

for civil liberties and sovereignty.⁸² The losses of civil liberties and the inauguration of a “big brother” epoch—intrusive surveillance, redefining due process—have been especially discussed.⁸³ The “expansive philosophy”⁸⁴ of proactive enforcement law is concern to a number of Americans used to living in a country where personal freedom is more reverently guarded than anywhere else in the world.

Clearly, what is at stake, normatively, is *getting the balance right*. In that sense, secure trade should and probably will (insofar as these factors are known and accepted by decision-makers) replace the current regime.

Conclusion

Over the past half-century, through various rounds of bilateral, regional and multilateral negotiations (including the one currently underway since its launch at Doha, Qatar), countries have attempted to adjust their policies to gradually produce as calming (and thus prosperous) a result as possible for international society—that “one common tie of interest and intercourse”,⁸⁵ otherwise known as free trade. While not perfect, the world has come a long way.

Then, with the advent of a new uncertain age, imperilled by terrorism, Canada and the world have been forced to change the way trade was conducted. Order was threatened. A surprising development was that trade was in the first instance only moderately affected. Secure trade is on its way to replacing the old

⁸² The loss of sovereignty is especially a concern for Canadians—will increased cooperation with the US cause our border to vanish? Drew Fagan, “It’s the year 2025...There is no U.S. Border; Has Canada become the 51st state?” *Globe and Mail* (March 16th, 2002); Internet Article; Available at <http://www.globeandmail.com/series/borders>; Accessed January 6th, 2003.

⁸³ *The Economist*, “A Question of Freedom,” (March 8, 2003), 29-31.

⁸⁴ Jonathan Stevenson, “How Europe and America Defend Themselves”, *Foreign Affairs* 82, No. 2 (March/April 2003), pg 78.

⁸⁵ David Ricardo, quoted in Robert Gilpin, *The Political Economy of International Relations*, (Princeton, NJ: (Princeton University Press), pg 174.