

The Canadian respondent to Prof. van Staden was Ms. Jill Sinclair (DFAIT), who began by stating her general assent to the claim that security needed to be conceptualized in a much more inclusive manner. She also agreed that preventing terrorism did require close heed to the conditions that bred it. In her view, there was and remained much that Canada and the Netherlands could do together in responding to the contemporary security challenge, not the least important undertaking being to argue jointly the case for a broadened understanding of security consistent with the conception, "human security." She also worried that "we haven't learned the lessons of 9/11 yet."

These points of agreement having been broached, Ms. Sinclair identified areas where the Canadian and Dutch positions seemed to differ. First was the question of the meaning and impact of the attack on America. Notwithstanding the contemporary mood of the Dutch (and by extension of the other members of the EU), Canadians continued to experience the trauma of 11 September. "Canada," she said, "felt the attack on the US as an attack on Canada in the most visceral sense." Not only did Canada take the initial shock in a manner different from the Dutch, but Canada had decidedly not gone back to a business as usual position. Instead, "our country has changed irreversibly." The threat is taken very seriously, and Canadians are "more closely related to the US than ever before." Ms. Sinclair continued by observing that there had developed a new awareness of what it meant to be a neighbour of America's, as well as of what it meant to be a Canadian, and she noted that Canadians were in the midst of a debate over where the country would or should fit in the new command structure(s) being envisioned for US homeland security.

A second comment concerned NATO. Ms. Sinclair stated, "I think the Alliance is as healthy as it has ever been." The invocation of Article 5 for the first time constituted a powerful symbolic statement, and demonstrated that the Alliance had more than adequately met the test of solidarity. Indeed, she described the Article 5 invocation as "scintillating in its magic." Another encouraging development was the way in which NATO's further enlargement was shaping up, given that the expansion of the alliance was tantamount to the expansion of the zone of peace in Europe. The new NATO was not only becoming in many ways a partner with which Russia could work, but was also evolving into more of a political grouping, harking back to an earlier Canadian preference that the Allies pay closer heed to the processes and norms of political, economic and societal cooperation (associated with the concept of an "Article 2" alliance). NATO's adaptation was healthy, and gave the lie to those who were predicting its demise in the early aftermath of the ending of the Cold War.

A third point concerned the current state of relations between the EU and North American. It was not just the US that found it frustrating trying to deal with Europe, she observed, with an allusion to the celebrated comment of Henry Kissinger's about being