Editorial Preface

> The aspect of law or public affairs which seems most to have been affected
> by change during my lifetime in the law is that of the growth of
> international law and the growing *internationalisation* of law
>
> > Sir Ninian Stephen
> > "The Expansion of International Law,
> > Sovereignty and External Affairs"
> > (1995) *Quadrant* 20

Significant and controversial change to the landscape of Australian law has been a common theme of Special Issues of the *Sydney Law Review* since their inception in 1993. It was therefore entirely predictable, given sentiments of the kind expressed above, that "Internationalisation of Australian Law" would commend itself as a suitable theme. As in previous Special Issues, the *Review* has been fortunate in obtaining contributions from a distinguished group of scholars. The range of topics covered by them offers persuasive evidence of the diversity of both the forms and effects of internationalisation.

Another common feature linking this Special Issue with its predecessors is the central role played by the High Court in influencing change in the areas covered to date: native land rights, implied constitutional rights and now internationalisation. The Court's recent decision in *Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs v Teoh*, handed down on 7 April 1995, is a further example of that influence. The report of the case came to hand just as the Issue was being prepared for the printer, but fortunately not too late to receive some attention. In this respect, while thanking all those who have participated for both their willingness and the high quality of their contributions, special mention must be made of Margaret Allars who, under the most severe time constraints, produced her article on the *Teoh* case.

One innovation in this Issue is the use of editorial cross-referencing to draw attention to points of connection between articles. We hope that readers find this useful.

Colin Phegan
Editor