

environment for democracy. The complex encounters between the military and civilian components of humanitarian interventions must be dissected. A new framework has to be developed to incorporate the diverse actors involved in humanitarian interventions including NGOs, and para-state agencies. Military discussions can no longer remain isolated from political discussions. Fora should be established that facilitate the exchange of information, network building, and cooperation among diverse sectors of Canadian state and society (i.e., universities, organisations such as the Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development).

Brian Tomlinson, Canadian Council for International Cooperation, pointed out that the NGO community is not well situated to address humanitarian intervention. Instead it is engaged in a long term development. There is a general consensus that conflict is a result of political, diplomatic and socio-economic factors. It is here where influence on policy should be directed. However, this is increasingly difficult in the context of structural adjustment programmes. If social justice issues are not addressed, no amount of intervention can bring a peaceful and secure world to existence. We must remain sceptical about the grave consequences of human engineering. Humility is necessary.

Don Hubert, DFAIT, asked whether it is legitimate at all to use deadly force for civilian protection or the achievement of human security goals. Prosecution of war criminals is not protection, despite its deterrent qualities. What does it mean to make people safe, what does it take? Is a mere military presence a means to protecting civilians? Some argued that the creation of safe havens could be revisited. Claude Emmanuelli, suggested that security zones often do not work since those maintaining them have to be ready to defend them at all costs. Otherwise they just attract attention and enhance the vulnerability of a threatened group. Errol Mendes pointed out that conflict prevention facilitates security. The power/influence of the IMF and other IFIs could be brought to bear on authoritarian states.

5. Conclusion

Steven Lee, Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development offered a few closing remarks. He drew attention to Paul Heinbecker's overview of the intervention including the role of the G-8, NATO's moral justification of the war, the importance of human rights over national/territorial rights, the importance of the media, the question of finding effective criteria for intervention, the fact that atrocities committed on the ground can not be stopped from the air, and that the veto power in the Security Council is not always absolute. He also recognised the importance of an historical perspective, offered by Maya Shatzmiller, McGill University, and others throughout the day, including the shadow of intra-European conflicts through religious wars and the Crusades.

Criteria for humanitarian intervention could be developed in the framework of complex civilian-military encounters. The inter-operability of the military, NGOs, DFAIT, CIDA and others may be difficult to achieve. The deadlock at the Security Council must be resolved.