

KEYNOTE ADDRESS TO THE CONFERENCE ON  
THE SCHOOL'S ROLE IN GLOBAL EDUCATION OF  
THE BRITISH COLUMBIA TEACHERS' FEDERATION

BY

AMBASSADOR J. ALAN BEESLEY, O.C., Q.C.

Vancouver, British Columbia, March 1988

"The Need for Education in Global Environmental Issues"  
(Transcribed from taped transcript)

Introductory Remarks by:

ELSIE McMURPHY, PRESIDENT  
B.C. TEACHERS' FEDERATION

Good morning, everyone. Welcome to this conference on the role of the school in global education. Thank you very much for making the effort to share your time and expertise with us as we examine this question before us. I think many of us see education as the way to uniting our world family, to finding the solutions to our internationally common problems, and to establishing the understanding and tolerance that allows conflict resolution and a sharing of our global cultures, skills and resources.

I am particularly pleased to welcome you this morning on behalf of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, and I'm also very proud to have the honour of introducing to you your guest speaker, Ambassador Beesley. Not only has Ambassador Beesley been able to come to us on very short notice, which we also appreciate very much, but I would also like, on behalf of the organizing committee, to extend our thanks and appreciation to the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa and the National Survival Institute, also in Ottawa, for their generous cooperation in helping to bring to us such a prominent and respected member of the international community.

Ambassador Beesley was born and raised in British Columbia and received his Bachelor of Arts and his law degree from the University of British Columbia. In 1983 he also received from the University of Waterloo an honorary doctorate in Environmental Studies. He practiced law in B.C. until joining the Department of External Affairs as a foreign service officer in 1956, and he comes to us today from his current responsibilities as Foreign Service Visitor in Residence at the Faculty of Law of UBC.

Mr. Beesley has held numerous senior positions with the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa, as well as ambassadorial posts abroad, and he has had many years of bilateral and multilateral negotiating experience on behalf of Canada. His Ottawa assignments have included that of Director General of the the Bureau of Legal and Consular Affairs and Legal Advisor to the Department of External Affairs, and later that of Assistant Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs and Legal Advisor. His ambassadorial assignments have included: Ambassador to the Law of the Sea Conference, and Ambassador for Disarmament. His latest post abroad was Ambassador to the United Nations in Geneva, Ambassador to the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and Canadian representative to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

His prior assignments have included Canadian High Commissioner to Australia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu. Previously he served as Ambassador to Austria and Canadian representative to the International Atomic Agency and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

In 1974, in recognition of Mr. Beesley's service on behalf of Canada, he was appointed Queen's Counsel, and in 1983 he received the Prime Minister's Outstanding Achievement Award in the Public Service of Canada. In 1984, he was made an Officer of the Order of Canada. In 1986, he was elected in his personal capacity to the International Law Commission, the official organ of the United Nations for the progressive development and codification of International Law. He has headed Canadian delegations

which concluded fisheries, boundaries, and anti-hijacking agreements, and has led Canadian delegations in multilateral negotiations in such diverse fields as The Law of the Sea, the law of the environment, arms control and disarmament, outer space, human rights, refugee matters, international trade and the law of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

During the past 25 years he has also represented Canada in most of the committees of the United Nations General Assembly in New York and the United Nations specialized agencies and organs in Geneva, Paris, and Vienna, including--and another impressive list--the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the World Meteorological Organization, the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, United Nations Disaster Relief Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization, the International Bureau of Education, the Human Rights Commission, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the Economic Commission for Europe, as well as the International Committee of the Red Cross Conference, the League of Red Cross Societies, UNESCO (in Paris), and the IAEA and UNIDO (in Vienna).

During all of this activity, he has also found time to publish numerous lectures and articles on foreign affairs, and to take time also to share his perspective and knowledge with many groups such as ours today. It's a common admonition in circles such as these, one well known to all of us, that it's better to light a single candle, than to sit in darkness. I join with you in looking forward to hearing the words of a man who I'm sure has lit many, many candles to lighten our darkness. Your guest speaker, Ambassador Beesley.

APPLAUSE

AMBASSADOR BEESLEY:

INTRODUCTION

That long c.v. wasn't designed to use up the time that I would otherwise be taking, but thank you for the kind introduction.

