

Byers cautioned that Canada would benefit from having a better understanding of the debate between the two disciplines. He also suggested that Canada must defend and strengthen a public international law model that is more than just a US version of international law. Yet Neta Campbell found that the USA still needed to justify its actions in international law. In this way, international law continues to act as a check on the hegemony.

Regarding the US effect on international law, Professor Byers suggested that the USA's opposition to the *Rome Statute* of the International Criminal Court is mainly based on the US public's ignorance of international issues. While the USA is isolationist, Professor Byers thought that the USA might still be angered if the ICC goes ahead without it. He believes that the USA should be coaxed into participating in areas where it wants to be engaged. Professor Campbell and Professor Toope, on the other hand, stated that the ICC should be made as strong as possible, ignoring the hegemony, and that the USA opposition will shift over time following the shift in the internal dynamics of the USA.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS/POLICY OPTIONS

- Canada should gain a better understanding of the debate that exists at the intersection between international relations and international law.
- Canada must defend and strengthen a public international law model that is more than just a US version of international law. To do this Canada should encourage and promote new and independent theoretical thinking by Canadians in the area of international law and international relations. Canada should also encourage other countries to do the same.
- While Canada should encourage international lawyers to expand their perspectives by asking larger and open questions, international legal theorists should be reminded to 'keep their feet on the ground'. The questions asked must be real questions relating to the real world.