connected to a popular individual would add to one's own status or popularity, while sharing a positive tie with an unpopular person would likely reduce one's status. A correlation was made between the logic of status and the logic of affective

[5] Michael Barnett also refers to Mann's model as a modified social network approach; see Hobden and Hobson 2002:118.

[6] A disadvantage of the Correspondence Analysis program is that it produces very tight clusters, making the graphs difficult to interpret. I experimented with several programs and found one that maximized the legibility of results but still produced at times unreadable clusters in cases of high density graphs. To compensate, I supplemented the CA graphs with graphs produced using Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), a similar method to CA except it not does include row and margin totals. I will not describe the method in detail but will use the SVD graphs to provide a "zoom" view of the dense CA clusters, allowing the reader to capture the nuances not available in the CA graphs.

relationships in balance theory. In a balanced graph (where all of the positive relations are within a group and all negative relations between groups), the eigenvector's positive and negative scores revealed not only the clique structure but also status scores within each clique. The status (eigenvector centrality) score is a measure of how perfectly an individual is placed in a clique. This measure is particularly salient in a study of international relations, and can be expected to illustrate expected polarizations in the Cold War era. Because most of the theories we are examining focus on significant changes after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, we use two time points to examine changes in the structures of world power—5 to 10 years before and after the dissolution of the Soviet Union (1981-1985 and 1996-2001).

To test the applicability of this measure on voting relations, I began with a matrix of country by resolutions where the voting choices had been made binary, and obtained correlations for each pair of countries (specifically, the percentage of time two countries voted alike). Because of its implications for measures of status, I used a scale from 1 to -1 rather than 1 to 0. Although equally valid, if I had used a scale from 1 to 0, there would not have been negatively evaluated countries, just more or less positively evaluated ones. Then it would not have been true that voting similarly to a country voting dissimilarly would decrease that country's status. Opposition is conflict and a measure of voting similarity ranging from 1 to 0 does not capture this negativity. If two opposing cliques exist, then voting in opposition to the enemies of one's clique raises one's status. Second, I needed to assume a true zero from which to make comparisons and draw conclusions about negative centrality. To use a negative correlation you have to believe there is a zero and that negatives are real (enemies). This effect is best captured by a relationship measure ranging from –1 (opposition) to +1 (agreement).

There were two problems that presented drawbacks to this method. First, countries that did not vary their vote for a given subset (for example, some countries voted yes on all resolutions) had to be excluded for lack of standard deviation. This meant that some important countries were excluded from certain regional subsets. Second, countries that did not vote either highly similar or dissimilar to other countries were made isolates. This occurred because cutpoints were used to select the most similar and dissimilar countries from the distribution of correlation scores. The countries with the highest positive correlations were given a +1, and countries with the highest negative correlations were given a -1. All other countries were assigned a zero. A new adjacency matrix was created from the recoded data and imported into Ucinet, a social network software program[7]. The eigenvector centrality ("EC") measure was calculated on this recoded matrix resulting in an EC score of zero for some countries, thereby excluding them from any cliques. Subsequent analyses confirmed the accuracy of the exclusion of these countries from the cliques found in different regions, at different time points and for resolutions representing different power sources. The correlation is clearly reflected in the correspondence analysis graphs.

Finally, eigenvector centrality scores are both a measure of status or position within a network and a measure of 'cliqueness'. The latter is the primary focus in this study. The intention had also been to look at the most central states within a given subset. Subsequent analysis revealed this to be misleading. The US appears to be marginalized in

[7] We tested the accuracy of using these thresholds, comparing the results obtained from the recoded data with those from the original correlation data and found the results were identical.

much of the voting, and may indeed have low status among other states but that is not a measure of its influence—even within the UNGA[8]. We found it more productive to focus on this measure as a way to discover alliances and coalitions in voting. Coupled with state organizational memberships and state characteristics, the measure provided useful insights into the structure of power networks.[9]

Social Network Graphing

Adjacency matrices represent information about the data in numerical form which can be difficult to interpret. An adjacency matrix by itself will not yield insights into patterns, particularly when you have large data sets. Graphs can extract the information and display it in a way that can allow you to visualize the global structure of the data and identify patterns (Michailidis and de Leeuw 2001:435). They can represent relationships between sets of objects and model complex systems. They have mathematical properties that have been well examined. There is also a large body of research on graph drawing which addresses the algorithms that can optimize the researcher's desired properties.

Graphs contain only the qualitative information, so vertices can be located anywhere in the plane. The vertices of the graphs are represented as points in R space and the edges as lines connecting the points (Michailidis and de Leeuw 2001:439). Graphs use different algorithms designed for different purposes. These include satisfying aesthetic rules such as symmetry, minimization of edge crossings, distribution of vertices and uniformity of edge lengths. The goal is to draw the graph in a way that shows "important and invariant aspects of the data…whose structure and properties" can be examined analytically (Michailidis and de Leeuw 2001:436).

The graphs in this paper are not directed which means that ties are symmetric. If Country A is similar to country B, then the reverse holds true. Nevertheless, I maintained the arrows because I found them useful to show connections when the graphs were dense with ties. Solid edges (lines connecting the points) represent positive ties (similarity in voting); broken edges represent negative ties. Although standard graphing programs can evaluate different relations, initial explorations indicated that some were not well suited to illustrate the modified eigenvector centrality measure. Most were unreadable with very large datasets like the ones for the all country subsets. I experimented with several popular graphing programs before choosing a program modified for this data, e.g., to take negative relations into account. Most layout routines treat positive and negative relations in the same way, often with misleading results. Blythe introduced a modification to the Davidson-Harel annealing layout, used in the original KrackPlot software program (Davidson and Harel 1996; for the related 1989 technical report, see http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/davidson96drawing.html), which treats positive dyads in the usual way but tries to maximize the length of negative dyads, subject to connection strength. It balances attraction over positive links and repulsion over negative links while generally keeping all the nodes spaced out from each other, regardless of structure (Jim

[8] Interestingly, several interviewees mentioned the effect of the delegate's personality in affecting the drafting of resolutions and in other matters such as being voted into a leadership position on an important committee. Although personality can make a difference in the short term, we do not believe it makes enough of a difference to overcome historical alliances and cleavages. It may affect change on a smaller level, however.

[9] Because of the limited scope of this paper, we will not include the charts of EC scores that include state attributes and organizational membership, but will reference them when needed. This material is available from the author upon request.

Blythe, personal conversation, 2004). We also found that the graphs illustrated the structure implied by the eigenvector centrality scores quite well.

Correspondence Analysis

We discussed two drawbacks to using the eigenvector centrality above: the exclusion of some states for lack of variance and countries that did not vote either highly similar or dissimilar to other countries were made isolates. A third drawback was the loss of information on resolutions. Correspondence analysis allows us to overcome all three of these shortcomings. Correspondence Analysis ("CA") can be derived in many ways: partition chi-square; approximate distance; graph drawings; using a technique to maximize correlations; and principal components analysis. I used Jan de Leeuw's graph drawing approach ("homals" or homogeneity analysis package for R; see www.stats.ucla.edu/gifi) as an additional graphical approach to test and compare results obtained from the social network graphing method. This method, also called multiple correspondence analysis, and often referred to as the "Gifi system" does optimal scaling of categorical variables through an alternating least squares algorithms (Michailidis and de Leeuw 1996:2001). The foundation of this approach is to simplify complex multivariate data by displaying their main regularities in "a low-dimensional joint map of objects and categories in Euclidean space" (Michailidis and de Leeuw 1996:2). The distance between two object points is related to the similarity between their profiles. Objects with a 'unique' profile will be located farthest from the origin of the join space, and those with profiles similar to the average will be located closer to the origin (Michailidis and de Leeuw 1996:6).

We used the same 1-mode country-by-country adjacency matrix to obtain the EC scores and to create the social network graph. We used the original 2-mode country-by-resolution data to create the CA graphs. We took this approach as an additional measure to test the robustness of our results. This also allowed us to assess how much information may have been lost from using the 1-mode country-by-country data in the social network analysis. Again, because of space constraints, we will not show all of the results but will include them where salient.

Comparative Historical Method: Time periods and regions

We cannot understand change without comparing at least two time periods. All of the theories we examine have a rich historical component with great variance in the timeline. A key debate in globalization theories are when globalization processes begin. The answer to this question is dependent upon empirical exploration of multiple processes, particularly global trade. We limit our focus to what has been referred to as the most significant geopolitical event in the twentieth century, and one unarguable responsible for major changes in state relations and world power structures—the dissolution of the Soviet Union and subsequent end of the Cold War. As we discussed above, we analyze the structure of relations among states across four sources of social power: ideological, economic, military and political.

To address arguments regarding uniform or differential affects of globalization processes, and theories of regionalism, we further divide the voting by regions and examine inter- and intra-regional divisions. The regional analyses will also provide an opportunity to examine conflicting arguments on the continual salience of the nation-states. Differences are likely to occur across regions, demonstrating the varying effects of globalization processes on states, dependent upon their internal strengths and alliances.

The concept of region is used differently across disciplines and is generally recognized as a theoretical construct that ranges from geographical entities with a degree of interdependence to a supranational group of countries with a common political or economic project or identity. In general, the definition varies according to the phenomena being investigated (Hettne, 2005; Lewis & Wiggins 1997). The UNGA itself has two geographical grouping schemes:[10] regional groups of which there are five: African states, Asian states, Eastern European states, Latin American and Caribbean states and Western European and Other (WEOG) states (see Appendix ? for lists of members of each) and the UN Economic and Social Council's ("ECOSOC") Regional Economic and Social Commissions of which there are also five: ECA or Economic Commission of Africa; ESCAP or Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific; ECE or Economic Commission for Europe; ECLAC or Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean; and ESCWA or Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (group memberships are designated in the eigenvector centrality tables below). Memberships for regional and economic commissions are similar for several of the groups such as Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean but there are important differences. Regional groups were developed in accordance with UNGA requirements to provide regional representation on various committees and are the groups from which the GA President, Vice Presidents and Committee Leaders are drawn. This has important political implications but I chose to base the divisions on the ECOSOC regional commissions as they were created to promote regional development and integration for security and development purposes, making the IEMP categorizations more salient.

There were several other important factors used in making this decision. First, the European regional commission does not split East and West Europe, but the WEOG grouping does. This was important for several reasons: to show polarization in Europe, both Eastern and Western European states would have to be included in the same group; the US and Israel are also included in this group making this a Western group useful for examining Huntington's thesis; Turkey is also included which is important because it is a NATO member and EU applicant. Africa and Latin America are essentially the same for both groupings except the Economic Commission includes the US, Canada, France, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the UK. I only included US in this region as all but Canada are clearly European states, and Canada did not become a member of the OAS until 1990 (the US and the majority of Latin American states became members in 1948). Preliminary data exploration also revealed Canada voted consistently with European states and quite differently from both the US and other Latin American states. Its outlier status was problematic for the Correspondence Analysis graphs and there was little historical basis to include it in this region other than it is located in the Americas. It made sense to include the US, however, because it not only has historically dominated this region but is also the dominant member of the OAS, one of the key IEMP organizations in the region.

The Asia and the Pacific regional commission grouping differed from the Asia regional grouping on several countries so I only included countries that were members of both or which were geographically located in Asia and the Pacific such as Australia and New Zealand (both members of WEOG). This meant excluding Eastern European states:

[10] The UN Statistical Division uses different regional groupings depending on what is being assessed (e.g., trade, poverty, etc.).

Armenia, Georgia and the SU/Russian Federation as well as European/WEOG members France, Netherlands, Turkey, the UK, and the US. Notably, many European states were members of other regional organizations probably because of their economic resources and position in important international economic organizations. The former Soviet Union Central Asian states were included in both the European and Asian and Pacific Regional Commissions and in the Asian regional group so I included them in both regional commissions for historical, political and geographical reasons. The regional commission of Western Asia is very small: 13 members and Palestine (which is not included because as a non UN member state it cannot vote). This group is largely the Middle East sans Israel although the Middle East has also been conceptualized to include North Africa and other countries from Asia. This UN ECOSOC group only includes North African state Egypt. Members of this group are also included in the Asian and African (Egypt only) regional groups.

Although the data analysis is centered on these particular divisions, we will consider other groupings of states derived from the theories described above. These categories also provide insights into the presence or lack of regional integration. To summarize, the subsets are divided into four power sources, two time periods and five regions.[11] The scheme is as follows: we will examine four power networks (ideological, economic, military, and political: IEMP) for each of five regions and for all countries combined (across regions) at the first and last time points (to illustrate the greatest contrast): Time 1: 1981-1985 and Time 4: 1996-2001; a total of 60 subsets. Because of space constraints, we will only show the graphs for ideological networks for both time periods and for the five regions but will reference the other analyses and charts as they become salient.[12]

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Although we detailed hypotheses derived from each of the theoretical approaches in Chapter I, we make a general hypothesis that there will be a clear East-West polarization during the Cold War period both within and across regions. We expect this to be particularly the case in Europe, but also evident in other regions illustrating spheres of influence of these two rival blocs. Graphically, we expect to see a balanced graph of positive relations within the Western and Eastern blocs or cliques, with negative relations between them. We expect this to be correlated with membership in key IEMP organizations such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact—the two military alliances representing Western and Eastern states respectively. We also expect democratic and communist countries to vote similarly along economic and ideological issues. The earlier period also represents the end of decolonization so we expect to see some relationship between colonies and their former colonists. The relationship may be positive, representing continuing economic—including trade—ties, or negative, representing different interests related to development issues.

Results for Europe, Time 1

The graph for Europe, all resolutions combined, for the first time period, reveals the expected East-West division indicating high similarity in voting (and attitudes or

[11] Appendix A lists all of the countries analyzed in each time period by region
[12] A book is underway that develops each dimension of globalization and adds many new datasets.

norms) within the blocs and strong dissimilarity between the blocs. In this graph, there are three countries lacking ties to either cluster or to any other countries—Greece, Malta and Turkey. We refer to these countries as isolates meaning there were neither very similar nor dissimilar to any other country. Peripheral countries (here they are. Yugoslavia, Cyprus, Albania, Romania, Israel and the US) on the other hand, are generally dissimilar to other countries but not enough to become part of one of the clusters. For example, the US and Israel had many negative ties to the Eastern European cluster but they did not have any positive ties to the Western European cluster. They are implicitly a member of this group through shared common enemy but not highly integrated with them. Although this pattern was as predicted, I separated the resolutions by the social power source they represented to see what additional insights we might gain. For example, did certain membership requirements or state interests in a particular area override the dominant polarization. Finally, would variances in alliances resonant with the predictions of a particular theory of world division.

The graph for Europe, Time 1, ideological resolutions (figure 2), shows the same two cohesive subgroups: Western Europe (top cluster) and Eastern Europe (bottom cluster) with positive ties among members of each subgroup and only negative ties to members of the other subgroup or cluster. In this graph, the US and Israel share a positive tie to each other and multiple negative ties to the Eastern European cluster. They are only connected to the Western Europe cluster through sharing a common enemy. Romania holds a similar position vis a vis Eastern Europe; they are only a member of this group through sharing a common enemy but not otherwise similar to this group. The UK and Western German occupy a more peripheral position, both having more negative ties to the Eastern bloc than positive ties to the Western bloc. They are closest to the group of Benelux countries and France. The isolates are Albania, Cyprus, Greece, Malta, and Turkey. Interestingly, Albania and Turkey are the only Islamic-majority countries in the region.

Many of the resolutions focused on human rights issues. These resolutions can indicate overall differences in levels of democracy, political rights and civil liberties. They can also represent conflict directed at particular countries. For example, a resolution regarding human rights in Afghanistan (occupied by the Soviet Union since 1979) would divide the Soviet Union and its allies from the Western cluster of countries. Resolutions addressing the death penalty distinguishes the US and Israel from many of the Western European countries. Another resolution illustrating the East-West divide stipulates the interdependence of economic and other human rights.

