The circulated paper that Richard Falk wrote, in part reflects a feeling of anguish and despair, visionary exhaustion, shared by many around the globe, although perhaps reasons and articulations may differ. Is anguish the new common bond? Is the gap between the unacceptable and the unattainable the space for a new quest - seeking new knowledge, combating our own illusions? Or, the unacceptable and unattainable will coexist in petrified anguish?

In the time following our "interrupted" dialogue a number of surprises emerged, demonstrating not only that reality resisted to a larger degree than expected, the realization of the visions for a better future, but also that some of the visionary thinking contained troubling, although unintended practical consequences.

1. One "surprise" came with the end of Cold war, an end that was in it desirable. However, what followed, the unipolar moment, blinding triumphalism, the new round of interventionism and ethnic conflicts, etc. indicated that the Cold War was only a chapter in a much longer historical novel, that deeper structural tensions, contradictions extended their reach beyond the demolition of the Berlin wall.

2. The end of Cold war did not represent only the demise of communism, but also a serious erosion of social capitalism. Due to unprincipled compromises, pragmatism, and accommodating neoliberalism - the Third way become an empty phrase. The social consequences of the neoliberal project are crying for a social democratic project, but mobilization on these assumptions is lacking. The political and social logic seem to diverge. Why?

3. Globalization was hailed for its capacity to transform the nation state, the state centric system. Problems that emerged in the weak/fragile states (their rising number) indicate that the sovereignty norm may have been abandoned prematurely, "too much too soon". The unevenness, redistribution of sovereignty, opened doors to old and new forms of interventions, extending the asymmetry of power. The attempts to formulate new normative rules for a new world order, turned out to be rules for "them", while self-exemption (K. Schmit) become the criteria of sovereignty.
4. The moral interdependence resulted in the prioritization of Human rights - a progressive change, that was to mark an era where foreign policy would be based on ethics and not interests, and the protection of the individual beyond the state borders would stand above the principle of sovereignty. However, this step forward entailed new inconsistencies. Prioritization of human rights without the development of new forms of international law, led to the legitimization of (selective, disproportional) military interventions, to the extension of the reach of the most powerful states undermining the UN, to the distinction of deserving and undeserving victims, i.e. to new spaces of unaccountability. Greater good, again reappeared as a justification for massive violence.

5. The sheer complexity of the globalization process is becoming unmanageable. A good illustration of this is globalized crime. C. Nordstrom (Global Outlaws, 2007) depicts how based on porous holes in borders, customs, laws, lines become blurred between legal and illegal, acceptable and illicit. Networks are established between the national and international business partners, multinational companies and states, states and extra state actors, etc. but networks that are "almost impossible to chart, much less curtail". As criminal organizations globalize, so too do norms of extra/legal association. On the other hand the sheer size of trade that is conducted, for instance in the biggest ports, demonstrate "the inability to regulate the unregulated". (According to C. Nordstrom (p.171), in 2005, 300,000 vessels and 133,000 inland ships visited the Port of Rotterdam, and carried approximately 9 million containers). Another reality of authority and wealth, with new rules and actors, invisible fortunes, shadow empires, is being created, an unmanageable part of reality.

To come back to Richard's findings we face: asymmetry of power, and unprecedented military force, widening the gap between the West and non-Western societies; lack of political will to responsibly tackle acute problems like economic crisis and its social consequences, or climate change, lack of actors of change/leaders, parties, states, institutions; new/old forms of interventionism leading to desovereignization, erosion of democracy, creation of reactive not active citizens,

Under the present circumstances what is possible? A new round of diagnosing and self-reflection?