

unable to find Europe's phone number: Canada, as well, too often found no one at the other end of the line, but just a "demonic call-forward system."

Fourthly, Ms. Sinclair thought the expression "military apartheid" a bit unfair. It was true that no one country could compete with the US when it came to developing military capability, but why was it important to do so? She doubted that the current administration in Washington represented a long-term challenge, if that is what it was, to the interests of the other Allies, and suggested that those Allies should rejoice in America's willingness to shoulder a disproportionate share of the military burden, which meant that they were freer to focus their own initiatives on addressing the root causes of terrorism. In her view, lamenting the existence of a capabilities "gap" detracted from the business of addressing root causes.

Finally, and the above disagreements notwithstanding, Ms. Sinclair reiterated that "we are absolutely kindred spirits," and suggested that the world had more need now than ever of creative policy ideas stemming jointly from the Netherlands and Canada.

Because of the richness and length of the two presentations, time proved scarce at panel's end, resulting in a decision to reserve general debate until the conclusion of the morning's second panel.

## **PANEL TWO: MULTILATERAL SECURITY INSTITUTIONS**

The lead presenter and moderator of this panel were also Dutch. Prof. van Staden served in the latter capacity. Mr. Herman Schaper (MFA) began his presentation by noting that contemporary institutions of greatest significance for security represented an evolution of the structures erected by the West during the Cold War. In this vein, he observed that the idea of inclusive security institutions represented nothing new, and cited the Marshall Plan as an example of a security undertaking that went far beyond the simple military dimension.

Mr. Schaper departed from the first panel's lead presenter insofar as concerned the causes of terrorism. He pointed out that Dutch government officials tended to shy away from the "root-causes" phraseology, as it seemed to constitute a diminution of the challenge posed by terrorists. These latter, he reminded his auditors, "are criminals, after all." Moreover, it was unclear what exactly was connoted by the expression, "root causes," all the more so in that it was far from apparent that poverty per se must rank as one such