The graph for Europe, Time 1, economic resolutions (figure 3), shows the same East-West polarization with some important differences. Here, the US and Israel continue to be isolated but this time they differ from each other also. Romania is again distinct from the Soviet bloc countries but Albania is closer to the Soviet bloc countries than it was in the graph for ideological resolutions. Cyprus, Malta and Turkey are again isolates along with Yugoslavia; Greece now integrated with the Western European countries. There is a closer cluster of Scandinavian countries which may reflect their similarity in social welfare policies. The Soviet bloc countries are not designated as either developed or developing countries, which reflects Snyder and Kick's (1979) categorization of them as part of a "semi-core" along with a group of the poorer Western countries. The EC scores reveal a more cohesive Western European group which may be attributable to

EEC membership; the same is true of COMECON membership for the Soviet bloc. Yugoslavia had some trading options with Western European members which may explain its more neutral stance on economic issues.

The graph for military resolutions is more polarized; only Malta is isolated. The US and Turkey are now integrated into the Western bloc, presumably because of their shared NATO membership. Israel is also integrated into this block, as is Greece. Yugoslavia and Cyprus (former isolates) are now integrated with the Eastern block but Romania and Albania are not, only sharing negative ties with the Western block. Finland is now more peripheral; not surprising given the close proximity to the Soviet Union. Albania was a member of the Warsaw Pact at one time but withdrew in 1968. It is still aligned with the Soviet bloc, but like Romania, is more independent. Although the Security Council is the primary organization for military matters, the General Assembly helps create policies around nuclear weapons, landmines, and other security issues, and representatives are lobbied by many NGOs on these issues. The GA helps develop norms around security and military matters, where they are only "morally" binding. Most of the military resolutions in this time period relate to disarmament, reducing military budgets, and the relationship between development and disarmament. Countries which have nuclear weapons differ on these issues from those who do not. Although Huntington's clash of civilizations thesis is intended for the post-Cold War period, it is interesting to note that the same two Islamic countries which were neutral on ideological and economic issues are split into different blocs on military issues. It is their military alliance and not their civilization that makes a difference.

The graph depicting similarity on the political resolutions has the most distinct Eastern and Western clusters. There are no isolates, but Turkey, Malta and Yugoslavia are very peripherally connected to the Eastern block. Interestingly, Romania is integrated into the Eastern block for the first time. The US and Israel are also integrated into the Western bloc but are still somewhat peripheral. The resolutions for this type and time period focus primarily on issues of colonialism and the Israel/Palestine conflict.

The analysis of all resolutions combined for Time 1 provides a good average of the relations across power types but does not reveal important nuances When the resolutions for each type were combined, we lost important nuances. This was particularly notable in the case of Turkey, which aligned with the Eastern bloc on political issues, with the Western bloc on military issues, and neither on ideological or economic issues. Turkey's membership in NATO and in OIC has obviously influenced its voting. Likewise, entry into the EU is likely to change (or be contingent upon?) its voting more similarly to the EU countries which clearly vote in a bloc. Overall, in addition to the clear East/West bloc, we note potential explanations for the peripheral status of the US, Israel, Albania, Cyprus, Greece, Malta, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Romania. The US and Israel are not geographical members of the European region but the US is an important ally and responsible for much of the region's security. On the other hand, both the US and Israel differ from most European countries on the Palestinian issue having to do with alliances and different demographic issues. Clearly this region is marked by an East-West divide during this time period and across power sources as would be predicted given the strong differences that democratic and communist regimes have on political, economic and ideological issues and that this conflict distinguishes them on military issues. There were clear opposing IEMP memberships: NATO vs. the Warsaw Pact and

EEC vs. COMECON for example. There is support for Turkey being a "torn" country as Huntington indicated (cite). Albania and Turkey are the region's only majority Islamic countries and only OIC members at this time. Cyprus and Malta are Commonwealth members but not members of NATO or EU at this time. Interestingly, although Canada is also not a regional member, it is a Commonwealth member and shares more norms with Europe than its North American counterpart, the US (e.g., the death penalty). It also historically wanted to exert independence from the US as the North American regional power. Therefore, despite the overall pattern of ideological polarization, there are differences across power types and these may prove to be more—or less—salient in the post Cold War world.

Results for Europe, Time 4

The graph for Europe, all resolutions combined, for the post-Cold War time period, reveals strong cohesion, reflecting strong regionalization. There is not only an increase in the number of countries in the region, increased memberships in the EU and NATO (as well as the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and COMECON as alternative IEMP organizations) but the nearly identical voting of both "old" and "new" Europe. It is interesting that many former Soviet bloc countries voted almost identically to the Soviet Union in Time 1, and now they vote almost identically to the Western European bloc. The motivations may vary—coercion or incentives—but these countries appear to value bloc memberships. Although not members of the geographical region, the US and Israel are more integrated into the core cluster; Canada votes almost identical to EU member states. The only states on the periphery are the Former Soviet Union ("FSU") Central Asian states Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, (Kazakhstan is integrated with the core group in this graph), and Bosnia-Herzegovina. These states are members of the OIC and not members of the dominant IEMP organizations in this region—the EU and NATO. There are many interpretations for this. It could support Huntington's thesis of "the West vs. the rest" or the West vs. Islam or support for his hypothesis of strong cohesion on the basis of cultural similarity. There are numerous reasons the Eastern European states were incorporated into the EU but not the FSU Central Asian states but this is an issue for another paper. Overall, sub-regional differences appear to be less salient as WEOG ("Western European and Others Groups") and Eastern European regional groups are now well integrated.

All of the graphs representing the separate power sources have the same dense cluster with variations only in which countries are isolated or peripheral. The graph for Europe, Ideological Power, Time 4: 1996-2001 (Figure ?) shows several isolates—Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkey; and several peripheral countries—Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Yugoslavia, Russia, Belarus, and Armenia. Many of these countries are OIC members and some of the resolutions were related to the world conference in Durban where Israel was criticized for racist policies. Several others dealt with human rights issues; many of these countries had governments criticized for violation of human rights issues.

The graph for Europe, Economic Power, Time 4: 1996-2001 (Figure ?) had many of the same peripheral countries but also included Israel, the US, Moldova and Albania, while Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey are integrated into the large cluster of countries.

The EC scores reveal a tight clustering of current EU members with candidate (2004) members in 2004, and applicants for 2007 and beyond. Interviews conducted at the European Commission in New York indicated a strong interest in the voting similarity of EU members. The EC publishes voting reports for EU members. Regardless of the purpose, there is clearly evidence of which countries vote in the interest of the EU and which do not, reflecting some normative pressure. Most EU members are developed countries or in transition. There is some support for Huntington but also evidence of other factors including historical alliances, trade partners and simply state interests in democratic leadership and economic growth.

The CA graphs show Uzbekistan near Israel and the US indicating economic ties/interests on the part of Uzbekistan who votes regularly with these two countries and receives economic benefits from the US for military bases strategic for its wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. This is clearly a case of state interest rather than ideological polarization and shows room for cooperation in this period of "flux." The danger of assuming polarization is that it can be a self-fulfilling prophecy. Although there are clear trends that validate some of Huntington's hypotheses, there are enough exceptions to question them. As Mann notes, societies are messy and complex and it is difficult to presume too much determinism.

The resolution nearest Turkey and Russia, and farthest from the US, Israel and Uzbekistan, addresses US sanctions against Cuba. The issue of economic sanctions against Cuba used to be widely supported by the Western bloc in general as part of the Cold War ideological divide. The US and Israel along with either Uzbekistan, the Marshall Islands or Micronesia (the latter former US island trusts) are the only countries who now support this resolution. This is clearly an issue between the US and Cuba and has isolated the US in the UNGA along with its perceived neglect of Palestine in favor of Israel. Most EU countries have either large Muslim populations or are in close proximity to these states and require more distance from this issue. The resolutions closest to Tajikistan relate to either assistance to Sudan or elimination of economic coercion. Resolutions closest to Armenia, Cyprus and Malta, relatively close to many of the EU countries and farthest from Israel, US and Uzbekistan, relates to Palestinian sovereignty over its natural resources and financing the Lebanon interim force.

The graph for Europe, Military Power, Time 4: 1996-2001 (Figure ?) shows a striking difference from the Time 1 graph. The polarization has been replaced by strong regional cohesion. The only countries in this region that are peripheral are the FSU Central Asian countries, and Turkmenistan is the only isolate. Russia became an associate member of NATO in 2002, which is reflected in its closer ties to the other states in this region on this dimension. The membership of Russia in its former adversaries' military alliance is perhaps the greatest indicator of the end of Cold War divisions. Yugoslavia is also quite peripheral, probably related to internal conflict. Again, there is less inner-regional differences except for the FSU Central Asian countries which are part of the Asian region. We will explore below—in the Asia and Pacific analyses—whether these countries are more integrated with other countries in this region.

The resolutions primarily address nuclear disarmament, nuclear free zones, test ban treaties, cooperation between the UN and OECS, and preventing violent disintegration of states. The resolutions closest to the peripheral states focus international arrangements to assure non-nuclear states against the use of nuclear weapons, reducing

nuclear danger and transparency in armaments, ICJ advisory opinions on legality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; and the role of science and technology in context of international security and disarmament (presumably, non nuclear states want the technology for other uses). It is clear that the US as the sole super power and military hegemon would want more control over any attempts to reduce its military maneuvering. This presents more evidence that state interests vary and make a difference in the strength of alliances. The European states suffered catastrophic losses in two world wars and with the "irrationality" of using nuclear weapons understandably want to work towards disarmament and the control of nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear states would like to be compensated for not developing nuclear weapons by having the technology shared for peaceful purposes such as energy.

The graph for Europe, Political Power, Time 4: 1996-2001 (Figure ?) differs in that the US and Israel are very peripheral to the group, along with four of the six FSU Central Asian states (only Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan are integrated with the large group), and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Russia is more integrated than the US. The CA graph shows the US and Israel to be more similar to many of the dominant Islamic states than to the EU states on these issues which is interesting given that many resolutions dealt with Palestinian rights and OIC membership requires support for Palestinian issues. The US is more supportive of decolonization issues than are most of the EU states.

Although the graphs were remarkably similar illustrating strong cohesion among the core European countries, the differences found across power types are also important. Clearly five FSU Central Asian states, the US and Israel, and several of the former Communist states are peripheral. Kazakhstan was the most integrated of the FSU Central Asian countries and interestingly, the religious make-up is 47% Muslim, 44% Orthodox and 2% Protestant. The other four FSU Central Asian states are from 75% to 90% Muslim. But religion is obviously not the only salient factor as Uzbekistan aligns with US and Israel on resolutions related to sanctions on Cuba and provides a military base to the US in exchange for economic awards. Albania is predominantly Muslim but integrated into the larger European bloc probably because it has established a multiparty democracy (although fraught with problems of corruption). Most of the other Islamic majority states have not established democracies.

In summary, the graph combining all resolutions at this time period gives us the consistent image of a very cohesive region with the US, Israel, and Islamic states more peripheral. There is a strong EU identity that appears to be non-Islamic although there appears to be a correlation between Islamic states and non-democratic regimes in this region (Inglehart quote). Turkey is the only Islamic state that is an EU candidate; notably it was a candidate before some of the recent EU members so cultural and religious issues may play a role. It is also a member of NATO while the other peripheral countries are not, with the exception of the US. Overall, ideology or culture does appear to play a role, but it appears to be centered around democracy and not religion, particularly as most European states and Canada are relatively secular. How countries align across regions will tell a lot about the salience of identity.

Because of size constraints, I will just highlight results from the other regions and all of the regions combined by way of illustrating differences in pre- and post-Cold War structures.

Results for Asia and the Pacific, Time 1

The graph for Asia and the Pacific, all resolutions combined, for the post-Cold War time period, reveals a split in Communist states and this is true for all of the individual analyses as well. Soviet-backed Laos, Mongolia, Vietnam and Afghanistan are distinct from China and Cambodia, reflecting the historical tensions in this region during this time period. China and Cambodia also vote very similarly to members of the non-aligned movement ("NAM"). The NAM was an odd mixture of Communist and non-Communist states organized by the Prime Ministers of Burma/Myanmar, SriLanka (then Ceylon), India, Indonesia and Pakistan and including leaders of 29 states, mostly former colonies from Africa and Asia, to discuss common concerns and to develop joint policies in international relations. Their key focus was to resist the pressures of the major powers, to maintain their independence and to oppose colonialism and neo-colonialism, especially western domination. Although Commonwealth membership exerts some influence in the region—about half of the states in this region were members during this time period (Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Maldives, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Fiji, PNG, Vanuatu, Brunei, and India), NAM membership appears to account for voting similarity.

The other pattern of interest is evidence of voting similarity between Western-aligned countries and the other countries in the region. Australia, New Zealand and Japan form a cohesive subgroup isolated from the other states in the region. This is a precursor of Huntington's post-Cold War hypothesis that new divisions will be between the West and the non-West, across regions. The coalition of Communist and non-aligned states and the split in the Communist states indicates a different dynamic than a singular East-West polarization would hypothesize. The pattern represents more of a complex mixture of geopolitics involving current and past alliances on all four of the power sources. Although the Vietnam War was very much a Cold War conflict, Communist China made overtures to the West to counter Soviet influence in the region—and threats to its ally, Cambodia.

The graph for Asia and the Pacific, Ideological Power, for the first time period (1981-1985, Figure ?) shows a large cohesive group composed of members of the non-aligned movement ("NAM") and Communist states China and Cambodia with ties to a more peripheral group of Communist states—Laos, Mongolia, Vietnam and Afghanistan—and India, with negative ties to Western states Australia, New Zealand, Japan and several smaller island countries like Vanuatu, Samoa and Solomon islands. Several historical factors explain these relationships. Mongolia has a long history of relations with the Soviet Union; it won its independence in 1921 with Soviet backing, and installed a Communist regime shortly after (1924). India signed a treaty of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union in August 1971 relating to the latter's 1965 role as peace broker between India and Pakistan and India's desire to deter Chinese support of West Pakistan. The Soviet Union had a long history with Afghanistan eventually occupying the country in 1979 after it began to lose influence. Laos also experienced close ties with the Soviet Union but the closest ties were between the Soviet Union and Vietnam. Vietnam became a full COMECON member in 1978, and provided the largest naval base for the Soviet Union outside of its own country.

The Vietnam War increased tensions between the Soviet Union and China and between these states and the Western states in the region. During the war, Thailand,

Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines (along with South Korea—not yet a UN member state—and the US) fought with South Vietnam against Soviet and Chinese backed North Vietnam (and the Viet Cong, a South Vietnamese opposition movement), eventually involving border states Cambodia and Laos. In 1978, the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia (China's ally) and remained in a civil war for almost 13 years. In this same year, in an attempt to counter Soviet influence in the region, China signed a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with the Japanese and a joint communiqué with the US. Both documents contained an "anti-hegemony" clause directed against the Soviet Union. It was during this period that the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) chairman referred to the Soviet Union as a greater threat to Chinese security and world peace than the Soviet Union. It particularly objected to Soviet presence in Vietnam and Cambodia. The Soviet Union signed treaties of friendship and cooperation with India, Mongolia, North Korea, Vietnam, and Afghanistan.

In addition to historical alliances and conflict, memberships in regional organizations played a role in voting similarity. The dominant regional organizations during this time are arguably NAM (established in 1961) and G77 (established in 1964). Ironically only Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Solomon Islands, Samoa and Fiji are not members. The G77 is the 'economic branch' of NAM (per interview with head of NAM, UN, 2002) and its goal was to promote economic cooperation among developing countries. The only non-members in this region—Australia, New Zealand and Japan—are the only developed states at this time.