I should explain one thing: during this last semester, I've been promoted from Ambassador to Professor; now you may call me Professor Beesley. I accept that title with great pride, even though I don't have any pretensions of being an educator. Indeed I would like to state to you most sincerely, that it's a privilege for me to be here, and I hope to stay on this morning and listen to what you have to say, so that I can learn something, and take it away with me. If there is no objection, I will feed it back to some of my own colleagues in Ottawa, bearing in mind, of course, the traditional British Columbia attitudes which I have retained concerning the feds, although I'm one of them.

REPRESENTING CANADA

I should tell you also that I am very conscious of how much can be misconstrued from being introduced as Ambassador to this, and Ambassador to that; my only way of explaining my perspective is to say that I was told many years ago a story which might have been a parable, - a story about a great man who came into a village on a donkey and he was welcomed by everyone: they spread palm leaves, they said marvellous things, ... and the poor little donkey thought it was all for him.

My point is that the work I've been doing has been in a representative capacity; to the extent possible, it has been my function to represent Canada. That means representing the people of Canada as well as the Canadian Government of the day - successive governments in other words, - and, therefore, attempting to speak for people like you. I've always been conscious of this strange anomaly, attempting to speak for people with whom it is simply not possible to check out every aspect of what one is going to say. I would

like you to know that in everything in which I have been involved, I have always made a conscious effort to encourage a consultation process. That's another reason why I welcome this invitation today.

#### PERSONAL ATTITUDES

The only other introductory comment I would make is to quote Lester Pearson who said: "Diplomacy is largely the art of making an indiscretion sound like a platitude. In politics, it's making a platitude sound like a pronouncement." I'm going to try to avoid being guilty of either. Another purely personal comment that I would make is that I was born in Smithers; I lived in Williams Lake; I lived in Penticton; I lived in Kamloops; I lived in Victoria; and I lived in Vancouver when I went to university. Also, from the age of 14, I took summer jobs that had me working all over the province, so this is a province I know and love. It has affected my attitudes. I come from "God's country" and I will come back one day.

#### IMPORTANCE OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

I should like to emphasize that I consider this concept of global education, which I interpret to mean education on global issues, as being not merely relevant and important, but vital. In my own case, I was influenced very much concerning world affairs by my father, who was a public servant of the Government of British Columbia, but also by a Social Studies teacher, at the high school level, when my parents lived in Kamloops. Although I'm not presenting myself as any kind of a role model, I can assure you all that this exercise in which you are engaged is not just important to you, but it's important to those of us who have been charged--and are still charged--with attempting to either recommend government policies or implement them.

## THE RELEVANCE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

I'm now going to tell you--if I may--one aspect of my own personal approach, but I shall not dwell on it at length. When we talk about international affairs, I almost invariably encounter people who say, well, it's lawless: there is no such thing as international law. This kind of argument is made repeatedly about multilateral endeavours to resolve global issues. I have found this to be a very simplistic, negative and defeatist approach. I'm going to explain to you five assumptions that I make on such issues. Obviously, you don't have to agree with these assumptions, but I want you to know my perspective; at least from a legal point of view.

1. Quite apart from "customary" international law, (which is just what its name implies), and closely related to it, there is an existing body of "conventional" international law, comprising a vast, complex network of bilateral and multilateral treaties which effectively regulate relations among states, in spite of the lack of sanctions to enforce them. This is a little-known fact. It's something which, I believe, contains within it a message of encouragement to young people, to educators, and others concerned with global issues. We have made a tremendous amount of progress in regulating relations on a wide range of subjects by developing this network of treaties.

2. Even in the field of greatest controversy, such as arms control, there are over 20 contemporary treaties, laying down obligations which states do observe, such as the Outer Space Treaty, the Seabed Arms Control Treaty, the Antarctic Treaty, the Treaty of Taseelco, all of which place explicit constraints upon the conduct of states throughout large areas of the globe, including, in two cases, whole environments, namely Outer Space and the Antarctic. We're all aware of the difficulties concerning the future development of the law of outer space.

