

would add nothing new. Environmental security as (b) the security of the individual, he believed, provides us with an overinclusive definition of security; he asked, if religious fundamentalism, human rights and poverty are security threats, what is not? Environmental security as (c) the security of the state, Le Prestre claimed, requires an analysis of issues which directly affect us, such as safeguarding access to resources important for Canada and the impact of global atmospheric change on Canadian security, and leaves open the question whether, for example, the flooding of small island states is a Canadian security issue (as opposed to a moral one). Finally, environmental security as (d) the security of the international system (i.e. as international order), focuses on minimizing interstate conflicts and Le Prestre argued that it is the perspective with the most to offer to foreign policy analysis. However, he noted that the value of some case studies in this area have been questioned, with critics saying the causal link (environmental degradation causes conflict) has not been proven.

Le Prestre believed that environmental security could make sense as an aspect of Canadian foreign policy if it is understood to pertain to direct threats to individuals from pollution and conflicts between Canada and other states over resources. Environmental security could also provide a new framework for governmental and non-governmental action in the field of the environment; and allow for an extension of cooperative security to the promotion of the resolution of political conflicts through environmental cooperation.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PARTICIPANTS:**

The enlargement of the concept of security over the last few years has given rise to a great array of interpretations. This ongoing debate was illustrated during the seminar. With regards to the concept of human security, the participants did not agree on what elements should be included in its definition. Some stressed the importance of agreeing on an operational concept and not confusing the terms security and safety, while others argued against narrowing the concept down since all the elements relate to each other. Our security is threatened by our ability to live here as we currently do, and enjoy at least the same level of standard of living. For that reason, some claimed that one should focus on the local level rather than on the international level, an approach which will also allow us to enrich our knowledge of local level issues.

As far as the environment is concerned, it was argued that we should not talk about "environmental factors" as if they were all the same. Some distinguished two