There are two clusters of resolutions; one cluster nearest the Western group addresses human rights problems in specific countries (Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala and Iran) and the abolition of the death penalty. The cluster of resolutions addressing social and economic changes, measures against totalitarian practices, the elimination of racial discrimination, alternative approaches for improving human rights and freedoms, and human rights and the use of science and technological developments are closer to the large non-Western group. Although world polity theory asserts there is an evolving universal norm regarding human rights, it is not uncontested. Differences in voting reflect the belief of non-Western developing states that improvement of economic and social conditions is integral to the idea of human rights. There are also historical legacies of colonialism and discrimination that help shape differences in perception of human rights by non-Western states. Overall, this graph shows greater unity of non-Western states than the graph for all resolutions combined, indicating there is strong similarity on ideological issues.

The graph for Asia and the Pacific, Economic Power, Time 1 (Figure ?) shows a similar grouping as the graph for ideological power with several important differences. First, there are many more negative ties between members and no isolates. Oddly, the ASEAN members which were grouped together for ideological issues are not grouped together on economic issues, which are putatively more salient to this organizational membership. Japan is now grouped with Australia and New Zealand, forming a triad of the only developed states in this region during this time period. The Communist states continue to be split. Vanuatu now shares ties with the large group of non-Western states which may be a function of its G77 membership. Vanuatu is a poor country with a very small delegation. Both NAM and G77 offer smaller countries information on resolutions important to the interests of developing countries so it is not surprising to see this

grouping. It appears that G77 is a more important organization than ASEAN for economic issues during this particular time period.[13] ASEAN began concentrating on regional economic development centered on particular industries but it allowed members to exclude sectors sensitive to their own interests. The result was that only 5 percent of trade was covered by this agreement. There are plans for a free-trade area scheduled for 2008 which would allow for a gradual reduction of tariffs.) All of the states in this region are members except Australia, New Zealand and Japan. The Palestine Liberation Organization ("PLO") is also a member of both NAM and G77 (It has observer status in the UN but maintains an active presence in the UN and makes statements in Committee Members in support of various resolutions.) Therefore NAM members are more likely to vote for the resolutions related to needs of the Palestinians. Other resolutions distinguishing the West from nonwestern states related to the program budget, the financing of various UN programs, the financing of the UN interim force in Lebanon, and embargoes against Nicaragua and South Africa (the Western powers did not initially sanction South Africa; this was driven by NAM members).

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power (Figure ?) looks very different from the ideological and economic power networks. Australia, New Zealand and Japan, representatives of the West generally, share positive ties with Cambodia, and by extension, China. This may be explained by China's efforts to improve relations with the West to counter Soviet influence. Although the ASEAN Regional Forums (ARFs) were organized to address security issues, they were largely ineffective. The Soviet influenced states continue to form a cohesive subgroup with ties to the larger group of NAM states. The majority of resolutions for this subset are farthest from the Soviet-influenced states. The resolutions address disarmament, denuclearization of Africa, Palestine issues, strengthening of international security, prohibition of WMD and new systems of weapons of this type, nuclear test ban treaty, nuclear weapon free zone in South Asia, Antarctica, and the Middle East, and the Falkland islands conflict.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power (Figure ?) is the first graph to depict a predicted East-West divide. There is a large cluster of 13 states, consisting of NAM member states and China and DK/Cambodia with ties to a group of eight states consisting of the Western oriented states. These two groups have multiple negative ties to a cluster of eight states consisting of the Soviet-influenced states plus Iran and Vanuatu. This graph shows stronger dissimilarity between groups, likely centered on the situation in Afghanistan and Democratic Kampuchea ("DK", wanting sovereignty as Cambodia) and independence for East Timor. Other resolutions addressed the apartheid policies of South Africa; the independence of Namibia; the situation in the Middle East and relief for Palestine refugees; the declaration granting independence to colonial countries and peoples; the granting of independence to colonies by UN agencies and International associations; Israeli practices affecting the human rights of Palestinians and Arabs; sovereignty in Grenada; and the right of self determination of Western Sahara from Morocco.

Overall, the graph for all of the resolutions combined reveals the strongest relationships: a group of Western states with negative ties to a group of Soviet-influenced Communist states, and a group of NAM with China and Cambodia. When we combine all

[13] The Economist Intelligence Unit United 2004 notes that ASEAN started with grand objectives but could not deliver; see p. 44, Country Profile, Myanmar (Burma) at www.eiu.com.

resolutions, we lose important differences within each power type including apparent influence of organizational memberships and alliances specific to the power source, i.e., military or economic.

Results for Asia and the Pacific, Time 4

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power for the second time period (Figure ?) shows two differences from the first time period: an increase in the density of ties due to a 33 percent increase in the number of states and the presence of two rather than three clusters. There are also more isolates including three of the FSU Central Asian states but also Mongolia, Vanuatu and new island state Nauru. The other two FSU Central Asian states—Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan—are aligned with the larger group of Western states: Australia, New Zealand and Japan and now South Korea plus several island states including newly independent former island trusts very much dominated by the US—Marshall Islands and Micronesia. The five remaining Communist countries: China, Laos, Mongolia, North Korea and Vietnam are integrated with the large group of NAM states, now largely focused on development issues. Vietnam begin withdrawing from Cambodia in mid-1988—encouraged to do so by the Soviet Union—to aid in their attempt to improve relations with both China and the ASEAN states. This factor and the fact that these five Communist states plus Cuba are the only remaining Communist states internationally likely led to the necessity for new alliances and based on different needs than Cold War politics. There is a clear cluster of Western countries (Japan, NZ, Australia highly cohesive, with ties to South Korea, the island countries and the two FSU Central Asian states. Almost 40 percent of the states in the region at this time are considered Free on the Freedom House democracy scale; most of these are in the Western group of states. There is a larger cohesive group which includes the four remaining Communist states in the region.

This graph could be interpreted in many ways. It has elements of Huntington's "the West versus the rest" except for the tie with Uzbekistan, a majority Islamic country, and Kazakhstan, which has a large Islamic population. It could be interpreted as developed states and their allies versus developing states except the large group includes two of the four Asian Tigers—South Korea and Singapore (the other two—Hong Kong and Taiwan—are not UN member states). History is certainly a factor as FSU Central Asian states vote differently from the Communist states in the region suggesting there is no residual communist affiliation. Political practices are also an issue. Many of the resolutions in this subset pertain to human rights situation in particular countries: Bosnia-Herzegovina , Croatia, Yugoslavia, Kosovo, Sudan, Iraq, Iran, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire), Cuba, and Nigeria ; a resolution aimed at the elimination of honor killings against women; and two on promoting democracy—all of which the western group supported. The nonwestern states tended to support resolutions focused on returning cultural property to countries of origin, protection of migrants, respect for right to the universal freedom of travel (Cuba), the right of Palestinians to self-determination, principles of national sovereignty and noninterference in elections based on human rights issues; promotion of a democratic and equitable international order; and the right to development.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power implies economic organizations are salient; ASEAN and APEC members are clustered together

as are Western member states. APEC was established in 1989 with the goal of promoting trade and investment in this area. Its members include four states with advanced economies—Australia, New Zealand, Japan and South Korea—and many of the ASEAN members—Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei, Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam—as well as Papua New Guinea. It also includes the US, Canada, Mexico, Russia and other non-regional states Chile and Peru. Hong Kong and Taiwan are members of APEC and the region but are not UN member states. APEC does not include three other ASEAN members: Cambodia, Myanmar and Laos. The majority Islamic states (who are not members of these organizations) in the region are not a cohesive subgroup; the five FSU Central Asian states continue to be split, with Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan generally allied with the West. Most of the resolutions in this subset imply an ideological division between the West and nonwestern states as they focus on Palestinian economic issues, the Cuba-embargo (although only the US, Israel and Uzbekistan or the Marshall islands vote yes on this now), assistance to Sudan, the elimination of coercive economic measures as means of political and economic compulsion and financing the UN interim force in Lebanon. Relations depicted in this graph imply trade interests are stronger than ideological divisions on economic issues. This counters more hypotheses of more polarized relations such as civilizational identity.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power, shows greater differences in the West and nonwestern groups than for the economic resolutions. There is a strong clustering of Western states with ties to all five of the FSU Central Asian states. The Communist states are clearly in a separate cluster with multiple negative ties between the two clusters. ARF is the security organization for ASEAN and its members have negative ties to the Western members. Several of the Western states are members of the Australia Group (Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea). The Western states also have ties to NATO (Japan and South Korea are arguably military protectorates of the US) although they are not officially members. The resolutions address a range of issues that clearly include "a balance of power" among nuclear and non-nuclear space. The resolutions include those aimed at the prevention of an arms race in outer space; agreements on disarmament and arms control; creating a nuclear weapon free zone in the southern hemisphere and adjacent areas; claiming the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace; promoting the non-proliferation treaty and regional disarmament; creating a nuclear free South Asia (most salient to Western countries); nuclear testing issues (most salient to Western countries); creating international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of them and risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

The patterns belie Huntington's clash thesis in the alignment of the West with the FSU Central Asian Islamic states. There is not a clear overriding identity to describe these two 'blocs' of states other than West plus FSU Central Asian Islamic versus Communist, and others. India and Pakistan vote alike even though they continue to engage in conflicts over Kashmir. Iran is a religious republic aligned with Communist countries. The complexity of post Cold War relations is revealed in this subset.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power differs from the other graphs as there is less division of the Western states from the other states. There are several states which are highly dissimilar from the majority of the countries: Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Micronesia, Tonga, Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Indonesia.

Many of these countries were marked by conflict; Micronesia and Tonga were newly independent states and missed much of the voting. The resolutions in this subset addressed a range of issues relating to the Israeli/Palestinian situation; a declaration granting independence to colonial countries; and measures to eliminate international terrorism. There were also resolutions pertaining to the oceans and the law of the sea which were closer to the interests of Western countries. Overall, the issues addressed in the resolutions do not appear to be overly divisive to this group of states.

The graph combining all power sources for Asia and the Pacific for this time period (Figure ?) reveals two distinct groups—a Western dominated group and a more cohesive group of Communist and NAM members with multiple negative ties between the groups. The graph combining all resolutions misses important differences between alignments on issues representing different power sources. This graph could be interpreted as "the West versus the rest" except for the presence of all five of the Islamic majority FSU Central Asian states allied with the West. Many of the Western group states are democracies (with the exception of the FSU Central Asian states) implying the cultural division is between democratic and non-democratic states. The divisions also do not represent a North-South split; the Western group does contain four developed states but the NICs in the other group and China's increasing economic power undermines this interpretation. It is clearly not a case of regionalism. There are too many religions in the non-Western group to call this a civilizational divide and the mixture of Islamic and Christian states in the Western group also undermines this interpretation. We can only summarize that post-Cold War geopolitics are complex and in flux. It is too early to denote a major world division. The dominant pattern remains states pursuing their own interests and creating alliances based on these even if they change across power types as noted in the examination of the separate networks of power.

Overall, the five FSU Central Asian states do not appear to have a strong identity or alliances in either the European or the Asia and Pacific regions. They are still developing as states. There is a lack of clustering according to religious similarity. There is some clustering based on regime type, level of development, and according to NAM and G77 membership but the latter may be because most of the states in this region are members. It does distinguish the dominant Western states in the region, however. Membership in the Organization of Islamic Conference ("OIC") does not appear to be salient, particularly since the FSU Central Asian states did not vote differently on political issues when OIC membership would indicate a greater likelihood of doing so. There are clear differences between the Western states and the Communist states but the alliance of the FSU Central Asian states with the former indicates this is not a case of "the West vs. the rest". Rather overall, the graphs look like the West plus FSU Central Asian Islamic states versus Communist and NAM states with a few politically troubled outliers. There is no evidence of a civilizational divide, nor a divide representing North vs. South because the NICs are not integrated with the Western developed states. This is a complex region with multiple identities, histories, religions, political regimes and levels of development. It is a "multicultural" region neither cohesive nor particularly divisive. There is no evidence of regionalism; if anything, nationalism is more salient given the number of new nation states and identity issues with the independence of East Timor from Indonesia and the continual conflict between Pakistan and India over Kashmir but

not enough to keep them from cooperating on a number of issues related to NAM and G77 interests.

Results for Latin America and the Caribbean, Time 1

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power for Latin America and the Caribbean for the first time period (Figure ?) is somewhat surprising. The predominant cluster is a group of NAM member states with negative ties to the US on one side and to Cuba, Nicaragua and Guyana on the other side.[14] NAM and G77 are central organizations for developing states which defines the states in this regional overall. All states except the US are G77 members and only seven states in this region are not NAM members—the US, El Salvador, Haiti and three OECS states (Antigua Barbuda, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. The graph also gives a picture of regionalization, not unlike the graph for post-Cold War Europe. Although there are subregional differences; for example, several of the states receiving negative ties are members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean states ("OECS"): Antigua Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines—all but St. Lucia. These states requested US assistance in the 1983 invasion of Grenada to prevent the Marxist takeover in progress. Cuban troops fought both OECS member states and the US but democratic elections were returned in 1984. The US was also involved in the Nicaraguan Contra War waged from 1982-1990. These conflicts help explain this particular pattern of negative ties in addition to an overall regional pattern of nonalignment in an attempt to stay out of the Cold War conflicts.

Many of the resolutions for this time period are centered on human rights issues. Commonwealth membership requires democratic government and a commitment to international human rights norms, so this could be influencing the patterns of the Caribbean states--12 of which are Commonwealth members. These states are more likely to speak English and to be Protestant (rather than Spanish-speaking and Catholic) which makes for important subregional differences along many cultural dimensions. It is unclear how influential Commonwealth membership is given that it no longer provides the same economic advantages before decolonization. It is also unclear how much trade preference is provided. Other factors that could account for differences in voting relate to the content of the resolutions, several of which specifically address human rights issues in Chile, El Salvador, and Guatemala as well as in Afghanistan and Iran. There are several resolutions related to the Israel-Palestine situation. The Soviet Union used the Israel-Palestine issue to its advantage which likely influenced Cuba as well as many NAM members. These resolutions illustrate the political nature of many human rights issues.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power shows less cohesion than for ideological differences. Cuba is now more integrated into the larger group which may reflect voting on resolutions regarding embargoes against Nicaragua. Trade agreements do not appear to play a factor in the alignments. Although MERCOSUR does not exist at this time, precursors existed but members did not share ties. Likewise, members of the Caribbean Community ("CARICOM") do not form a cohesive subgroup, nor do members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States

[14] NAM does not provide membership dates so it is unclear if Nicaragua and Cuba were members during this time period; they are members now. They were clearly Communist countries at this time—Cuba continues to be.

("OECS"). The overall patterning is more suggestive of cohesion among developing states and could be interpreted as a North-South divide.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power shows the OECS countries as more peripheral than in the other two graphs, with negative ties to Grenada, Cuba and Nicaragua, reflecting the attempted Marxist takeover of this island state. The Organization of American States ("OAS") is the only security organization for this region, so the OECS members requested assistance from the US in restoring Grenada to independence. Most of resolutions relate to disarmament, reducing military budgets, and the relationship between development and disarmament. These resolutions would distinguish the US from the rest of the states in the region, and possibly Cuba as well, although Cuba would more likely vote with NAM on resolutions connecting development and disarmament. Overall, the analyses reveal some Cold War ideological differences but also reflect state interests. The OECS states did not want a Communist state so close to their boundaries—an interest of the US as well in both regional conflicts. There is also clearly an element of North-South divisions reflected in the resolutions linking development and disarmament.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power shows greater dissimilarity among states in the region than in the other graphs. Interestingly, this is the only graph where the US shares a positive tie with another country—Paraguay. Cuba also shares more ties, now connected to Nicaragua, Guyana and Mexico with ties from the last two countries to Panama and Trinidad and Tobago. There is a denser clustering of OECS states with greater similarity to the US. This pattern is interesting in that it would appear to be more accurate for military resolutions—until you examine the content of the resolutions. The military resolutions were more generalized while the political resolutions are specific to state sovereignty issues, with one specifically addressed to the situation in Grenada. Another resolution addresses the situation in Afghanistan which is where Cuba and its allies would disagree with the rest of the NAM members. NAM members also support resolutions addressing South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, Cambodian sovereignty, issues related to Palestine refugees, and independence of East Timor.

