

culminated in a series of public protests). Third, academics can play a role of a balancer. This was the case in shifting Canada's focus from bilateralism to more multilateral approaches.

The areas where Canadian academics fall behind the curve include their tendency to dichotomise problems and solutions. This is the case in looking at "end-runs," for instance (i.e., the concern that end-runs undermine, de-legitimise and over-extend the UN system *versus* the enthusiasm about end-runs and fragmented authority). Another deficiency may be the clustering of Canadian academics around the same issues, which may leave some important issues unaddressed.

Andrew Cooper addressed issues related to new developments such as just-in-time publication, putting more pressure on academics to deliver, and virtual diplomacy and virtual war. He also pointed out that the obsession of American academics to be ahead of the curve does not exist (to that degree) in Canada. Another major difference is that many American research initiatives are funded by private agencies/individuals. Canadians can rarely draw on such opportunities.

Louis Pauly (University of Toronto) said that while the CCFPD is a significant initiative, creating a Council on International Relations, on the lines of the American equivalent, would be useful for sharing ideas and building academic fora. Robert Wolfe (Queen's University) pointed out that there is a structural need in the United States for the Council, while debate in Canada takes place through institutions like the CIIA and the House of Commons, foreign policy today requires advice on a myriad of complex issues. Globalisation is making the involvement of outside actors essential and unmanageable at the same time. The challenge to connect all the pieces is significant and a forum could be useful. Larry Woods (University of Northern BC) added that it is important for any future academic foreign policy fora to be multi-disciplinary and reach beyond the political science community.

7. *Conclusion*

Steve Lee, Chair, concluded the day's discussion by stressing that the Department can no longer do foreign policy alone. Participation of all sectors of civil society is required. The challenge continues to be in how to best promote inclusion and coherence. Who should be included and how? Today's roundtable aimed at building the foreign policy community by helping to connect young and seasoned scholars with each other and with Department officials.

He said that the discussion of human security, globalisation and Canada's constructivist approach were interesting and useful. He reiterated Canada's role as a builder of norms and asked why has it been so difficult to develop and apply norms (especially moral-based norms) on nuclear weapons issues. Future roundtables could address some of the main issues coming from today's discussion, including the need to think about norm building in trade policy.

He encouraged participants to identify issues for foreign policy options and submit