

"Nation-states have been carrying out their individual *manifest destinies* and exercising their right to self-determination as gained through their sovereign status. Likewise, TNCs have been operating mostly as big businesses B not only because that's what they are but also due to their unrealised, hegemonic nature on the world scene. When positioned together in the present global system, the nation-states and TNCs carry out mainly a contentious interaction that is based on one entity trying to circumvent the others regulations or practices, i.e., it is not necessarily always a constructive relationship".

The implications of Edwards's comments are clear--there needs to be an arena to promote cooperative interaction and interfacing exercises between TNCs and national governments. If Edwards is correct, market concerns precondition large information corporations to collaborate to localisation. There are inherent opportunities to build bridges between the interests of the two actors, rather than to develop rigid positions based upon conflicting interests. In the wake of the failed MAI discussions, such collaboration may be a 'hard sell' to Canadians, but in absence of other means of control, it is imperative.

Robert Adamson⁶ brings a legal perspective to these issues, noting the trend towards internationalisation extra-territorialisation which has been increasingly marked in the development of law and policy during the 20th century. Indeed, by far the greater amount this blurring of boundaries occurred the second half of that century, and the pace only intensified as it wore on. This desire to promote standard-setting across borders is not merely a desire for harmonisation or uniformity for their own sake, but a realisation that the business of government involves dealing with issues which, by their nature, are transnational. The law/policy response must come from the same perspective. Extra-territorial application of laws, the making of one's laws applicable outside one's territory, even to aliens, cannot escape controversy, and yet, in some manifestations, seems to derive from the needs of citizens. The desire of US authorities to have the right to punish acts of terrorism directed at Americans anywhere seems an acceptable analogy with the long-standing laws of piracy, which allows any state to punish a pirate. *The Helms-Burton Act* seems, on the other hand, to cross too many established jurisdictional prerogatives.

The basic point is well made: domestic law and policy were once seen as operating inside the water-tight compartment of national territory, more or less

⁶ Law, Sovereignty and Trans-nationalism: *Competing Trends in Global and Domestic Justice*, Robert Adamson, Centre for Asian Legal Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.