The structure of the political network in this region during this time period reflects a complex mix of state interests, regional Cold War-based conflicts, and a mix of alliances. The predominant identity appears to be NAM (and G77) although OECS membership is central to the conflict in Grenada. The OAS appears to be less salient; the US provides security to the region now but there was a clear conflict during the Cold War when member states were divided in East-West loyalty. Overall, states sought to protect their own sovereignty and economic interests.

The graph combining all power sources for Latin America and the Caribbean for this time period (Figure ?) reveals significant differences from the individual graphs for this time period. Although still peripheral, both the US and Cuba are shown as more integrated into the graph, which misses major differences within the individual analyses. In general, this graph provides evidence of Cold War conflicts, particularly through the clustering of NAM members with positive ties within the group and many negative ties to the US on the one hand and Cuba and Nicaragua on the other hand. The clustering of OECS states near the US with Grenada quite peripheral reflects the US-OECS military action to counter the Marxist takeover of Grenada. The overall pattern is more similar to

Asia given the large NAM presence in both regions and different from the very polarized East-West division in Europe.

Results for Latin America and the Caribbean, Time 4

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power (Figure ?), is significantly different from the ideological graph at Time 1. The graph for Time 1 reflected a very cohesive region while this graph represents a very sparsely connected group of states—clearly not a case of regionalism. The US continues to be very dissimilar to other countries in this region while Cuba is now more integrated with the island states, possibly as a result of ACS membership although it is not a member of the other Caribbean IEMP organizations. Cuba also has negative ties to several MERCOSUR states, all of which maintain democratic governments and have experienced recent economic difficulties potentially making Cuba a threat from the left. Another explanation is that several resolutions from this subset center on human rights issues and many address particular states, including Cuba. The US as the dominant World Bank, IMF and WTO member is probably negatively viewed for the neoliberalism-based policies imposed on regional members. These policies have been unproductive and even disastrous, driving many countries to leftist governments. Other than a loosely connected group of Caribbean states the pattern looks like nationalism with each state pursuing its own interests.[15] Other issues that would distinguish US from the other countries in the region relate to resolutions criticizing unilateral coercive measures (likely directed at the US and sanctions against Cuba), requesting a democratic and equitable international order (of interest to developing states), respect for national sovereignty and noninterference in electoral processes, use of mercenaries to impede self-determination, the right to food, and development. The differences in interpretation of human rights issues continues to distinguish developed from developing states, with the former focused on the right to food and development more than political and civil liberties. This contested nature of a 'universal norm' of human rights needs to be taken into account more in world polity theories.

There does not appear to be an overriding ideological unity in this region. This region is an interesting contrast to Europe at Time 1 as the patterns are completely opposite. Europe was very divided at Time 1 and is now highly cohesive with deep economic, military and political integration. Latin America was very cohesive at Time 1 but is not cohesive at Time 4. Clearly regionalization cannot be ascribed to this region. There are definitely North-South divisions reflected in the US and the rest but it is not a strong uniting force. There are differences between Latin American and Caribbean states—these are grouped into different civilizations based on differences in dominant language and religion—but not enough to be particularly divisive or to suggest future clashes. Inglehart and Norris (2003) found that Latin Americans scored the lowest on religiosity suggesting this is not a very salient issue for them. Centeno (2002) notes that although Latin American states share a macro-regional culture, the ethnic diversity within each state weakens internal cohesion and presumably, cohesion among states. World Systems Theory would imply greater cohesion among developing states but this is not evident. The overall structure is one of nationalism or individual states voting according to its own interests and how it prioritizes its alliances.

[15] I thank Angela Jamison for this insight.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power is more cohesive than the graph for ideological resolutions for this time period. Interestingly, despite Mexico's incorporation into NAFTA, it shares a positive tie with Cuba and a negative tie with the US. These three states are also very peripheral to other states in the region. As are several Central American states. There are more trade agreements among regional members at this time and appears to influence voting alignments. MERCOSUR members Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay, and associate members Chile and Bolivia share many positive ties, as do OECS member states. There is also greater similarity among CARICOM members. The ACS (generally perceived as a talk shop) membership on the other hand does not appear to influence voting alignments. NAM and G77 memberships appear to be salient as there is some overall cohesion. Garreton et al (2003) note that a goal of NAM is to change the international economic order and with the importance of development issues to states, increased similarity on these issues are likely. In general, the increase in trade agreements does appear to contribute to voting similarity on economic issues.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power is unique in its configuration. There appear to be four sparsely connected subgroups with many negative ties between them and several isolates which include the majority of Central American states. The resolutions during this time period reference nuclear disarmament, creating nuclear free zones, test ban treaties, cooperation between the UN and OECS, and preventing violent disintegration of states. Other resolutions address international arrangements to assure non-nuclear states against the use of nuclear weapons, reducing nuclear danger and transparency in armaments, ICJ advisory opinions on legality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, the role of science and technology in context of international security and disarmament (presumably, non nuclear states want the technology for other uses). It is clear that the US will take a unique stance as the remaining super power and military hegemon. Notably, it is most dissimilar from Cuba, Mexico, Haiti and Guyana. There is a cluster of OECS/CARICOM member states that probably reflects voting similarly on the resolution addressing cooperation between the OECS organization and the UN. Cuba is clearly not integrated with other Caribbean states and is fairly isolated in the region. This could reflect the increase in democratization in the region. Cuba is excluded from most regional IEMP memberships, including OAS and OECS, the two most salient organizations for security-oriented resolutions.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power shows a more cohesive group than we have seen for the other resolutions. There has been an unprecedented increase in the number of democracies in the region (using the Freedom House scale for democracy, 21 countries are designated as free; 11 as partly free; and 2 as not free (Cuba and Haiti), and all but three countries have electoral democracies (Antigua Barbuda, Cuba, and Haiti)). In addition, MERCUSOR incorporated a democracy clause in 1996 "following the successful efforts by Brazil and Argentina (among other countries) to thwart a 1996 coup attempt in Paraguay" (Garreton et al 2003:52). The clause also "played an important role in preventing military intervention after the 1999 resignation of President Raul Cubas of Paraguay" (Garreton et al 2003:52). The OAS has also taken steps to defend political democracy in the region including passing Resolution 1080 in 1991 which was invoked several times during political crisis: in Haiti in 1991,

Peru in 1992, Guatemala in 1993 and Paraguay in 1996. In 2001, the OAS created the Inter-American Democratic Charter which seeks to both protect and establish democracy (Garreton et al 2003:52).This would imply greater similarity in political ideology among regional members, although there continues to be subregional differences, with several Central American and island countries continue to be more peripheral to the larger group of Latin American countries. Cuba and the US continue to be very dissimilar to other group members.

The graph for all resolutions combined for this second time period is significantly different from the individual graphs for this time period and quite misleading. The level of density in this graph belies the sparse connections and sub-regional affiliations of the individual graphs. It misses the strong negative position of Cuba in the military resolutions and its isolated status in political resolutions. Finally, it implies no change in degree of regionalization when in fact there appears to be a significant change since Time 1. The large increase in the number of democracies may account for greater similarity. There is also economic similarity as all countries but the US are developing countries; all but the US and Mexico belong to G77; the majority continue to belong to NAM. Sub-regional identities appear to be stronger than the NAM identity prominent in the first time period. The Caribbean countries are distinct from the Latin American countries in numerous ways: most are members of the Commonwealth, most speak English and most are predominantly Protestant. There are recent changes in Latin America with Evangelical Protestantism citing major inroads into this predominantly and historically Catholic region. Overall, the countries in this area can be characterized as newly democratizing and trying to integrate into global economy through subregional trading blocs (MERCOSUR, CARICOM, and NAFTA primarily). There does not appear to be a single unifying factor for states in this region other than developing states.

Garreton et al (2003) notes that Latin American states need to find a unifying identity if they are going to be successful in generating regionalization—believed by many to be a first step in global integration. They believe the traditional Latin American approaches to integrating into the world economy were not successful because of the difficult social adjustments required to adopt dominant international patterns while "maintaining other incentives and supports also inherited from the past" (Garreton et al, p. 43). Mann and Riley note that US regional hegemony in this region was originally "mobilized against socialism" but is now "expressed through international financial institutions" and neoliberalism resulting in an increase in inequality and divided states (Mann and Riley 2002:4). Current economic crises threaten gains in democracy but Garreton et al do not believe there is an "alternative international ideological model to democracy" so they do not predict a strong reversal (current events belies this optimism) (Garreton et al 2003: 52). They note that Islamic fundamentalism "lacks the religious adherents to be viable" (although interestingly, Guyana and Suriname are recent members of the OIC even though they lack dominant Islamic majorities); Asian authoritarianism does not have "key cultural carriers or social bases" in Latin America; and the end of the Cold War ended the influence of the Cuban Revolution (Garreton et al 2003:52). Transnational social movements and networked international and domestic NGOs provide support for social movements focused on democracy, human rights issues and the extension of democratic and civil rights has increased in the region (Garreton et al, 2003, p. 52). On the other hand, global economic transformations have weakened Latin

American states, strengthened financial conglomerates, and weakened middle-sector and working class groups (Garreton et al 2003:53). Latin America has "greater disparities of income distribution than any other region in the world" (Garreton et al 2003:57). Recent failures of neoliberalism has set off a wave of leftist movements—a counter to the recent strengthening of democracy in the region. World systems theory appears to be the most salient description of post-Cold War Latin America. This may change with current economic globalization processes. In response to China's growing interest in the region, the US appears to have increased its own interest, perhaps reflected in the creation of CAFTA (Central American Free Trade Agreement). Clearly globalization processes are still at work, are multi-dimensional and are too complex to be explained by a single paradigm.

Results for Africa, Time 1

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power (Figure ?) shows two distinct clusters with dense positive ties within the clusters and few negative ties between them making this an unusual graph. There are also numerous isolated or peripheral states. Nigeria and Liberia appear to function as a bridge from the top cluster to the bottom cluster. Interestingly, the EC scores reflect the similarity between the two groups by showing differences on a continuum in a single large group with only a few states receiving negative EC scores.

The Cold War made its presence known in this region with both the US and the Soviet Union attempting to influence states. There appears to be some division of states according to political ideology. Communist states Angola, Congo, Ethiopia, and Mozambique are in the lower cluster with socialist state Madagascar (a one party state from 1975-1992) and leftist states Algeria, Burundi, Mali, and Tanzania. This cluster also contains more Southern African states, primarily former British colonies, including Mauritius, one of only three countries in the region designated as Free. The other two are Nigeria—which serves as a bridge between the two groups and Botswana, an isolated state. The North African Arab Islamic states are split between the two groups. Algeria, Libya and Tunisia are in the bottom cluster and Egypt, Morocco and Sudan are in the top cluster. The top cluster has more OIC members (Cameroon, CotedIvoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Morocco, Niger, Somalia, and Sudan; only three states were not OIC members—DRC, Liberia and CenAfrRep which has observer status even though it is a majority Muslim state). Many of the states in the top cluster are also former French colonies; subregionally, these states include three of the four Central African states; four from West Africa; three of the four Horn of Africa states (excludes Ethiopia); and three from North Africa (Egypt, Morocco, Sudan). Eight of these 13 states are listed as Not Free by the Freedom House scale; the other five are listed as Partly Free.

The similarity in state attributes likely contributes to voting similarity. Many of the resolutions addressed issues of apartheid and racial discrimination. Other resolutions referenced social progress and the "indivisibility and interdependence of economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights" supported by most developing states. Resolutions relating to human rights issues in Afghanistan (this would likely distinguish the group of states with more leftist governments from the other group). Other issues relating to women's issues (this would separate the Islamic states according to Inglehart and Norris (2003); issues related to press freedom; abolition of the death penalty; and

general protection of human rights and freedoms would like distinguish most states from Western states and thereby create more voting similarity. Political and historical issues play a role as there are many conflicts that involve borders and alliances during this period. Sudan was in a civil war involving the repression of African Christians; notably it is in the cluster dominated by OIC member states. Mozambique (bottom cluster) was also in a civil war. Although it facilitated communication between the US and the region regarding South Africa and Namibia, it also had strong Soviet military assistance and a Marxist regime. There were problem areas on the borders of Liberia, a US ally who helped with the situations in Rwanda and Somalia but who also had Soviet ties.

It is hard to determine if any of the organizational membreships made a difference. The OAU was largely an ineffective talk shop with no resources or leverage in the larger international community. NAM may or may not be making a difference; there are some Cold War 'divisions' but appearing to be less ideological than 'expedient' re: negotiating for state interests. The Arab League ("AL") states are split into the two clusters with one group containing more leftist governments but they are not very dissimilar. AL membership could be keeping these countries from becoming too polarized. Given the number of states that 'switched sides' during the war, it is more likely they were less polarized than desirous of help in development and aid and worked with both Super Powers to achieve this. OIC membership may have made a difference in some of the voting, possibly on gender issues as predicted by Inglehart and Norris (2003) based on their findings in assessing the World Values Survey. There seem to be roughly equal numbers of Muslim and Christian countries but this does not seem to be creating any antagonism—just a tendency for OIC states to vote more similarly. Former colonial ties resulted in memberships in the Commonwealth and the Franc Zone which provide potential economic, cultural and historical differences that could influence voting, but this is not evident. Divisions are minimal and based on numerous factors with no one factor particularly salient overall. In the All Country analysis these countries are likely to be divided along North and South divisions with some effect of political regime.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power is less divided than the graph for ideological resolutions. Most of the countries voted no on the resolutions, many of which related to financing. It is possible that because many are related to financing, they preferred to abstain in order not to offend larger countries. The resolutions that likely united this group were those recommending or continuing the embargo against South Africa and those related to the Middle East, particularly programs to support Palestinians given the large OIC membership in this region. The resolution that probably contributed to differences was the one recommending or continuing the embargo against Nicaragua; states with leftist governments are more likely to support Nicaragua and vote against this resolution. Overall, there is more to unite this region economically than divide them. The Franc Zone (FZ) was established in 1964 with the purpose of forming a monetary union among countries whose currencies are linked to the French Franc. Members include Benin, BurkinoFaso, Cameroon, CenAfrRep, Chad, Comoros, Congo, CotedIvoire, EquatorialGuinea, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Togo but there is not a clustering among these states. Commonwealth membership no longer has an economic benefit; and member states do not vote in a cluster. NAM and G77 memberships likely contribute the most to voting similarity given the preponderance of developing states.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power shows two dense clusters with positive ties within and both positive and negative ties between. One cluster has 19 OIC member states compared with eight in the other cluster. Interestingly, all of the leftist states are in the cluster with the most OIC members, unlike the situation in the ideological graph. Somalia and Liberia are now under US influence; they are in the cluster receiving many negative ties from the group with the leftist state. Given the involvement of the US and SU in the internal affairs of African countries, it is perhaps not surprising that there would be more of a divide on these resolutions. The North African states are also split; Algeria and Libya in the top cluster and Egypt, Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia in the bottom cluster. Most of the resolutions address disarmament, denuclearization of Africa, Palestine issues, strengthening of international security, prohibition of WMD and new systems of weapons of this type, nuclear test ban treaty, nuclear weapon free zone in South Asia, Antarctica, and the Middle East, and the Falkland islands conflict. Spheres of influence and type of political regime seem to be more salient for these resolutions than for the other two power types. Organizational memberships appear to be less salient other than a clustering of OIC states; the AL does not appear to create solidarity among its six member states. What divisions are present appear to be North-South but countries remain relatively similar overall.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power is similar to the graph for economic power. There are no longer distinct groups; just a large group with several peripheral states. The resolutions address apartheid and illegal occupation of Namibia—both related to South Africa, the Israel/Palestine situation, political situations in Cambodia, Grenada, Western Sahara, East Timor, Afghanistan, independence to colonial countries, and observer status of liberation movements recognized by the AU or AL. States are likely differentiated on a few situations related to East-West conflicts but most resolutions would be of importance to African—and OIC member—states. There is a clustering of North African, OIC and AL member states on issues related to Palestinian issues. Overall, OIC and AL membership appear to be most salient for political resolutions because of the strong focus on Palestinian issues. Interestingly, although this identity appears to be salient it is not particularly divisive between Christian and Islamic majority states.

