

If we are unwilling to pay, we will be unable to succeed. New thinking has to be encouraged as a lesson from our experience in Kosovo. A myriad of tragedies occur every day across the globe. There was a chance for a new beginning for Germany and Japan. Why not the Balkans?

The moral justification of the Kosovo intervention was outlined by Paul Heinbecker, Assistant Deputy Minister, Global and Security Policy, DFAIT. He argued, similarly to Polanyi, that there was little doubt the international community as a whole favoured the action. However, there was also little doubt that the initiative would be blocked by the Chinese and Russians at the Security Council. Fear that no decision would be taken by the Assembly prevented the initiative to go through that channel as well.

General Michel Maisonneuve drew attention to the on-the-ground experiences of the Kosovo Verification Mission. He also pointed out that the role of Canada within the OSCE is credible. Where the Kosovo Verification Mission was effective, breaches of humanitarian law were prevented. While the work of such Missions is invaluable, there are difficulties with enforcing humanitarian standards in practice.

To counter criticisms aimed at the selective nature of NATO's involvement, Paul Heinbecker pointed out that just because NATO can not intervene everywhere does not mean it should not intervene anywhere. Drawing on the Czech President, Vaclav Havel's appeal, decent people simply can not sit back and tolerate the atrocities committed by the government of Yugoslavia. In this instance, human security trumped sovereignty.

Others were not as enthusiastic about the legitimacy of the NATO intervention in Kosovo. Marcus Gee, *The Globe and Mail*, for example, argued that the international community flaunted law on behalf of the rule of law. It is simply unacceptable that the UN was circumscribed on the basis of potential rejection. Moreover, Gee pointed out the devastating consequences of the NATO bombing campaign on lives and infrastructure as well as the acceleration of massacres by the Yugoslav leadership. NATO forces openly took the side of the Kosovo Liberation Army. Serbia capitulated because it was unable to fight the air campaign. While refugees returned, rebuilding and reconciliation remains a huge challenge. In a way, the involvement of the international community in Kosovo was inspiring. However, the effects and practicalities of humanitarian intervention have to be seriously thought through.

An argument was made that the Kosovo intervention was a clear violation of international law. The principle of NATO as a defensive alliance was also challenged. Circumscribing the Security Council made the action illegal. In the final analysis, the Canadian government also violated its own Constitution. Geoffrey Pearson expressed his doubts about the inclusiveness of the term "international community" and asked the question whether countries like China, India or Indonesia were not a part of it. Others pointed out that the concept of humanitarian intervention is hypocritical since it seems to apply to some but not others. How would Canadians react if human intervention was proposed for Canada? Without clear criteria, humanitarian intervention might become a tool of Northern neo-colonialism. To a question posed by Polanyi: does not