3. The next point I wish to make is that it is undeniable that cases occur of breaches of treaty obligations, such as those reflected in the 1925 Geneva Poison Gas

Protocol, to which both Iran and Iraq are parties, as well as interpretations disputes such as that concerning the ABM Treaty. A related point is that these disputes or breaches of treaties cannot in my view legitimately be cited to establish the non-existence or inefficacy of binding international law, any more than the continuing commission of murder, robberies, rapes, and hooliganism in many countries can be cited to prove the absence of a legal order on the municipal plane, where there is ample machinery and infrastructure for developing and enforcing the law. While this may seem to be a very obvious point, it's one that is usually overlooked, and I often find myself engaged in a dialogue with someone who thinks that because here or there breaches of the peace occur we should wipe out the UN. Under this logic, if someone has a fire in his house, and it burns down, we should burn down the firehall, or if someone has a burglary, we should shoot the policeman. This doesn't impress me, this categorical kind of negative thinking.

From my point-of-view, if we don't like the scope and content of existing international law, then it's open to Canada and other nations to seek to modify the law and help to create new legal regimes by the process known as progressive development, particularly, for example, within the International Law Commission, of which I am a member. Canada repeatedly has done just that, and has helped develop the law of the sea, the law of the environment, the law of outer space, and the law of disarmament.

Now, I won't carry on about my view of the role of international law, because I wish it were more determinative of state acts. I think it's always relevant and influential, but I would be foolish and naive to say that it is the basis of foreign policy of every state in the world. I think it's equally idle, however, to talk as if it's a totally lawless world. It is always unwise to focus only on the bad, and then generalize from it. It seems to me

that on some of the most vital issues of the decade, such as arms control and disarmament, we are in a kind of transitional period, on which it's very difficult to prognosticate, but there are signs of an improved climate, an improved political environment which has already brought forth some fruit. The INF Treaty is one which some people tend often to brush aside. I don't, partly because it raises and resolves a host of political and military issues, but also because it focuses on the underlying question of whether we can ever develop not just an arms control approach, but a disarmament approach. These particular weapons are not merely being removed, but are being destroyed, and this is no small achievement. Again, underlying that, what I find impressive is the greater understanding and trust between the superpowers. They are willing to accept a treaty in lieu of weapons - actual hardware, - in defense of their national security. That's a very big step for any state to take. I can think of a particular treaty, the Versailles Treaty, which was later described as a scrap of paper, and it doesn't behoove any of us to contribute to that attitude by being cynical about the disarmament treaty-making approach. It's a painstaking process.

#### THE LAW OF DISARMAMENT: RECENT PROGRESS

The INF Treaty can be explained in various ways. Some say it has happened because of the policy of negotiating from strength, which is being advocated by some in the western world. Some say it has happened because of the coincidence of that development and the advent of Secretary Gorbachev on the scene. Some say that this particular development could not have occurred if NATO hadn't developed its two-track approach and stood firm on it. It may be all of these things. Ironically, fearful attitudes have been brought to life again now that the reason for the two-track approach has had the purpose intended, namely to get rid of the weapons in question.



I suggest, without, I hope, sounding Pollyanna-like, that the INF Treaty constitutes a constructive development which should not be overlooked or belittled, in spite of the many, many other things that need to be done, - including, for example, a comprehensive nuclear test ban, which Canada has worked very hard to achieve, with relative little success, I might say, over the past four years, and which I found very frustrating in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Even on that issue, however, two of the nuclear powers are exchanging experts, and at least observing one another's nuclear explosions in certain situations, and there is not much point in doing so unless there is a possibility of at least reducing either the size or the numbers of their tests. That was not considered an inevitable development or even a likely prospect four years ago, or three years ago, or even two years ago. I can give you other examples. I wish to stress that I'm talking now about the most difficult problems, war and peace issues, essentially. The chemical weapons negotiations I find somewhat discouraging, but it's an admittedly complex question. I think that on the issue of verification there is probably no kind of arms control or disarmament agreement more difficult to verify than a ban on chemical weapons. The current negotiations, in which I have been actively involved, go far beyond the 1925 Poison Gas Protocol. There was no ban on possession, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons in the 1925 Protocol, - only their use - but even that provision is now being breached all too frequently.

Apart from that problem, a total chemical weapons ban could affect the domestic economies of many states, not because they are in the business of producing chemical weapons, but because they have chemical industries. They don't want their industries interfered with or policed in a way that would affect trade secrets, etc. Nonetheless, I have seen, step-by-step, steady progress in that field. Perhaps this is the time to make the point that Canada has played a very active and constructive role in those negotiations, in attempting to persuade people to give up the pleasures of rhetoric and develop instead serious working papers that are aimed at bringing the parties closer together. Here the

problem is not merely an east-west one but a north-south and south-south one. It obviously involves everybody, because the sad truth about chemical weapons is that they are really quite effective, and therefore they present a tempting prospect for any country which feels its security is being threatened, or is already engaged in hostilities. There may be a tendency to say, "well, one way of killing a person is not much different from another", even though we have developed a whole branch of international law called Humanitarian Laws of War.