The graph for all resolutions combined for this first time period shows a cohesive group with many peripheral nodes. There is more distinction between leftist states and OIC members (although these categories are not exclusive). There is also some clustering of predominantly former French colonies (10 of 14). The combined graph misses the changes across power type including a change in status of several nodes. The degree of cohesion also varies across power types. There is not enough distinction between the two 'sub-groups' to conclude that the Cold War divide was very salient for this region. Given the recent decolonization, struggling states and the lack of development in the area, they do not appear to have been central to Cold War struggles.

Results for Africa, Time 4

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power (Figure ?) reveals one large cohesive group and many peripheral states very dissimilar to the majority on voting on this subset of resolutions. Although there is some clustering of Islamic states, there are no differences between Islamic and non-Islamic countries,

contrary to what might be predicted from Huntington's clash thesis. Only the most peripheral nodes are distinguished here. These include Somalia, Rwanda, and the Central African Republic which are experiencing political turmoil.

Countries in this region tend not to vote in favor of resolutions dealing with human rights in particular states (during this time period, states referenced are Bosnia Herzegovina, Croatia, Yugoslavia, Kosovo, Sudan, Iraq, Iran, DRC, Cuba, and Nigeria) or the elimination of honor killings against women. They tend to vote yes on issues relating to Palestine, right of development, protection of migrants, impact of globalization, respect for right to the universal freedom of travel, principles of national sovereignty and noninterference in elections based on human rights issues, promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, and against the use of mercenaries impeding self-determination—many of which distinguish developing from developed states.

In general, countries are more cohesive during this time period than during the first period we examined. There was some evidence of East-West divisions during the first time period and some clustering of OIC member states during this time period, but not strong polarizations among states at either time. In general, the voting is more reflective of the interests of developing states. World Systems theory accounts more for voting than Huntington's clash of civilizations thesis, which is notable given that over half of the states in this region are majority Islamic states. The cohesion cannot be attributed to regionalization as there are no strong organizations in the area. Although the Organization of African Union reformed as the African Union and instituted a democracy clause, it remains to be seen if it will be more effective. More than half of the states in the region have OIC membership and are therefore expected to support Palestinian issues. There is no democracy clause in OIC membership and it does have a negative stance towards Israel. North African states belong to the Arab League which also does not have a democracy clause. Although there have been some increases in democracy, the extreme poverty of the region makes for political instability.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power is considerably less dense than the graph for ideological power with as many negative as positive ties. There is a clustering of Islamic and North African states, which appears to be related to issues on assistance to Sudan, financing the Lebanon mission, Palestinian sovereignty, and the elimination of coercive economic measures. There is a second clustering of 10 states—five OIC member states and five non-OIC member states (they do not share a similar colonial history) which also generally support these resolutions. It was somewhat surprising not to see greater coherence representing a North-South division but the content of resolutions may not have been structured this way.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power is more cohesive than the graph for economic power and continues to have many negative ties; most to states that are sanctioned during this time because of human rights violations including the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Malawi, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome Principe, Seychelles, and Somalia. The rest of the countries are rather similar on voting; they are composed of 19 OIC member states and 11 non-OIC members. The 19 OIC member states includes all five of the North African, AL member states—Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, and Tunisia—which have the highest similarity in voting. Some of the voting similarity may have been based on resolutions addressing

the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. Other resolutions representing interests of developing states in include those addressing the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power shows stronger differences and more clustering among subgroups of states. There is a cluster of states sanctioned for human rights violations and a second one containing many of the remaining states sanctioned for the same reason. Many of the resolutions are not supported by states in this region; even OIC members do not seem to support issues related to the Palestinian/Middle East situation. Other resolutions reference the ocean and the law of the sea; driftnet fishing; and some information and declarations about decolonization. It is unclear why states are more divided on these issues as even the North African OIC and AL member states are divided. Overall, political ties appear to be weaker than ideological ties.

The graph for all resolutions combined for this second time period shows less cohesion than during the first time period. There is one large cohesive group, a smaller cluster with a few tie between the two groups and several peripheral states. The large cluster is dominated by OIC states containing 20 or so of the 28 OIC member states. The EC scores indicate the most similar states to be Muslim majority states. We can surmise that on average, the combined resolutions show a stronger clustering of Islamic states in the post-Cold War period. It is important to note that this does vary across issues. Recent media articles indicate the vulnerability of poor African states in the war on terror, indicating that this identity could be exploited. It is important, however, not to make the error of assuming this and creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is a lack of development and political and social crises that dominates the region.

Overall, Africa seems less polarized after the end of the Cold War. There is less polarization based on outside power politics regarding spheres of influence. This is a diverse region regarding ethnicity and religion but highly similar regarding development. There is a tendency for African states to vary voting alignments by the issues at hand. On the other hand, there is an increase in cohesion among OIC member states that could be exploited. There is also some sub-regional clustering with correlations to colonial history Many countries in Eastern and Southern Africa were colonized by the UK; those in Central and West Africa largely by France. Eighteen of the 20 former French colonies are Islamic compared to eight of the 18 former UK colonies, meaning North and West Africa are heavily Islamic. This makes sense as Islam spread from the Middle East to North Africa to sub-Saharan Africa. Former French colonies were less democratic in Time 1. There was an increase in democracy during Time 4 with eight countries designated as free; 18 as NF; and 26 as PF. The improvements in democratic measures also extend to Islamic states. Seventeen of 30 states designated as NF were Islamic majority states during T1. In time 4, nine of 18 NF designated states are Islamic. Ten of 17 states designated PF in Time 1 were Islamic states compared to 17 of 26 in Time 4. There are also seven Islamic Commonwealth members (and 10 non-Islamic members); democratic government being a requirement of Commonwealth membership. This provides some support for Inglehart and Norris (2003) findings that democracy and Islam are not incompatible. The AU is attempting to promote democracy but the AL and OIC do not. If the latter two organizations could add a democracy clause and work with the AU, they

may be able to attract more investment to help with development and reduce the conflict in the region from weak states and ethnic conflict.

Inter-regional divisions for Africa are not highly polarized. Key differences centered on states receiving international sanction for human rights abuses. There is some clustering of Islamic and North African states that can be attributed to memberships like OIC and AL that place expectations of solidarity in voting along Palestinian issues—and there are many such resolutions in the UN. There is also intra-regional solidarity on development issues. This region has increased in the number of democratic states following the Cold War; it has also decreased in its position in world trade (Centeno et al 2005). It is important for the international community to provide development support and rewards for good governance. There are two vulnerabilities. The first relates to the continual defining of states following decolonization, some of which has led to ethnic cleansing—what Mann (2005) refers to as "the dark side of democracy, when nationalism leads to extreme forms of exclusion. The second relates to self-fulfilling prophecies regarding the clash of civilizations thesis. The high percentage of Islamic states has not lead to a clash of civilizations but these countries are vulnerable to exploitation, accepting help in whatever form it is offered. Good international policy can prevent this.

Results for Western Asia, Time 1

The social network graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power (Figure ?) reveals a cohesive group of countries with Iraq somewhat peripheral and no negative ties although Iraq is peripheral. The correspondence analysis graph reveals more distinction across resolutions related to some Cold War issues. Democratic Yemen was the only Communist country in this region (at any time; it forged ties with Cuba, China, the Soviet Union and the Palestinians during the Cold War period) and they had ties to leftist Syria and to Iraq, all of whom had ties with the Soviet Union. Democratic Yemen, Iraq and Syria shared ties with the SU; Syria and Iraq both received arms from the SU and each had a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the SU. These three countries are close to a cluster of GCC states—Kuwait, Bahrain, UAE, and with Saudi Arabia and Qatar nearby. The CA graph also shows a cluster of Western oriented states—Egypt, Jordan, Oman (the sixth GCC member state), and Yemen (divided from the communist Democratic Yemen during this period). Lebanon is also near the group but not as close, likely a result of the ongoing internal conflict (Syria has partially occupied it since 1976 as a result of military and political action against Israel in 1975—undertaken with Jordan).

The issues creating the greatest voting similarity are those on women's equality, the death penalty, and the elimination of apartheid and racial discrimination. Issues creating voting dissimilarity were those on human rights issues, as many were directed at specific countries including Afghanistan (this could account for differences between Iraq, Syria and Democratic Yemen and the rest of the states in the region) and those linking economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights, generally rejected by Western states as socialist in orientation. These were the only issues providing some evidence of the East-West conflict but not enough to overcome other allegiances, particularly since none of the governments were democratic at this time. Membership in OIC and AL probably accounts for the greatest solidarity on most voting. The central goals of the OIC are to strengthen Islamic solidarity among member states; safeguard national rights of Muslims;

coordinate action to safeguard the Holy Places; support the struggle of the Palestinian people and assist them in recovering their rights and liberating their occupied territories; observe the right to self determination; and peaceful settlement of differences between member states, making this membership a likely influence on voting in this region. AL was also created to help Arab states in their struggle for national independence so they would likely feel an obligation to help Palestinians in their struggle for a state. The AL is very active with the OIC and the PLO (as a UN observer) in pushing this issue before the international community.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power shows a similar split although more distinct, with one cluster composed of Syria, Iraq, Democratic Yemen—and this time Yemen (probably because it is still very much associated with the economy of Democratic Yemen, there is discussion of reuniting and they do not share the hostility that East and West Germany did). A second cluster consists of all the other states in the region except Lebanon. The second cluster has all of the GCC member states; four of these (plus Iraq) are also OPEC members (Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and UAE). Lebanon continues to be isolated; it has a large Christian population and this sector was protected by Israel during their civil war; Syria protected the Palestinians. Many of the resolutions in this subset relate to Middle East issues, including the financing of the UN interim force in Lebanon, many resolutions addressing the needs of the Palestinians. Economic issues are likely to be salient to East-West divides as is illustrated by the divisions. The AL is supposed to have an economic component but it is not very effective. All states in the region are all listed as developing states and have the designation "least developed country" despite the enormous oil wealth in the region which makes G77 and NAM the most salient organizations to general economic issues. We are likely to see greater solidarity with other G77 and NAM members in the intra-regional analyses.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power shows a large cluster consisting of four of the six GCC members (Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar and UAE—all but Bahrain are also OPEC members), Iraq (an OPEC member), Jordan and Yemen. Egypt and Oman are somewhat similar to this group while Saudi Arabia, another GCC and OPEC member is an isolate, as is Lebanon. Syria and Democratic Yemen are similar to each other and dissimilar to the rest of the countries. Historical factors likely account for this. In addition to receiving weapons from the Soviets, Syria aligned itself with Iran during the 1980 (and the following 8 years) war with Iraq which stressed relations with the more moderate Arab countries. Saudi Arabia provided generous financial aid to Syria in an attempt to moderate its radical policies. It also received oil from Iran as repayment for its support and to compensate for the closure of the Iraqi pipeline (which runs through Syria). Also during this time period, Israel invaded Lebanon and destroyed Syrian surface-to-air missiles deployed in the Biqa Valley as well about 79 Syrian MiG-21 and MiG-23 aircraft.[16] Other factors that would likely have influenced voting are GCC and OPEC memberships, as the former is a sub-regional security organization and OPEC members would seek to protect the oil fields during the conflict with Iran.

Although none of the countries in this region were close to the resolutions for this subset, differences among the states were most likely relate to regional and international

[16] see http://memory.loc.gov/regionalstudies, Syria and the Middle East Conflict, chapter 5.

politics. The resolutions addressed disarmament, denuclearization of Africa, Palestine issues, strengthening of international security, prohibition of WMD and new systems of weapons of this type, nuclear test ban treaty, nuclear weapon free zone in South Asia, Antarctica, and the Middle East, and the Falkland Islands conflict. These states would likely differ on disarmament and establishing a nuclear free zone. Syria wanted nuclear weapons to counter Israel's but the more moderate states would likely vote in favor of these resolutions. The states were likely united on resolutions related to Palestine. There were some differences representing East-West differences; Syria and Democratic Yemen were most dissimilar; Iraq voted with OPEC members although it is worth noting that the Soviet Union had temporarily stopped supplying it with arms so this could be a factor as well.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power shows the greatest similarity in voting. Syria and Democratic Yemen continue to be distant from the larger group of countries and Lebanon is still isolated. The rest of the countries are clustered together although Iraq is peripheral to the group. The six GCC member states are clustered closely together. Many of the resolutions in this subset address Palestinian issues (all but Lebanon are located on the same vertical dimension). Other resolutions address political situations that clearly involve East-West tensions, such as those aimed at Cambodia, Grenada, Western Sahara, East Timor, and Afghanistan.

The graph depicting similarity on all resolutions for this time period shows the predominant pattern to be a cluster of the GCC member states with Egypt and Jordan; the isolation of Lebanon; and the peripheral status of Syria and Democratic Yemen. Iraq and Yemen are also somewhat distant from the large cluster of countries. Iraq was the state that changed alliances most during this period; the separate analysis provided more detail on this. Otherwise, the graph combining all resolutions is a good average of the relations, showing solidarity among GCC states in general. Differences across power types reveal that internal politics can override what would appear to be a high degree of homogeneity among states in this region on the one hand, but effect of outside influences on the other hand. All are Arab States and members of the Arab League; all are members of the OIC; all are members of G77 and NAM, all are developing states and all are majority Islamic states. All speak Arabic and most have a history of British influence even though none are members of the Commonwealth (Iraq and Egypt qualify). Most (just over half) are designated NF by Freedom House democracy measures. The other five are listed as PF; none are listed as free. Factors dividing the states arise from several conflicts occurring during this time period: the 1980-1988 Iraq-Iran war which prompted the five Gulf states (Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar and UAE) along with Saudi Arabia to form the Gulf Cooperation Council in recognition of their vulnerability vis-à-vis Iraq military power (Qatar and Saudi Arabia also formed a bilateral defense agreement in 1982). They were also concerned that an Iranian military victory would open the way for radical Shia Muslims of Iran to spread their form of Islam. The goal of the GCC is to provide security without the direct involvement of foreign powers but their goals have only been reached to a limited degree. Outside influences largely affected Syria and Democratic Yemen through primarily military relations.

Results for Western Asia, Time 4

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power shows a different pattern than the same subset for the first time period. There is greater cohesion among states with Iraq now very peripheral as a result of the 1991 Gulf War. Also, Iraq is sanctioned during part of this time and not allowed to vote in the UN. Lebanon is more integrated in the group at this time. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia differ from the rest of the group on the horizontal dimension; this may be due to stronger ties with the US following the 1991 Gulf War. Democratic Yemen has now united with Yemen. The resolutions for this subset center around human rights (including the Palestinian right to self-determination), the right to development, promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, and specific resolutions relating to human rights in Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Nigeria, Cuba, Kosovo, and DRC. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia differ on one dimension and this could be related to voting with some Western countries following their assistance in the war and the continual Western military presence. Syria may vote with Cuba on some resolutions because of past alliances. Overall, however, this is a cohesive group. The assistance of the Western states in internal conflicts undermines Huntington's clash thesis somewhat.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic is overall quite similar to the graph for ideological resolutions except Saudi Arabia and Kuwait are less distant from the other GCC members and Iraq votes more dissimilarly from the other countries in the region. There are still differences along one dimension and high similarity along another dimension likely related to resolutions focused on the financing of the UN interim force in Lebanon; eliminating coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion; assistance to Sudan; and the right of Palestinians in the occupied territory to natural resources. It is unclear what issues divides them; there may have been some vote trading of GCC/OPEC members with Western states in return help in securing and managing damaged oilfields from the Iraq invasion.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power reveals greater division between the groups. Syria and Lebanon vote more similarly but Syria is essentially occupying Lebanon now. During the Civil War, Syrian troops were involved in Lebanon's civil war with the approval of the AL; probably to support Muslims against Christians since Israel was supporting Christian factions. Iraq remains isolated, and there is much greater cohesion among the other states in the region. There is a stronger link between Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Egypt in comparison to the rest of the group. GCC and OECD members are again tightly linked, not surprising given the salience of GCC to security issues. Most of the resolutions focus on disarmament, protection of non nuclear states, risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, the role of science and technology in nuclear weapons, and the prohibition of land mines. The majority of resolutions are not near the countries indicating they are not strongly supported. Differences are likely related to a continuation of political differences that prevented the GCC from reacting effectively to the Iraqi invasion, and without direct involvement of foreign powers, an original goal of the organization. The US, UK and France all negotiated military cooperation arrangements with GCC members (and Egypt). In return for developing a security framework, the US was allowed to position arms, obtain port access and conduct joint training. The goal was to provide Western security without a permanent force.[17]

[17] See http://memory.loc.gov/regionalstudies, Persian Gulf War, 1991.

