

on the most vulnerable target populations, including women and children. Furthermore, they often produce permanent effects - such as impaired physical and mental development due to malnutrition - which cannot be reversed following the lifting of sanctions. Mr. Hubert called into question the idea that sanctions-related civilian pain produces political gain. Indeed, he argued, civilian pain is often exploited by the target regime in an effort to foster resentment toward the international community. With regard to humanitarian exemptions, Mr. Hubert advocated the adoption of blanket exemptions which would allow humanitarian organizations to bypass the normal approval process.

Mr. Hubert also pointed out that the NGO community, which once favoured sanctions as a constructive alternative to the use of force, has now largely reversed this position. Carolyn McAskie picked up on this theme, noting that there is very little that a target can do to evade the use of force. She agreed that the public should be challenged to revisit the notion that sanctions are not necessarily harmful, while force is inherently so. Patrick Wittmann (IMO) agreed. He also pointed out that sanctions which inflict significant collateral damage often risk undermining the humanitarian norms they are intended to uphold.

David Malone observed that one of the challenges of sanctions is to turn the target regime into an international pariah while avoiding measures which would impact adversely on civilians. Prof. Black suggested that in order to do this, we need to convey the message to states and to our own domestic audiences that cultural and sporting sanctions, given their often considerable psychological effects on the target - are not necessarily "soft options." Less promisingly, Prof. Black also noted that it is becoming difficult for the UN Security Council to