

is commendable new groups are brought in, the question who is brought in and who is left out is key. Jill Sinclair said that the groups of NGOs differ according to the topic at hand. Moreover, it is the NGOs who usually approach the Department rather than *vice versa*. Coherence between NGOs and the government and among NGOs and government departments themselves will have to be improved in order to deliver integrated human security oriented policy and programmes. (In this respect the coherence of NGOs on the landmines issue was unprecedented). This coherent approach will have to be extended to include International Financial Institutions (IFIs) so that links are created/strengthened between global economic "security" and human security, said Debra Stienstra (University of Winnipeg). Currently the coordination between DFAIT and IFIs is very weak.

#### 4. *Globalisation*

Claire Cutler (University of Victoria) addressed the disjuncture between globalisation related processes, sanctioned by the majority of states, and international law. These processes include, for instance: 1) the growing flexibility of labour, financial, commodity and other markets, 2) intensifying global competition and the concomitant ascendancy of the "competition state" (as opposed to the welfare state), and 3) the growth of transnational production/capital mobility (i.e., Foreign Direct Investment). Faced by these globalisation related challenges, law is often de-localised. States implement/superimpose international law that increasingly reflects the power of corporations (business interests). Consequently, in developing countries or newly emerging states, sovereignty (which can also be seen as a reaction to globalisation related homogeneity) is being reasserted in a way that protects property rather than people. The modernised world is thus being reimposed unevenly around the globe.

A good example of this trend is the growth of private arbitration in settling commercial/business disputes. Tax, securities regulation, and other issues previously considered public policy issues are removed from the public realm and arbitrated privately. While this practice has only started recently and is concentrated in the United States, it has a potential of becoming a universally adopted norm if the public does not become aware and resistant. There is a need to better understand where these emerging legal practices are taking us. It is also important to realise that international law has an asymmetrical impact around the globe, depending on the degree to which legal (and other) traditions and mechanisms are embedded.

Debra Stienstra (University of Winnipeg) pointed out that a similar analysis could be applied to human rights law. Globalisation related processes, in this case the shift to the "Competition State" and privatisation, pose challenges for the ability of states to provide welfare for their citizens. The implications of this trend, lets say for the rights of persons with disabilities, are significant. What are the strategies to create new norms?

Shreesh Juyal (University of Regina) asked whether the recent developments in Washington and Seattle do not point to some penetration of public interest into the state sanctioned corporate agenda. Claire Cutler said there is very little correspondence between