I don't want to go into that field of Humanitarian Law of War, because it could take all day, but chemical warfare I find absolutely horrific, again, perhaps because my father was gassed during World War I. I've had occasion to say that, in the Conference on Disarmament, when I've answered allegations about western attitudes. Nonetheless, my conclusion is that while we are much, much closer to success in negotiating a chemical weapons treaty than when we began, it's not simple and it's not going to happen tomorrow. That applies also, of course, to all of the deliberations on outer space, because views differ sharply on that issue. I prefer not to go into all of the details, but there are differences in perception even amongst western states concerning this issue. So too with the Strategic Arms Initiative, popularly called "Star Wars". The problem is not merely political, strategic, or military; there is also a fundamental legal issue at stake here, and that is whether the community, - which in this case is a relatively small community in terms of those who have the wherewithall to make decisions that matter, - whether this community does make a decision to put arms in space - for defensive reasons or not, or to keep space free of weapons. It's simply incorrect, of course, to say that outer space is now devoted to solely non-military purposes. We all know that satellites are used for a variety of purposes, but most of the people involved in strategic studies in and outside of government tend to the view that it's not a bad thing for the major powers to be able to

observe what one another is doing through the use of satellites, (quite apart from many other great benefits they bring--satellites of a different kind, - everything from knowledge about resources, to knowledge about climate, etc.)

I have begun with some comments on these peace and war issues, not to be provocative, but in order to avoid simply sweeping them under the rug. They are very difficult questions, yet the atmosphere now is improved. You may say, "well, what's the good of a better atmosphere. I would like to see a concrete agreement on an immediate test ban." We won't get that kind of result, unless there is an improvement in relations between and amongst not just the major players, but, I believe the whole international community. In spite of the difficulties we all know about, there is a real improvement and it's showing signs of concrete results. I will give you only one example. We now have been successful--Doug Roche, our Ambassador for Disarmament, has played a very major role in this respect -- in getting consensus resolutions in the UN on verification. Four years ago, three years ago even, this was a very controversial issue, with one side saying, it's just a smoke screen to avoid coming to grips with the concrete issues, and the others saying, we can't achieve a viable treaty without specific, workable, verification provisions. That, I suppose, is an issue on which Canada has become very well known, and one on which we've made tremendous progress. We haven't been alone, of course, but it's no longer a controversial question as it was a short time ago. Although I may be giving an overly legal view on that question, it's a kind of conceptual breakthrough if one can get a consensus resolution on the importance of verification. It doesn't mean we have achieved verification, but it means that no longer is it going to create an obstacle at every stage of negotiation.

I should perhaps say in passing that one of the most important treaties in this field is also one of the most criticized, and that's the Non-Proliferation Treaty, because it's arguably unbalanced in that some states are permitted to have and maintain nuclear

weapons, while others have renounced that right. Even here we have been able to make progress. It's a fragile treaty, in the sense that it's under attack not just by those who refuse to sign it in order to keep their options open, but by some of those who have signed it; the accusation is being levelled at the nuclear powers that they haven't carried out their part of the tradeoff of obligations. It is said that the nuclear powers haven't wound down their nuclear arsenals, but at the same time they have prevented others from acquiring them. Well, now at least we can see a beginning of that winding down. I'm not altogether sanguine about the future of that treaty, but I mention that treaty for another reason.

### THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS

To make a rather complex story short, in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, almost always delegations speak not only for their government and their countries, but for groups, to varying degrees, because the conference is divided into three groups, the western states, the eastern european, and the neutral and non-aligned, plus China. This is both useful in crystallizing positions and negative in that there is a tendency to march in lock step, and that tends to freeze the situation, and can create deadlocks.

