

4) It illustrates the virtues of building extensive coalitions.

5) Lobbying proved successful because the need to retain anti-personnel land mines was not seen by civilian political leadership as a fundamental aim in policy.

**Max Cameron**, University of British Columbia, analysed the Ottawa process and its implications for the contemporary international system (perceived by the majority of International Relations theorists as inter-state and anarchical). He argued that despite the endurance of a realist framework, the success of the land mines ban movement bodes well for the emergence of a global civil society.

Cameron pointed out that for the purposes of his analysis it is useful to distinguish between civil society and a social movement. While the former is defined by its relationship to the state, the latter operates within the political spaces provided by civil society. Social movements include collective actors with common interests and a shared identity who use mass mobilisation as their source of power. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines approximates the latter better. This distinction draws out the fact that while NGOs actively participate in policy development/making they do not (nor do they claim to) represent the people in the same way parties and parliaments do.

Cameron qualified the land mines process as unique in certain respects. He pointed out that the purpose of banning anti-personnel land mines was not to change the inter-state system but to alleviate a humanitarian crisis. Indeed, anti-personnel land mines have never been a weapon of strategic importance in the arsenal of states. They have little impact on the distribution of capacities among states. They rarely confer a long-term advantage on a military force and never caused a country to win or lose a war. They are more commonly used in civil conflicts than inter-state conflicts. At last, but not least, the major producers of anti-personnel mines have not signed the ban treaty. The relative "light-weight" nature of the issue ensured that the international security regime/context would not be challenged. Moreover, the transnational social movements contributed to re-framing of the land mines issue in a way more amenable to cooperative solutions. Land mines were moved from the realm of military security to human security.

Nevertheless, the process enhanced what Cameron labelled "global horizontal accountability" (as supposed to vertical accountability where a subordinate public agency is held accountable to a higher agency). Horizontal accountability hinges on the ability of state agencies that are legally empowered and factually willing and able to take actions against other agents or agencies of the state. Moreover, the process relied on the support of like-minded small and middle-size states as well as mine-afflicted states, located mostly in the "South." It created a larger normative system which the non-signatories and non-compliant can not ignore. The pace of the process was also unprecedented. No other multilateral disarmament treaty has ever entered into force more rapidly.

The principal role of the NGOs (the International Campaign to Ban Landmines in