stream dichotomy does not hold since water problems are inter-related (i.e., fish may swim upstream). He further cautioned against the danger of imposing Canadian or western resolution methods on people who would otherwise approach water-related issues and disputes/conflicts differently and perhaps more successfully. Some good examples of cooperation on water-related issues include the International Joint Commission (IJC).

The last speaker, Ken Macartney, Director of the Environmental Relations at DFAIT, pointed out that water-related issues impact all of the three basic pillars of Canadian foreign policy: 1) economic prosperity, 2) peace and security, and 3) Canadian values. In order to be economically prosperous resources have to be protected. Various organisations (IJC) and bilateral as well as international agreements on water sharing are mutgral to preventing conflict and maintaining peace – necessary conditions of a prosperous trading system. Protecting the global commons and issues of human security as well as environmental security constitute an important part of the Canadian value system.

Mr. Macartney pointed out Canada could draw on government, NGOs, and other private and institutional support to conflicts in international fora setting, offer policy advise on sustainable water management issues as well as conflict prevention. He also drew attention to the challenges of approaching too broadly when assisting countries with water problems that differ vastly in kind and scope. Other questions he posed: In which context should global water issues be addressed (i.e., regionally or bilaterally)? How do we achieve coherence, coordination and cooperation in an environment of scarcity?

SYNOPSIS OF THE DISCUSSIONS

The participants addressed the nature of water-related issues. Some raised the point that it is not quite clear how the topic fits within the human security context and therefore some basic definitional clarification is needed. Until recently water-related issues have been primarily seen through the prism of water-related war/conflict (among states), putting the issues on the top of the human security agenda could prove challenging. This shift in focus should be accompanied by a shift from war/conflict terminology to that reflecting the new preoccupation with individuals and their well being. Redefining the nature of the problem naturally implies a change in strategy, leading to new dilemmas of how to approach water-related issues. Different strategies have to be devised for different kinds of problems. For instance, the response to an armed conflict over water between states (as well as regions, communities, or nations) will be quite different than a response to a crisis brought about by natural causes or pollution. This reality poses not only conceptual but also institutional challenges. In particular, it requires coherence in foreign policy where development priorities (CIDA) become synonymous with human security preoccupations (DFAIT).

While some argued vehemently for the human security approach to water-related issues, since there is nothing more threatening to human beings than the lack of food, water, and shelter; others pointed out the importance of seeing them in the context of