

- preferring the *status quo* rather than being left behind,
2. a gap between a delegation's public announcement endorsing certain reform proposals and hidden reasons (interests) behind these preferences,
  3. striking a balance between effectiveness of the UN and justice (i.e., representativeness)
  4. how important is the universality of the UN in the context of alternative governance mechanisms?

Addressing the first issue, Paul Heinbecker said that Canada is caught in the middle when trying to wrestle with reforming the UN. However, it is likely that extending the veto to other countries would further bound the Security Council and make it even less accountable than it is now. Taking up the gap between public and hidden (interest-based) endorsement of certain reform schemes, Guenther Altenburg said that while it is historically plausible that the notion of state sovereignty will disappear, in the foreseeable future states and their interests will continue to play a large role in international relations. States will continue to be a factor in securing peace and stability within a geographical area, in ensuring that human rights are respected, in keeping international agreements, and so on.

Turning to the effectiveness of the Security Council, Guenther Altenburg pointed out that there is a good debate surrounding the merits of the various schemes aimed at extending the Security Council membership in order to make it more effective, representative and democratic. Issues, such as squaring the notion of regionally-based seats with a state-based UN membership, will have to be addressed. In the end, a balance will have to be struck among the various criteria for Security Council membership, including merit. Minister Axworthy said that Canada is not opposed to the enlargement of the Security Council membership *per se*, however, he expressed doubt that enlargement would make any difference without structural changes. He reiterated that the merit principle must be engaged. Others pointed out that restructuring the Security Council and in particular changing the veto mechanism will require significant political momentum. Not surprisingly, all P-5 countries belong to the group for the preservation of the veto party and the message today is not to touch it. One could say that the Security Council has actually become more secret and closed in recent years than at any time before. There is a danger that the power of the P-5 will solidify even further, especially with the Chinese delegation promoting a P-5 summit as an antidote to the G-8. This trend does not bode well for UN reform.

While some participants insisted that the UN remains a unique source of legitimacy and legality in the international system and should continue trying to preserve international peace and security, others pointed out that perhaps other factors should be taken into consideration. Global governance has become fairly fragmented, with various regionally and internationally based institutions making decisions which impact the international order. UN reform is a desirable but a long term goal. Other frameworks for global and regional governance may be better equipped to address certain problems that the UN simply does not have the capacity (or is not willing) to address today. These alternative global governance bodies could also act as subsidiaries to a reformed UN. Similar logic applies to alternative ways of financing the UN – financial contributions do not necessarily have to come from governments.