GCC members along with Syria and Egypt again tried to establish a permanent security force to protect Kuwait after the end of the war (the 1991 Damascus Agreement). Disagreements over troops and funding and fear of prolonged Egyptian and Syrian presence in the gulf soon ended this agreement. Kuwait instead negotiated agreements with the US, UK and France. All of the states in the region were sobered by the concentration of Iraqi military power underscoring the vulnerability of the territory and the oil facilities of the other Gulf states. These states spend a large amount on security relative to their size and population but their military experience is limited and hampered by ethnic divisions, traditional rivalries and territorial disputes.[18] These internal divisions undermine Huntington's civilizational paradigm. If there is enough distrust within this region of all Islamic states to turn to Western powers for defense, and economic agreements, it is unlikely these states replace Cold War ideological polarization with civilizational polarization.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power reveals on overall similarity, with Iraq and Yemen peripheral to a rather cohesive group of the other countries. Many of the political resolutions focus on the Middle East situation and Palestine in particular, but also the occupied Syrian Golan. This is the only region where the overall Freedom House status is worse than in 1981. It may be related to the lack of Western support for democracy in the region in favor of ensuring stability in an area of vital importance to world energy resources. Also, none of the regional organizations important to the region have a democracy clause; all of the other regions have at least one organization that requires or encourages democracy. This undermines world polity theory's emphasis on a universal norm of democracy and human rights. Huntington's civilizational thesis is also undermined as it does not account for the important differences among states within this region.

The graph for all resolutions combined is again a good average of relations, showing Syria and Lebanon as similar to each other and quite different from the other states in the region, and Iraq dissimilar from all other states. It misses variation in alliances across issues but finds the greatest divisions. The best explanation for the intra-regional divisions is standard geopolitical relations, possibly because this is a homogenous region vis a vis religion, language and organizational membership. The inter-regional or "all country" analyses will help determine their alliances outside of the region. For example, we can see if Islamic states in Western Asia, Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and even the two OIC member states in Latin America and the Caribbean increase in voting similarity in the last time period compared to the first. The lack of democracy in the region appears to be rooted in a number of factors: Western complacency in interest of regional stability, history of family rule, lack of regional organizations promoting democracy. There is nothing intrinsic to Islam or this region that would otherwise prevent democracy; just conflicting geopolitical interests. This must be considered when making conclusions about universal human rights norms as asserted by world polity theory, or about civilizational polarizations as asserted by Huntington. Positive regionalization does not appear to be taking affect as political differences among the countries continue to impede the strengthening of GCC as a security organization. There is great inequality in the region despite oil wealth.

[18] See http://memory.loc.gov/regionalstudies, Persian Gulf War, 1991.

Results for All Country, Time 1

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power shows a clustering of Western states from Europe and Asia Pacific. The US and Israel are again peripheral to this group, only sharing negative ties to the same states as do the other Western European states. Japan is also isolated from this group, not yet tied to other Western states in the region. Latin American states plus China, Cambodia and many other NAM states are grouped together and apart from both the Western group and the group Communist and leftist states. In the correspondence analysis graph, Soviet bloc countries differ from the West on one dimension and from China and Cambodia on the other dimension. Few of the NAM countries are on the same dimension with the West. The EC scores also reflect the strong clustering of Western states; the civilizational designation looking quite uniform. Gambia and Albania, two Islamic majority states receive an EC score of zero, reflecting neither strong similarity nor dissimilarity with the majority of states. The US, Israel and Japan are included in the cluster of Western European counties but are rather peripheral to this group. The EC scores also show a cluster of communist states with Cambodia and China considerably apart. There is some clustering of OIC member states through-out the graph indicating they are not highly cohesive across regions.

There are six other countries in this Western group: Vanuatu, Seychelles, St. Kitts, Grenada, Solomon Islands, Barbados and Gambia, providing representation from every region except Western Asia. All but one (Gambia) of the countries in the Western cluster of 30 countries are electoral democracies according to FH classification, although two countries are listed as NF (Grenada which experienced a Marxist coup during this period and Seychelles). All but five of these states are listed as belonging to the Western civilization; Gambia is listed as Islamic; Japan as a Lone State; Seychelles as Islamic and African; St. Kitts as Latin American, Grenada and Barbados as Western, and Greece as Orthodox. All but Japan, Gambia, Israel and Greece are listed as a dominant Christian of some type. Gambia is the only Islamic state marginally associated with this group.

There are distinguishing clusters of resolutions. One resolution in close proximity to the UK and West Germany indicates they are distinguished from the other Western group by holding a similar position on the abolition of the death penalty. The resolution closest to the island countries and near US and Israel relates to human rights in Afghanistan (a resolution the Communist countries would likely vote no on). Another one closer to Japan (at the bottom of the Western oriented island countries near the US) relates to further protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms (again, the title gives a general substance but does not detail language that some countries may object to even if they agree with the rest of the content of the resolution). There is another cluster of human rights resolutions related to specific countries (includes El Salvador, Chile, Guatemala, Iran and Afghanistan) as well as funds for torture victims; they are located just below the Western group. There is a resolution related to human rights for Palestinians detained that is nearest several Islamic countries. The resolutions nearest the Communist countries relate to human rights and scientific and technological developments and the indivisibility and interdependence of economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights. The NAM states are closest to resolutions relating to apartheid. This makes empirical sense and reflects what we discovered in the regional analyses. What we can conclude is that there was an overall East-West-NAM division with some

votes more reflective of state interests. Snyder and Kick's (1979) conceptualization of a world economic system of core, primarily Western—or the Triad which is Western Europe, North American and Japan-led East Asia, and two semi-cores of socialist countries, then a true-semiperiphery and periphery blocs has some resonance with this structuring as opposed to a clear North-South division. There are also clear differences between these groups on how human rights are conceived, with the West defining them as political liberties and civil rights, the dominant UN definition.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power to the graph for ideological power in the overall clustering of Western (with the US and Israel more integrated), Communist and other states. Most of the Islamic states are clustered as are the NAM states with China and Cambodia in the solidly placed in this group. The EC scores in Table 54 show a large group of 26 Western states and the opposite end of the EC scores show a clustering of Communist and other leftist states with the NAM countries more in the middle.The resolutions closest to the European countries relate to financing the UN Interim force in Lebanon. The rest of the resolutions are closer to the large group of NAM and cover a variety of items related to Palestinian sovereignty over natural resources, UN budget, activities of foreign economies impeding declaration of independence to colonial states, the elimination of apartheid in South Africa, economic measures as a form of political and economic coercion against developing countries, and oil embargo against South Africa among others that clearly relate to interests of developing states.

The overall pattern for this subset is very similar to the graph for ideological resolutions but there are important differences. For example, the US, Israel and Japan are more integrated into the group of Western states. There appears to be stronger unity on economic interests among Western states than among ideological interests; the latter includes resolutions related to the death penalty which does divide Western countries. Islamic states appear to be clustered closer together; this likely results from the number of resolutions addressing Palestinian issues.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power has the same clustering of Western states; Soviet bloc states—less cohesive, perhaps because not all are Warsaw Pact members; and a group of widely dispersed NAM countries. Turkey is integrated into the West (similar to the European regional analysis) this time presumably because of its NATO ties. The Soviet bloc countries are located together, as are China and Cambodia; both leftist groups are on the same vertical dimension but different horizontal dimension as they were in the other two graphs for this time period. The EC scores reveal the large group of Western countries with Turkey now well integrated; interestingly, Cambodia appears to be as well. It was also located much closer to the Western groups in all of the graphs. China is also closer but more integrated with the group of NAM states. China and Cambodia had conflicts with the Soviet Union for its invasion of Vietnam and made overtures to the West to counter Soviet influence in the region.

A significant number of resolutions relate to disarmament, the prohibition of developing new types of WMD, the end to all test explosions of nuclear weapons, the removal of landmines, a treaty to prohibit stationing weapons in outer space, issues related to nuclear and military collaboration with South Africa, arms embargo against South Africa, declaration on the denuclearization of Africa, issues related to biological

weapons, an international convention on strengthening the security of non-nuclear weapon states against the use or threat of such, Israeli nuclear armament, the situation in the Middle East, the Palestinian situation, the use of Antarctica for peaceful purposes, condemnation of nuclear war, the reduction of military budgets, peaceful settlement of the Falkland Islands, and bilateral nuclear arms negotiations. Because of the scope of this paper it is not possible to do a content analysis of often nuanced resolutions for full meaning, but it appears possible the large number of NAM states had a positive effect on containing Cold War aggressions. It would be an interesting project to research, not because of their power but because of their numbers and reminder of the purpose of the UN—to secure and maintain international peace.

The overall pattern reflects memberships in the two primary military alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Pact with the NAM distant from both groups, similar to the West on one dimension and the East on another. The distinction may rest on Palestinian and Middle East resolutions as the Soviet Union used this in its favor and against the West. Israel is allied with the West—primarily the US—and this also adds to the distinction. The combined regions do indicate an East-West-NAM division reflecting Cold War polarizations.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power shows a cluster of Western states with the US and Israel more integrated into this group; a less cohesive cluster of Soviet and leftist countries, and a clustering of OIC member states. There is much more cohesion between leftist and NAM states. The EC scores show the US and Israel to be more integrated with the Western states and also show Paraguay to be close to the US reflecting the same pattern we found in the Latin American regional graph. Also, the six UN member states of the OECS (Organization of Eastern Caribbean States) are close to the US, reflecting their alliance during the 1983 Grenada crisis. The majority of Soviet bloc and leftist countries are on the opposite end of the table of scores as would be expected. India and Mexico are also in this group, reflecting their ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba respectively. There is considerable more clustering of OIC member states; Turkey is in this cohesive group of Islamic majority states. The similarity on these resolutions reflects the content of the resolutions. Many were focused on particularistic issues such as independence for East Timor, Kampuchea/Cambodia, Western Sahara from Morocco, the situation in the Middle East, in Grenada, in Afghanistan, the question of Palestine and observer status of national liberation movements recognized by the AU and AL (Palestine in particular), the question of the Comorian Island of Mayotte (could explain change in Comoros voting), the situation in South Africa, issues related to the law of the Sea, enlargement of the international law commission, intervention in the internal affairs of states, elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in Namibia and other parts of South Africa; immunities of UN officials, and implementation of declaration granting independence to colonial countries and people. The bulk of resolutions are nearest the NAM, OIC and Communist states, likely centered on support for Palestinian issues. Resolutions addressing the situations in Communist Kampuchea (which is seeking sovereignty as Cambodia) and Afghanistan and implications for international peace and security are closest to the European states. The overall pattern for this time period is the West vs. the East plus NAM—modified by the situation in the Middle East. The Israel-Palestine situation clearly plays a strong role in UN politics.

The graph depicting similarity on all of the resolutions combined shows a distinct cluster of Western states, a group of Soviet and leftist countries, and a clustering of OIC states and NAM member states. The CA graph, shows the Western countries in the bottom left quadrant with the US and Israel just above this group on the same vertical dimension illustrating the variance in their integration with the West. Greece and Turkey are at the top of this NAM cluster and near the Western cluster reflecting their variance in bloc membership, based on power type There is a cluster of Soviet bloc countries and other socialist states in the top right quadrant with the majority of NAM and OIC member states in a dense cluster in the bottom right quadrant, on the same horizontal dimension as the Western States. These graphs look most similar to the ideological graph indicating the expected East-West-NAM Cold War polarization. The EC scores show the group of Western states with Turkey and Greece near the bottom and the US and Israel more integrated. The group of Soviet bloc and leftist states are at the opposite end of this table of centrality scores indicating strong polarization. There is a more distinct polarization across all regions than within each region, supporting the overall assumption of Cold War divisions. Interestingly, even combining all regions, we maintain the same changing alliances by some states that we did in the regional graphs. This provides support for the application of this frame as a way to detect differences in voting alliances across power types, reflecting state interests, Huntington's torn countries and the effect of organizational memberships.

In anticipation of the next time period's testing of Islamic integration across regions and power sources, we note that during this time period, OIC members are predominately integrated with NAM member states. Turkey is in general aligned with the West while Afghanistan, Albania, Mozambique and Syria are aligned with the Communist bloc. Interestingly, those in the middle of the graph are predominantly Commonwealth members, indicating Western ties or influence. OECD member states plus Israel (as a US ally) vote very similarly. AU, AL, OPEC, and MERCOSUR members do not vote as a cluster when all regions are combined.

Results for All Country, Time 4

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to ideological power is strikingly different than the graph of ideological resolutions for time 1. The most obvious difference is the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the subsequent re-alignment of many former Soviet bloc states with the West. There are only five Communist states left (although many now have mixed economies): China, Cuba, Laos, North Korea and Vietnam. The social network graph shows a large group of Western countries on the bottom of the graph (with the US and Israel more integrated), a large group of OIC member states on the top of the graph and all other states on the far edges of the graph. Most of the OIC member states are developing countries as well and the key post Cold War issue for NAM states is development. The FSU Central Asian states are in the center of the graph, with Uzbekistan closest to the Western group and Turkmenistan the farthest, as we saw in both the European and Asia and Pacific regional graphs. Latin American states on the whole are closer to the Western group (seen in the upper middle part of the graph). Interestingly, the Latin American countries look more cohesive when compared across regions but not within regions. The CA graph shows differences along one dimension only which could be interpreted as the global North vs. the global South or the

West vs. the rest. The countries on the other side of the horizontal dimension include new states and problem states—in general, states that are not yet integrated into the international community.

The EC scores reflect the expanded cluster of Western states. Most of these are EU members or EU candidates; notably they vote nearly identical, not unlike former Soviet bloc states. The US and Israel centrality scores reflect greater integration into the Western group on these resolutions. Turkey is again marginally part of this group on ideological resolutions, located near many Latin American states. There is a strong clustering of OIC member states at the opposite end of the spectrum from Western states.

The 44 countries with Western civilizational membership—are characterized as having Western type electoral democracies (only Uzbekistan does not; it is designated as NF by FH classification). All are classified as Free except Moldova and Albania both of which have a designation of Partly Free. The next group of 11 countries has four states designated as Free and five as PF. Of this group of 55 countries, only two—Albania and Uzbekistan—are OIC members. These countries primarily fit Huntington's Western and Orthodox civilizations (Albania and Uzbekistan are designated as being from the Islamic civilization). Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Micronesia, and Marshall Islands, all from the Asia and Pacific region, are well integrated into this group along with the US and Israel. In fact, the US and Israel now vote similarly on the full range of ideologically related resolutions. South Korea is also a member of this group as are Samoa and the Solomon Islands. There are two Latin American states in the group of 11 'Western states': Argentina and Chile. Of this group of 55, only five are not members of the Western or Orthodox civilizations (both based on Christian religions): Japan (classified as a Lone state), 1 Islamic, 1 Sinic, and 2 Latin American. Overall, this cluster of states fits Huntington's "West vs. the rest" hypothesis.

