

The European Union, he said, would never have gotten off the ground if proponents had clung too tightly to grand, idealistic visions instead of gradually building mechanisms from the ground up.

Many participants wondered what kind of practical steps could be taken to realize the goal of ending war. Lee noted that getting smaller states on side is not the big problem. Is there any specific part of this programme directed towards the great powers, especially the U.S. public? he asked. John English meanwhile wondered who within the great powers needed to be convinced of the merits of the programme. Is it elite opinion or public opinion that needs to be brought on side? He noted that in Canada, elite opinion carries the day: things have been changed against the will of public opinion. How critical is elite opinion in the US? he asked. Echoing these questions of who and how, Heidi Hulan reminded us of the enormous challenge posed by the permanent members of the UN Security Council. They have their own national interest in mind and their veto power will ultimately decide what does and does not come to the fore.

Dean argued that the Global Action program was realistic and was in fact moving toward implementation, as indicated by the nature of the present discussion: Participants were discussing, not whether a global security system could be created, but the imperfections of an already existing global security structure.

Stan Windass wound up the proceedings by reverting to the problem of enforcing justice between sovereigns which was the dilemma faced by the mediaeval thinkers who codified the just war doctrine. While it is true that in early theological formulations sovereignty descended from God via the pope to sovereigns, by the late Middle Ages sovereignty in effect firmly resided with the monarchs. It then descended through the democratic and human rights movements to the people, where it now resides. If "we the people" have an obligation to intervene to prevent genocide and crimes against humanity, we must have a corresponding obligation to discover or invent the means for effective intervention. The Foundation for International Security will therefore focus its research for the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty on the problem of modalities of intervention.

Union of Concerned Scientists
Ted Robert Gurr
Professor
Centre for International Development and Conflict
Management
University of Maryland

Barbara Harff
Professor
U.S. Naval Academy

Markus Unruh
Fugate
Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development
Heidi Hulan
Deputy Director
International Commission on Intervention and State
Sovereignty
DRAFT

David Yvank
DRAFT
Foreign Policy and Public Security Division
DRAFT