

should be separated from social and political issues.

Donnelly suggested that the prospect of developing the sense of social and economic rights in the U.S. is slim. A majority of Americans is obsessed with the virtues of free markets and is unwilling to accept the markets' possible negative impacts, except at home. The most movement one can expect is the softening of the Washington consensus. This view is reflected in the U.S. human rights policy, which does not draw links between human rights and aid (nor human rights and trade) – contrary to countries such as Canada, Norway, and the Netherlands.

7. Conclusions

The over-arching issue addressed by the participants throughout the day was whether post-September 11 U.S. multilateralism will last. Is it credible to assume that a common terrorist threat could bring enhanced cooperation between the U.S. and its traditional adversaries (i.e., Russia and China)? Doubt was raised about the ability of the U.S. to transcend its differences with other Coalition partners as soon as the present crisis subsides and when other long-term interests reappear on the foreign policy agenda (including NATO expansion, scrapping the ABM Treaty, building a BMD, etc.).

Another common theme was the future of the U.S. global leadership. Many participants agreed that the anti-terrorist campaign poses a great challenge to the U.S. as the sole superpower in the world. The manner in which the U.S. government handles the war in Afghanistan and the campaign in general will determine whether the international community will continue to accept the privileged position of the U.S. in the world, or whether it will mount resistance and demand change. The U.S. government should take care to project power/influence in a way that does not generate a backlash. Eliminating terrorism should include efforts to create a more equitable world. The U.S. simply must invest in nation building and good governance for broken, desperate societies – bombing the wretched of the world will not accomplish anything in the long run.

U.S. plans to engage the United Nations in a reconstruction effort in Afghanistan after the war and the pay-back of UN dues may point to the recognition on the part of the U.S. government that the UN is the only viable (legitimate) global mechanism to address peace and security in the world. Strengthening and reforming the United Nations in the anti-terrorist campaign and beyond could be the first step toward building a more just and equitable world.

New security concepts were addressed during the discussion. A point was made that the era of Mutually Assured Destruction was being replaced by an age of Assured Vulnerability. The new security environment supports the argument for nation building since, **as the experience of Israel demonstrates, no matter how much a state spends on defence and intelligence, terrorists find new, innovative ways to penetrate and strike.**

A concern was raised that the post-September 11 environment/rhetoric does not bode well for the