

would have not guessed ten years ago that the International Criminal Court would be possible. Nevertheless the discourse of human security should penetrate the public and institutional consciousness in order to ensure state-centric policies/theories do not become prevalent once again.

Shreesh Juyal (University of Regina) said that a dichotomy exists between human security and national security (i.e., some perceive the need for military intervention to protect individuals as a contradiction). This trend is apparent at the UN and other international bodies and will have to change. Moreover, the reform of the UN is necessary, it continues to be one of the most traditional (i.e., hierarchical and real-politik) international institutions today.

Robert Wolfe (Queen's University) pointed out that much of the human security agenda is not new. Instead, it draws on traditional peace-related studies. He was sceptical about promoting human security as being "pulpit diplomacy." Human security "has nothing to do with our interests and does not require anything of us." A case in point is Minister Axworthy's concern that Talisman's operations may fuel the conflict in Sudan and nevertheless, lack of action following the release of a report stating just that. Another case in point is the gap between fair trade discourse and protection of the textile industry. Jill Sinclair admitted to her occasional scepticism as well. However, she said Canada is doing tangible things such as passing resolutions and developing a human security discourse (i.e., building the normative framework for action), providing financial assistance to further human security objectives and making treaties implementable. While the human security agenda may be traditional, it has evolved and people and institutions are beginning to accept it more widely.

Others doubted the longevity and real impact of human security if the "great powers" fail to support it. Moreover, governments of many newly formed countries, struggling with state building, either do not understand the concept, or find it difficult to square human security with their state building objectives, said Piotr Dutkiewicz (Carleton University). Jill Sinclair pointed out that while some governments remain suspicious, many others, including the United Kingdom support the concept. Human security is becoming a part of institutional consciousness of international bodies, such as the OAS and even the UN.

Sandra MacLean (Dalhousie University) asked whether human security does not lead to the militarisation of development. Human security has its critics on the Left and Right of the political spectrum. Another question is whether human security, and especially humanitarian intervention, is truly aimed at protecting people or whether it is a form of neocolonialism. Would a sustainable development lens be better in addressing problems like health and education? Others questioned whether it is possible to focus on individual/localised protection while developing a universal set of values. Jill Sinclair pointed out that the suspicion of the Left is unjustified. Some left-of-the-centre groups have to square some circles themselves and move from an ideological militancy that characterised the 1960s.

The methodology for democratising foreign policy should be devised/improved. While it