

militaries significantly. Realistically, only three EU members seemed to be taking the issue of enhancing capabilities at all seriously: France, the UK and the Netherlands.

Finally, Mr. Schaper added a word about the OSCE, which the Dutch will be chairing in 2003. His country considered this security institution to be useful, particularly as it could provide early warning of impending crises. Some means of endowing it with a wider role, while at the same time reducing Russia's residual concern about its "interventionism," should be sought. Mr. Schaper suggested adding combatting terrorism, drug trafficking and crime to the organization's mission.

The Canadian respondent to Mr. Schaper was **Prof. Alexander Moens** (Simon Fraser University), who prefaced his remarks with a welcome to the Dutch participants, delivered in Dutch. Prof. Moens made no secret of the fact that he viewed the "bilateral house" after 11 September as being decidedly beset by stormy weather, not as a result of any specific Dutch-Canadian tensions but rather because of the transformations in US foreign policy set in motion by the attacks on Washington and New York. The effect of those attacks had been to render obsolete certain policy options that just a few years ago seemed worthwhile (as for instance the proposal to integrate military planning between NATO and the EU, which Prof. Moens himself once advocated but has now abandoned as being beside the point).

He added that 11 September had brought "a sudden end to the drifting 1990s," and in so doing had provided a glimpse of future security environment. Beyond dispute, he argued, was the transformation wrought by the attacks upon America's foreign policy, which had turned decisively away from recent "Wilsonian" and multilateral formulations in favour of a reconcentration upon American security and power. Prof. Moens reminded the group that the rise in American power should not necessarily be conceived as being detrimental to the interests of America's partners, even if it was likely to make Washington take its European Allies less seriously than heretofore. (As for Canada, geography would oblige Washington to take it seriously, indeed.)

Fundamentally, the US seemed to be abandoning the security order it had created in the aftermath of the Second World War. Less than ever before would it be interested in being entangled by alliances, and while the term "unilateralism" might not accurately capture the new American dispensation, it was obvious that for the Bush administration the current perceived threat from terrorism left little time or inclination for reflection upon "root causes" of the phenomenon.

What was to be done? Prof. Moens imparted some advice he gave to his students: throw out your old text books, and learn to "think outside the box." Insofar as initiatives