The top 55 countries in the other group (with an opposite sign in their EC scores) include the five remaining Communist countries, 35 Islamic countries and 15 others. This group includes eight of the 12 Western Asian majority Islamic countries and seven other countries from Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and Africa. Only seven in this group of 55 are listed as Free; 16 are designated as PF and 32 as NF. There are only 2 Latin American countries in this group: Cuba and St. Lucia. Most of the Latin American countries are closer to the Western group. Both graphs show them as quite peripheral. They are considered to have the lowest religiosity according to Inglehart and Norris (2003). Guyana and Suriname are the only Latin American members of the OIC although neither have majority Muslim populations.

The other characteristics of the groups discussed have an important modifying effect on Huntington's hypotheses. First, there are clear and important differences in the type of government—democracies vs. non-democracies. This will influence voting on many issues, particularly those related to human rights. This is evidenced in the separation of North and South Korea, a divided state, both members of the Sinic civilization along with China. War, political regime, and historical alliances are enough to account for the differences between them. Some may argue that recent efforts to merge into one state and antagonism towards the rest could be evidence of a Western vs. other civilizational divide. Albania is Islamic and formerly Communist and now aligned with the West. The FSU Central Asian predominantly Muslim countries show no clear civilizational alignment, likely based on historical alliances, the need for new IEMP

alliances, repression of religion, and geographical location. Japan and South Korea have had long term Western influence following war and reconstruction. Do these exceptions "prove" the rule or cast doubt on civilizational polarization based on complex factors?

Some notable resolutions near the Western group include several directed at human rights situations in particular countries (Cuba, Nigeria, Sudan, Iran, Zaire/DRC, Iraq, Kosovo, Croatia, Yugoslavia and BosniaHerz;, one addressing the elimination of honor crimes against women; and one promoting democracy. Several resolutions near countries on the opposite dimension from the Western countries address Palestinian issues such as the right to self-determination (farthest from US and Israel). Resolutions near the NAM states address the right to development and the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order. The resolution closest to the Communist countries (and clearly relating to Cuba and probably North Korea) addresses universal freedom of travel and importance of family reunification.

Many of these resolutions address specific political situations and human rights abuses. These are less civilizational than particularistic to states. Resolutions showing a difference in human rights foci—from political and civil rights on the part of Western states to economic and development rights on the part of developing states—represent more of a North-South divide. The resolutions most dividing the Islamic countries are those addressing the Palestinian situation. OIC and AL organizational charters require support of Palestinians and a resolution of their problems. This is a special interest political issue. Once resolved (a big question!!) it would seem to reduce the West vs. Islam divide. Overall, I would conclude the largest polarizations rest first on the Israeli-Palestinian issue which masks itself as a West vs. Islam division for obvious reasons—but not implying it is either permanent nor one-dimensional. A second polarization is between developed and developing states; it is not unrelated to the first and reflects conflicting norms on human rights and social, economic and political justice, belying a world polity currently exists. It is important to note that conflicts have specific issues at the center and these should not be globalized to represent major polarizations between groups. Making this kind of assumption results in a self-fulfilling prophecy and impedes more comprehensive policy making.

The graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to economic power is noticeably different from the graph for economic resolutions at Time 1 and from the ideological resolutions for this time period. The most obvious difference is the separation of the US and Israel from the rest of the Western states. The CA graph shows the majority of the countries clustered in the upper left quadrant with the newer and problem countries most peripheral—and different on the horizontal dimension. The EC scores reflect a very dense clustering of Western countries at the very top of the left side of the graph, with a tight clustering of EU members and candidate member states. Japan, Australia, New Zealand and Canada are also well integrated in this group but Israel and the US are less integrated. The group of remaining Communist states is clustered on the lower left along with many OIC member states. The primary issue distinguishing the US and Israel is the embargo against Cuba. Only the US, Israel and three other states—Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Uzbekistan—vote yes on this issue. The EU has pressured Cuba on human rights issues through trade sanctions but not overall economic sanctions.

The European countries vote similarly to the US and Israel on assistance to Sudan. (It is unclear what the resolution was really about; it could have been a financial issue as they voted no). On at least one of the resolutions on financing an interim force in Lebanon, only the US and Israel voted no; the rest were largely yes votes. On at least one of the resolutions related to Palestinian rights to their natural resources, only the US, Israel, Marshall Islands and Micronesia voted no. There appears to be an 'exchange' of votes between the US and Israel with the former supporting Israel on the Palestinian issues, while Israel supports the US on the Cuban embargo issue. The Europeans vote yes against the US on these issues but abstain when it appears it is more generalized such as a resolution about coercive economic measures. These are overall rather specific issues related to the politics of some countries and so there is less ideological polarization than at Time 1. This could be interpreted as state interests being more salient than any overriding polarization. EU membership provides significant economic benefits and the EC "monitors" voting by EU countries. They analyze and prepare summaries of voting by EU member states. Perhaps this is used to see on what issues member states diverge; it could be interpreted as a measure of similarity which could in turn affect membership. A hesitation on Turkey becoming an EU member may rest partially on its divergence from voting compared with the majority of EU members. This could be interpreted as reflecting different norms, culture or policies. Most of the UN work on development occurs through economic summits and the ECOSOC regional economic and social commissions so the economic resolutions may not be the best measure of overall divisions.

The social network graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to military power is strikingly different from the graph for the first time period given the number of former Warsaw Pact members that are now members of NATO. The graph shows a stronger clustering of Western states with the US and Israel integrated, as might be expected given the US leadership in NATO and the correlation between EU and NATO membership. Many of these states are also members of is the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe ("OSCE"), established in 1995. It includes all of Europe, the US, and Canada—a total of 55 members (including the Holy See and Switzerland, both UN observers during this time). Included are nine partners for cooperation—Israel, Algeria, Egypt, Japan, Jordan, South Korea, Morocco, Thailand, and Tunisia. The organizational goals are to foster the implementation of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law and to prevent conflict and manage crises. Australia, Japan, and New Zealand are excluded even though they tend to vote with the West on so many issues. Of the partners for cooperation, only Israel and South Korea vote with the West. No other regional security organizations appear to influence voting in this subset, further support for Mann's assertion of military integration. The overall pattern reflects Western military domination.

The CA graph shows a strong clustering of almost all states in the upper left hand quadrant, providing support for Mann's (2001) assertion that the world is militarily integrated through US military hegemony. The group of Communist states is the most distant from the Western countries. Cuba, Laos, North Korea and Vietnam are in a tight cluster, resembling an island separated from the rest. China is distinct from this group. The EC scores reveal the similarity in voting among Western states including Turkey and many former Soviet bloc countries. There is no significant clustering of Islamic majority

states, belying any evidence of the West vs. Islam conflicts. The resolutions address issues similar to those in the first time period related to disarmament and prohibitions on nuclear weapons on the one hand, and on the other, the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament, which addresses the benefits of technology for developing countries. There are also resolutions regarding the effectiveness of international arrangements to assure non-nuclear weapon states against the use of nuclear weapons, relating to the issue of balance between nuclear and non-nuclear countries. Countries without nuclear weapons clearly are vested in international laws to prevent other states from acquiring them, and they also express a desire to benefit from advances in science and technology related to that which occurred in the development of nuclear weapons. Finally there are new resolutions directed at both small arms and conventional arms control in regional and sub-regional areas.

The social network graph depicting similarity on resolutions related to political power shows a cluster of Western countries with multiple ties in the center of the graph with the US and Israel quite peripheral, a cluster of OIC member states on the left side of the graph and no other distinct groups—even the remaining Communist states are dispersed widely. The CA graph shows a dense clustering of Western states in the top left quadrant; ironically the former SU is much nearer this cluster than the US and Israel. There is another group of states near the US that frequently voted with the West, and a dense cluster on the bottom left quadrant containing many of the OIC member states. The overall pattern for this subset is very similar to the graph for ideological resolutions, reflecting a predominant focus on the Middle East, particularly the desire to create an independent state for Palestine.

The bulk of resolutions are closest to the non-Western group and particularly far from the US and Israel. The content of resolutions include many directed at the Israel-Palestinian situation, one related to the embargo against Cuba, eradication of colonialism, and one regarding Oceans and the Law of the Sea. The number of resolutions relating to the Middle East and support for the Palestinians explains the clustering of OIC member states and the distinction of the US and Israel from the rest of the West (further strengthened by the US's isolated stance on Cuba. The clustering of countries also relates to level of democracy. Overall the countries labeled Free or PF with high scores on the political freedom and civil liberties scales are clustered together and those labeled NF or PF which rate lower on these scales are clustered together.

The social network graph depicting similarity on all resolutions combined shows a cluster of Western European countries and a cluster of non-Western countries with multiple positive ties within the cluster and many negative ties between the clusters. The US, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia and Uzbekistan are peripheral to the Western group. Overall, the graph looks very much like the "West vs. the rest". The CA graph, locates the dense group of Western states in the top right quadrant with the US and Israel in the bottom left quadrant. The dense group of non-Western countries is fairly close to the Western group on both dimensions indicating less dissimilarity than the SN graph implies—perhaps indicating degree of difference rather than polarization. States that have a less distinct identity (FSU Central Asian states), Russia and problem states are located more in the middle). The EC scores show the strong clustering of Western states with Turkey, Israel and the US clustered towards the bottom of this group. There is definite clustering of OIC member states.

EU and NATO memberships appear to play a strong role in voting alignment. The US as the lone Super Power differs on several issues (reflecting unilateral approach that became particularly apparent in the recent Iraq war) not needing international approval as the hegemonic military power and dominant presence in global economic institutions. Evidence of the unique tie with Israel is reflected throughout the voting. Europeans share borders with Islamic states and have much larger Islamic populations. OIC membership is clearly salient but appears to be focused on the Palestinian situation. There are only 10 OIC member states located with the top 52 group of largely Western states. The majority of states voting with the West are electoral democracies, indicating political regime matters. The other factor is clearly economic; "the rest" clearly distinguishes developed from developing states.

All Country Summary

There was evidence of an East-West-NAM division during the Cold War within and across regions. This overall pattern was mediated by particular state interests resulting in a change of alliances for some countries on issues representing different power sources. The last time period revealed multiple patterns, underlining our hypothesis that globalization is complex and multi-dimensional. There was evidence of the "West vs. the rest" but also evidence of the North vs. the South reflecting important differences in the interests and goals of developed vs. developing states as might be expected. This difference is reflected in conceptualizations of human rights with developed states (majority democratic) focused on political rights and civil liberties and undeveloped states focused more on economic rights. This counters the assumptions of a global norm of human rights as posited by world polity theorists. It could also be said that there is a universal norm considering human rights but that it is contested and reflects divisions in levels of development. The general cohesion of the "political West" (Shaw 2000; we could add economic, military and ideological West)—as opposed to a geographical West—and its domination of the most powerful IEMP organizations supports theories of trilateralism overall. Clearly, Europe represents regionalization and its alliances with the non-geographical West represents wider globalization processes and supports this mechanism as a step to integrating globally, particularly when juxtaposed with regions which are clearly neither cohesive nor integrated enough with the global world to benefit from globalization processes.

Although there is some evidence of the "West vs. the rest" it is mediated by many factors with particularistic state interests prominent. Tensions between "the West" and Islamic states center on Palestinian issues but there are other important differences. Inglehart and Norris (2003) note that Islamic states do not differ from other states on issues on democratic values—only on gender issues. This does lead to a cultural clash within Western states with large Islamic populations. Historical factors such as colonialism and racism also play a factor in relations. Finally, IEMP organizations played an important role in creating voting similarity, particularly when membership requirements and incentives encouraged similar standards and norms. In summary, we presented evidence that globalization has affected each region differently depending on historical factors such as alliances, resources, IEMP memberships, percent democracies and developing states, and whether any organizations—such as the EU—specifically encouraged integration.

CONCLUSION

The divisions underline our hypotheses that globalization is multi-dimensional and produces complex relations among states which remain the central organizations through which globalization processes operate. The findings indicated that the Cold War structure has transformed into more complex alignments than others have argued. The data show a North-South division, not just about economic issues but about human rights, with development issues central to both. Second, while there is an Islamic bloc, it is primarily based on two issues—Israel/Palestine and gender. Third, there is a very solid, expanding EU, while the United States is somewhat isolated except as a military coordinator. Fourth, several other macro-regional organizations are becoming important mechanisms of economic integration, cultural diffusion, and enhancement of security and democratization. Finally, globalization processes are having differential effects within and across regions. (Europe is strongly integrated while Latin America is less cohesive.) The implications are that globalization processes are too complex and in flux to support a single paradigm such as clashing civilizations. Oversimplifying the dimensions of global structure is misleading, with potentially disastrous consequences for foreign policy.

The next step in deepening our understanding of globalization processes is to look closer at processes within each of the sources of social power. I am currently conducting an analysis of the structure of world trade using world trade analyzer data. I will supplement this with case studies in Latin America and Africa that examine the impact of globalization processes at the local, national, international, transnational and global levels.

REFERENCES

Alker, Hayward R., Jr. 1964. "Dimensions of conflict in the General Assembly." The American Political Science Review, Vol. 58(3): 642-657.

Alker, Jr., Hayward R. and Bruce M. Russett. 1965. World Politics in the General Assembly. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Baehr, Peter R. and Leon Gordenker. 1992. The United Nations in the 1990s. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Beyer, Peter. 1994. Religion and Globalization. London: Sage Publications.

Boli, John and George M. Thomas. 1997. "World Culture in the World Polity: a Century of International Non-Governmental Organization." American Sociological Review, 62:171-90.

Bollen, Kenneth. 1983. "World System Position, Dependency, and Democracy: the Cross-National Evidence," American Sociological Review, 48: 468-479.

Bonacich, Phillip and Paulette Lloyd. 2001. "Eigenvector-like Measures of Centrality for Asymmetric Relations." Social Networks 23: 191-201.

Bonacich, Phillip and Paulette Lloyd. 2004. "Calculating Status with Negative Asymmetric relations." Social Networks 23: 191-201.

Breiger, Ronald. 1981. "Structures of Economic Interdependence Among Nations," in Peter M. Blau and Robert K. Merton, editors. Continuities in Structural Inquiry. London: Sage Publications.

Carney, Judith. 2004. "Damaged Environments and Lives: The Bitter Harvest of Rice Policies in the Gambia." Unpublished paper.

Centeno, Miguel Angel. 2002. "Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin asymmetric relations." Social Networks 23: 191-201.

Centeno, Miguel, Sara R. Curran, John Galloway, Paulette Lloyd, and Suresh Sood. 2005. Visualizing Globalization. Unpublished manuscript. Princeton University.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher. 1989. Global Formation: Structures of the World-economy. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher. World Systems Theory:
http://www.irows.ucr.edu/cd/appendices/asr00/asr00app.htm

Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Thomas D. Hall, Editors. 1991. Core/Periphery Relations

in Pre-capitalist Worlds. Boulder: Westview Press.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher, Yukio Kawano, and Benjamin D. Brewer. 2000. "Trade Globalization Since 1795: Waves of Integration in the World System." American Sociological Review 65(1): 77-95.

Chirot, Daniel and Thomas D. Hall. 1982. World System Theory. Annual Review of Sociology 8:81-106.

Country Profiles: http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/newcountry.htm.

Davis, James A. 1967. "Clustering and Structural Balance in Graphs." Human Relations 30:181-87.

Davidson, Ron and David Harel. 1996. "Drawing Graphs Nicely Using Simulated Annealing," ACM Transactions on Graphics 15(4): 301-331.

De Leeuw, Jan, Chair, Statistics Department, UCLA. December 2004 version of Correspondence Analysis Program: http://gifi.stat.ucla.edu/ca.R.

Department of Public Information. 2000. Basic Facts about the United Nations. NY: News and Media Division, United Nation Department of Public Information.

