

win over 'hearts and minds.' It seems the U.S. has not come to a decision on the causes of terrorism.

Canada should also make efforts to better understand the root causes of terrorism and alienation. To do this, Canada must deepen its engagement with the Arab and Islamic world, both bilaterally and multilaterally, and should endeavour to establish closer links with civil society in the Muslim world. Finally, Canada should assist countries that cannot afford to implement security measures.

From some perspectives, intelligence failures played a significant role in determining the course of events on September 11th. An improved independent analytical capacity is important to formulating national decisions on courses of action. More broadly, intelligence must be seen as a base for sound foreign policy. Canada must improve its own intelligence capacity in order to better formulate its own security policy and reduce excessive dependence on intelligence from other countries. An independent knowledge base is important to formulating national decisions on courses of action that are distinct from, and uninfluenced by the intelligence provided by others who may be trying to influence such actions. Notwithstanding, information and intelligence sharing should continue. Canada should also assign a higher priority to sharing the intelligence burden with our allies, in order to strengthen links and increase its international influence. Intelligence is also a valuable tool in gaining an understanding of other societies.

Nevertheless, some argue that the success of the September 11 attacks arose from a failure of imagination rather than a failure of intelligence. Canada, like the U.S., must learn to use its intelligence information more efficiently to avert crises, and coordination and cooperation between different government agencies is essential. The question arose as to where Canada should focus its efforts to increase this intelligence capacity, and whether Canada can make use of its multicultural society in monitoring and tracking developments in other countries as a way to complement its other foreign policy initiatives.

Much discussion focussed on the intelligence available regarding Iraq, and whether the U.S. could demonstrate that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. From some perspectives, the U.S. has made no attempt to provide any specific information to substantiate their assertions against Iraq. Others argue that Saddam Hussein's record of aggression, the possibility that Iraq either already has weapons of mass destruction or, at a minimum, is working towards having them, and the fact that it has demonstrated its willingness to use such weapons on its own people means Canada should support an attack against Iraq.

Others, however, noted that action against Iraq requires a high standard of proof because the consequences of action are significant in terms of relations with the Muslim world and broader impacts on the region and Israel. Furthermore, supporting an attack on Iraq solely because the Iraqi government *may* be producing weapons of mass destruction sets a dangerous precedent for attacks against sovereign states. As one participant noted: "There is no end of speculation for preventative attacks. This has serious consequences for the new global order."