

collaborative measures and co-operative management. Indeed, many of the papers presented were devoted to the analysis of open borders and co-operative cross-border relations. Still, problems such as illegal migrants, refugees, terrorist threats (real and perceived) smuggling and drugs, on the frontier, in areas beyond the effective control of the state, loom large as threats which Canadians perceive are associated with negative impacts such as a deterioration of personal security or threat to lifestyle. Governments come under pressure to control through more stringent border functions. Reactionary policies that move to close borders emerge from the perception of extreme threat lying on the other side. Yet realistic assessment and response to threat is an extremely important area for policy intervention, because stress-free borders are inimical to healthy cross-border functions, and to the overall well being of the state - particularly in a global context.

This duality is equally evident within Canada. While the Clinton administration has been forced to rise to the challenge of increasingly de-territorialised threats to national security - some at the planetary level, the same would be true for the Chretien government. De-territorialised threats such as environmental degradation, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, transnational terrorism and ethnic nationalism, are all issues of concern to Canadians. The question becomes how to manage these issues, transnational in character, within an international political context that remains state-centred. Or, are there alternatives to "state-centred" systems which still maintain national sovereignty and self-determination?

While there is evidence that traditional Canadian security institutions such as the Department of National Defence have engaged these concepts in defence planning for the new millennium, work needs to be done in cultivating the Canadian public to explore the concept of permeable borders, particularly in areas of economic and political co-operation. Popular writers have tended to stress the negative aspects of globalisation--the "threat" of NAFTA or the "MAI" and transnational corporate culture. While Tom Edwards<sup>5</sup> does not offer answers, he is able to demonstrate how policy formulations could garner greater control while not eliminating cross-border flows of information and capital. Edwards analysis of the structuring of informational systems, corporate strategies and conditions in which recontextualising occurs raises the possibility of the development of "soft" means of control. His comments concerning the market implications of localisation errors are prescriptive, giving support to the concept that governments must provide or encourage interfacing services.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Information Geopolitics: Blurring the Lines of Sovereignty*, Tom Edwards, Geographer, Microsoft Corporation, Seattle, Washington, USA.