Eldis Globalization Resource Guide, Regional and Country Profiles: http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/newcountry.htm

Fox, Jonathan. 2001. "Two Civilizations and Ethnic Conflict: Islam and the West." Journal of Peace Research 38(4): 459-472.

Frank, David John and John W. Meyer. 2002. "The Profusion of Individual Roles and Identities in the Postwar Period." Sociological Theory 20(1): 86-104.

Freedom House Country and Territory Reports.
http://freedomhouse.org/survey99/relterr/intro.html.

Freedom House Democracy Information: http://www.freedomhouse.org/

Galtung, Johan. 1971. "A Structural Theory of Imperialism." Journal of Peace Research 8(2): 81-117. [AS9. J826 URL].

Garreton, Manuel Antonio, Marcelo Cavorozzi, Peter S. Cleaves, Gary Gereffi, and. Jonathan Hartlyn. 2003. Latin America in the Twenty-first Century: Toward a New Sociopolitical Matrix. University of Miami: North-South Center Press.

Governments on the Web: Comprehensive database of governmental institutions:
http://www.gksoft.com/govt/

Gowan, Peter. 1999. The Global Gamble: Washington's Faustian Bid for World Dominance. London: Verso.

Granovetter, Mark. 2000. "A Theoretical Agenda for Economic Sociology." To appear in Guillen, Mauro F., Randall Collins, Paula England, and Marshall Meyer, eds. 2002. The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Greenacre, Michael J. 1984. Theory and Applications of Correspondence Analysis. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Guilarte, Miguel G. 1991. Influence from the Periphery: The Delegitimation of the Colonial System after World War II. American Sociological Association (ASA).

Guillen, Mauro F. 2001. "Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature." Annual Review of Sociology 27:235-60.

Gurr, Ted Robert. 2000. Peoples Versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century. United States Institute of Peace.

Hargittai, Eszter and Miguel Centeno, co-editors. 2001. Mapping Globalization. Special issue of American Behavioral Scientist, 44(10).

Held, David and Anthony McGrew, eds. 2000. The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Henderson, Errol A. and Richard Tucker. 2001. "Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict." International Studies Quarterly 45: 317-338.

Hettne, Bjorn. 2000. "Global Market versus Regionalism." in David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds. 2000. The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hirst, Paul and Grahame Thompson 2000. "Globalization and the History of the Press. International Economy," in David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds. 2000. The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate. Cambridge: Polity.

Hobden, Stephen and John M. Hobson, editors. 2002. Historical Sociology of International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993a. "The Clash of Civilizations?" Foreign Affairs 72(3): 22-49.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993b. "If Not Civilizations, What?" Foreign Affairs 72(4): 186-194.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 2000. "Try Again: A Reply to Russett, Oneal & Cox." Journal of Peace Research 37(5):609-610.

Index to Resolutions of the Security Council, No. 3, 1946-1970. 1973. New York: United.
Nations, Dag Hammarskjold Library.

Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2003. Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

International Union of Local Authorities: http://www.iula.org/

ISO Country Codes. url: http://www.bcpl.net/~j1m5path/isocodes.html

The Journal of Democracy: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/

Kick, Edward L. and Byron L. Davis. 2001. "World-System Structure and Change: an Analysis of Global Networks and Economic Growth Across Two Time Periods." American Behavioral Scientist 44(10): 1561-1578.

Lewis, Martin W. and Karen E. Wigen. 1997. The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Library of Congress/Federal Research Division/Country Studies/Area Handbook Series. http://memory.loc.gov.frd/cs.

Lijphart, Arend. 1963. "The Analysis of Bloc Voting in the General Assembly: A. Critique and a Proposal." The American Political Science Review 57(4): 902-917.

Lloyd, Peter J. 1992. "Regionalization and World Trade," OECD Economic Studies No. 18, Spring.

Mahmood, Sohail. 1995. Islamic Fundamentalism In Pakistan, Egypt and Iran. Pakistan: Vanguard Books Ltd.

Mann, Michael. 2005. The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, Michael. 2004. “Globalizations: an Introduction to the Spatial and Structural. Networks of Globality.” Unpublished paper

Mann, Michael. 2002. “Globalization As Violence.” Unpublished paper.

Mann, Michael. 2001. "Is Globalization Single or Multiple?: an Examination of Ideological, Economic, Military and Political Aspects of Globalization." Paper given at Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, 224 September, 2001.

Mann, Michael. 2000. “Has Globalization Ended the Rise and Rise of the Nation-State?” In David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds. 2000. The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mann, Michael. 1993. The Sources of Social Power. Volume II: The Rise of Classes and Nation-states, 1760-1914.

Mann, Michael. 1986. The Sources of Social Power. Volume I: A History of Power from. the Beginning to A.D. 1760. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, Michael. 1984. "The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results." European Journal of Sociology 25:109-136.

Mann, Michael and Dylan Riley. 2002. “Globalization and Inequality: The Enduring. Impact of Macro-Regional Ideologies and Nation-States.” Unpublished paper.

MARC Code List for Countries. Library of Congress. Network development and MARC Standards Office. url: http://www.loc.gov/marc/countries/cou_home.html

Marin-Bosch, Miguel. 1998. Votes in the UN General Assembly. London: Kluwer Law International.

Martin, Charles H. Internationalizing "The American Dilemma: The Civil Rights Ethnic Congress and the 1951 Genocide Petition to the United Nations.” Journal of American History, 1997, 16, 4, Summer, 35-61.

McGrath, Cathleen and Jim Blythe. 2004. “Do You See What I Want You to See? Understanding Viewers’ Perception of a Complex Management Task.” Journal of Social Structure 5(2).

McGrath, Cathleen, Jim Blythe and David Krackhardt. 1997. “The Effect of Spatial Arrangement on Judgments and Errors in Interpreting Graphs.” Social Networks 19(3): 223-42.

McGrath, Cathleen, David Krackhardt and Jim Blythe. 2002. “Visualizing Complexity in Networks: Seeing Both the Forest and the Trees.” Connections 25(1): 30-34.

Melvern, Linda. 2000. A People Betrayed. The Role of the West in the Failure of the UN. London: Zed Books.

Meyer, John W. 2002. "Globalization, National Culture, and the Future of the World Polity." Hong Kong Journal of Sociology 3: 1-18.

Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." American Journal of Sociology 103(1): 144-81.

Michailidis, George and Jan de Leeuw. 2001. "Data Visualization through Graph Drawing." Computational Statistics 16:435-450.

Michailidis, George and Jan de Leeuw. 1996. The Gifi System of Descriptive Multivariate Analysis. UCLA Statistics Electronic Publications, Preprint 204. http://preprints.stats.ucla.edu/204/204.ppt.

National Endowment for Democracy: http://www.ned.org and http://www.ned.org/database/database.html

Newcombe, Hanne, John Allett, Lynn Schopen, and Christopher Young. Patterns of Nations: Interactions in the UN, 1946-1971. Authors are from Canadian Peace Research Institute, Dundas and Oakville, and York University, Downsview, Ontario. (no year or date of publication listed).

Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. 2002. "Islam & the West: Testing the Clash of Civilizations Thesis. John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Faculty Research Working Papers Series RWP02-015.

Oneal, John R. & Bruce M. Russett. 2000. "A Response to Huntington." Journal of Peace Research 37(5):611-12.

Pace, John P. 1998. The Development of Human Rights Law in the United Nations: Its Control and Monitoring Machinery. International Social Science Journal 50(4): 499-511.

Padgett, John F. and Christopher K. Ansell. 1993. "Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400-1434." American Journal of Sociology 98: 1259-1319.

Political resources on the Net: http://www.politicalresources.net/

Politicians of The World: http://www.trytel.com/~aberdeen/

Richards, Patricia. 2000. "Reviving Social Rights in Latin America: the Potential Role of International Human Rights?" Citizenship Studies 4(2): 189-206.

Rieselbach, Leroy N. 1960. “Quantitative Techniques for Studying Voting Behavior in the UN General Assembly.” International Organization. Vol. 14(2): 291-306.

Rohter, Larry. November 20, 2004. “China Widens Economic Role in Latin America.” The New York Times (web version, International section).

Roth, Guenther and Claus Wittich, editors. 1978. Max Weber, Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rulers: http://rulers.org/

Russett, Bruce M. 1966. “Discovering Voting Groups in the United Nations.” The American Political Science Review 60(2): 327-339.

Russett, Bruce, editor. 1997. The Once and Future Security Council. New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Russett, Bruce M., John R. Oneal, and Michaelene Cox. 2000. “Clash of Civilizations, or Realism and Liberalism Déjà vu? Some Evidence.” Journal of Peace Research 37(5): 583-608.

Seybolt, Taylor B. 2001. “Major Armed Conflicts, Chapter 1,” in SIPRI Yearbook 2001. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shaw, Martin. 2000. Theory of the Global State: Globality as an Unfinished Revolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siddiqui, Omar. 2001. “Relativism vs. Universalism: Islam and Human Rights Debate.” American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences 18(1): 59-94.

Snyder, David and Edward L. Kick. 1979. “Structural Position in the World System and Economic Growth, 1955-1970: A Multiple-Network Analysis of Transnational Interactions.” American Journal of Sociology 84(5): 1096-1126.

Sollenberg, Margareta & Peter Wallensteen. 2001. "Patterns of Major Armed Conflicts 1990-2000" in SIPRI Yearbook. 2001, Appendix 1A and 1B. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokman, Frans N. 1977. Roll Calls and Sponsorship: A Methodological Analysis of Third World Group Formation in the United Nations. The Netherlands: A.W. Sitjhoff International Publishing Company.

Swarns, Rachel L. July 9, 2002a. “African Leaders drop Old Group for One That Has Power.” New York Times (web version).

Swarns, Rachel L. July 10, 2002b. "Role in Group Enhances Mbeki's Image." New York Times (web version).

Tihhomirov, Vladislav B. 1981. Quantitative Analysis of Voting Behavior in the General Assembly: Who Voted With Whom Within the United Nations. Pacific Nations Case Study and Methodological Aspects of Analysis. New York: United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

Thompson, Grahame. 1999. "Globalisation Versus Regionalism?" in George Joffe. Perspectives on Development: The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, UK: Routledge.

Tomlinson, John. 1999. Globalization and Culture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. UN web page: http://www.un.org.

United Nations Statistics Division. Country and Region Codes. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49alpha.htm

University of California, Irvine. Center for the Study of Democracy: http://www.democ.uci.edu/

University of Michigan. Statistical Resources on the Web: http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/statsnew.html

U.S. Agency for International Development - Democracy Links and the Publications Page: http://www.usaid.gov/democracy/demlinks.html and http://www.usaid.gov/democracy/pubsindex.html.

U.S. State Department Countries and Regions: http://www.state.gov/countries

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press.

Weisman, Steven R. April 22, 2005. "At NATO Talks, Accord and Discord for U.S. and Russia." The New York Times (web version, International).

White, Harrison C., Scott A. Boorman, and Ronald L. Breiger. 1976. "Social Structure from Multiple Networks. I. Blockmodels of Roles and Positions." American Journal of Sociology 81(4): 730-780.

Willets, Peter. 2000. "From Consultative Arrangements to Partnerships: the Changing Status of NGOs in Diplomacy at the UN." Global Governance 6(2): 191-212.

The World Factbook AppendixA-Abbreviations. http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/appendix-a.html.

The World Factbook – Appendix B-International Organizations and Groups. http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/appendix/appendix-b.html

The World Factbook – Country Profiles. url: http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/

The WWW Virtual Library: International Affairs Resources: http://www.etown.edu/vl/

World Forum on Democracy: http://www.fordemocracy.net/resource.shtml

World Movement for Democracy: http://www.wmd.org/

Wuthnow, Robert. 1987. "Rethinking Weber's View of Ideology." Theory and Society, 16:123-37.

Yearbook of UN, 1996.

Yoder, Amos. 1989. The Evolution of the United Nations System. New York: Crane Russak.

Selected Graphs and Appendix A follow

Selected Graphs:
A. Social Network Analysis:
1. Ideological Resolutions, Times 1 and 4
    a) for all regions
    b) for the All Countries combined analyses
2. Military Resolutions, Times 1 and 4
    a) for the All Countries combined analyses
B. Correspondence Analysis:
1. Ideological Resolutions
    a) Africa, Times 1 and 4
    b) Western Asia, Time 1
    c) All Countries analyses

Appendix A: List of Countries included in Times 1 and Times 4 Analyses:

The data includes 2114 resolutions and 191 countries. There were 158 countries in 1981, the first time period, and 189 in the second time period. There were 33 new member states after 1989 with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the break up of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia (Eritrea), South Africa (Namibia), and independence of former island trusts such as Marshall Islands and Micronesia. There was a 'loss' of 2 countries as East Germany merged with West German and Democratic Yemen merged with Yemen. Five states also experienced name changes. For the analysis, separate country lists were prepared for the two time periods. See graph at end of document.

A note on regions:

The UNGA has two geographical grouping schemes (the UN Department of Statistics has yet another regional grouping scheme reflected in the World Trade Analyzer data and UN TradeCom data): Regional Groups and the UN Economic and Social Council's ("ECOSOC") Regional Economic and Social Commissions. Memberships for regional and economic commissions are similar for several of the groups such as Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean but there are important differences. Regional groups were developed in accordance with UNGA requirements to provide regional representation on various committees and are the groups from which the GA President, Vice Presidents and Committee Leaders are drawn. The ECOSOC regional commissions were created to promote regional development and integration for security and development purposes, making this grouping more salient for this particular study.

There were several other important factors used in making this decision, however. First, the European regional commission does not split East and West Europe, but the WEOG grouping does. This was important for several reasons: to show polarization in Europe, both Eastern and Western European states would have to be included in the same group; the US and Israel are also included in this group making this a Western group useful for examining Huntington's thesis; Turkey is also included which is important because it is a NATO member and EU applicant. Africa and Latin America are essentially the same for both groupings except the Economic Commission includes the

US, Canada, France, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the UK. I only included US in this region as all but Canada are clearly European states, and Canada did not become a member of the OAS until 1990 (the US and the majority of Latin American states became members in 1948). Preliminary data exploration also revealed Canada voted consistently with European states and quite differently from both the US and other Latin American states. Its outlier status was problematic for the Correspondence Analysis graphs and there was little historical basis to include it in this region other than it is located in the Americas. It made sense to include the US, however, because it not only has historically dominated this region but is also the dominant member of the OAS, one of the key IEMP organizations in the region.

The Asia and the Pacific regional commission grouping differed from the Asia regional grouping on several countries so I only included countries that were members of both or which were geographically located in Asia and the Pacific such as Australia and New Zealand (both members of WEOG). This meant excluding Eastern European states: Armenia, Georgia and the SU/Russian Federation as well as European/WEOG members France, Netherlands, Turkey, the UK, and the US. Notably, many European states were members of other regional organizations probably because of their economic resources and position in important international economic organizations. The former Soviet Union Central Asian states were included in both the European and Asian and Pacific Regional Commissions and in the Asian regional group so I included them in both regional commissions for historical, political and geographical reasons. The regional commission of Western Asia is very small: 13 members and Palestine (which is not included because as a non UN member state it cannot vote). This group is largely the Middle East sans Israel although the Middle East has also been conceptualized to include North Africa and other countries from Asia. This UN ECOSOC group only includes North African state Egypt. Members of this group are also included in the Asian and African (Egypt only) regional groups.

Finally, the UN ECOSOC regional commissions do not necessarily have a direct geographical correlation. For example the US, Canada and Israel are included in the European Commission (ECE), and Israel is left out of the Middle East as are most of the North African states. Western Asia only includes one North African state—Egypt.

UN Economic and Social Council's ("ECOSOC") Regional Economic and Social Commissions: ECA or Economic Commission of Africa; ESCAP or Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific; ECE or Economic Commission for Europe; ECLAC or Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean; and ESCWA or Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia.

UN regional groups: Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin American and Caribbean, and Western European and Other (WEOG).