In preparing for the last Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, we -- I'm speaking of Canada here, specifically the delegation in Geneva -- simply called a meeting and hoped somebody would come. We called meetings consisting of parties to the Treaty including Eastern Europeans, Western Europeans, Non-aligned, and developing countries, to see if they were all willing to work together in a common endeavour, to preserve and strengthen the Treaty, instead of maintaining the attitudes that become engrained in thinking instinctively as members of groups opposed to one another. We are now touching on another aspect of the problem. We don't develop or implement foreign policy by computers. We can develop models, but it's left in the hands of individuals, ultimately, to implement the policy decisions. Members of all groups came

to that meeting, and they came to yet another, in Geneva, and we met subsequently twice in New York. Ultimately, what saved the conference was the fact that people from all of these groupings were working together for a common objective. Some of them were at the same time criticizing the treaty regime, but recognizing at the same time that there was a larger interest at stake. This, I think, is one of the basic lessons to be learned--at least from my years of experience in negotiations. It is possible for nations to work together for the common good. I'm probably the least well informed here on some basic development issues, but I've had a lot of experience working with representatives of developing countries in the UN and the specialized agencies. I find them much more constructive, positive, imaginative and problem-solving-oriented than they're often given credit for being. In some conferences I have attended, such as the Stockholm Environmental Conference and the Law of the Sea Conference, some of the most brilliant and creative people were from developing countries. Indeed, many of the best minds which produced the results that led to the success of the Law of the Sea Conference were representatives of developing countries.

I have made these comments merely to avoid any unnecessary discussion about the role of the Third World. They too march in lock-step in certain situations, such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, for example. They try to adopt a common position because they feel particularly weak economically and, of course, in recent years there has been something of an onslaught on their concept of New Economic Order, but also the third world themselves now have a different kind of perspective. I know from personal experience that certain important Canadian objectives would never have been achieved without the support of developing countries. I also know that we would never have had their support by attempting to use them, or misuse them. As I was telling some colleagues the other night at a wholly legal gathering, I often find myself lately saying aloud what I've always believed and practiced: that negotiations on any of these questions are unsuccessful unless they are carried out in good faith. Moreover, I

have found that Canada has a reputation of negotiating in good faith. This can have implications years later in a totally different situation, in a different forum. I attach tremendous importance to that point. Good faith is also a treaty law principle. It has, I think, application to all the range of global issues with which you people are concerned.

I mention these questions because I think we should avoid generalizing from a particular bad situation. It is true that during a certain period in the UN the west had a disproportionate influence. Then there was a period of relative equalization between east and west; the developing world had begun to make its impact. Not surprisingly, they wanted to make a lot of changes, and some say they favoured the Eastern Europeans more than the west. Without going into that, I think you all know the attitudes of the third world on issues like Afghanistan, because they have made their views very clear in resolutions at the UN. These resolutions can hardly be cited against the third world.

#### AWARENESS OF COMMON INTERESTS

More and more I've come to realize that wise people from all parts of the world are beginning to operate on the basis of common interests, something which is almost a holistic view. Obviously that's necessary, even essential. On environmental issues it's not enough to talk about interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches. Without such an approach we do not merely fail to resolve problems, we complicate them and worsen the situation. Unfortunately, we are still learning about such questions as how best to help a country develop and how best to preserve the environment. Some of the mistakes we learned about in school, such as the Aswan Dam, which was extremely successful, but had rather unfortunate environmental spinoff effects.

#### THE BRUNDTLAND COMMISSION REPORT

I think we can learn from our mistakes, and perhaps this is the point where I would like to refer, without quoting from it, to the Brundtland Commission Report. The

Commission's Report represents an attempt to take an overview of global issues, and I suggest that it does do exactly that, whether we collectively or individually accept the solutions. These are the questions which I rate personally as being of the highest importance along with the arms control issues and the nuclear issue. When we are talking about sustainable development, at least we now know that the fate of the developing countries affects us, if only in the pocketbook, because they have huge national debts, and they have much less ability than countries like Canada to service their loans. There are signs of novel approaches being adopted, of agreeing to lend them money in return for environmental measures, but that's only one major part of the problem.

I attended the very first UNCTAD conference, the UN Conference on Trade and Development, where the whole focus was on the gap in development, and I tended to assume from then on that everybody was equally well informed about the development gap and the need to lessen it. Much to my surprise, it's like trying to develop environmental law. One has to keep charging into the fray again, re-educating people to the issues, and usually trying to explain the impact on the country, the individual, on the country, perhaps even on the personal pocketbook.

In considering the importance of the Brundtland Commission Report, merely to look at some of the chapter headings is educational: Population and Human Resources; Food Security; Growth Potential; Species and Ecosystems; Resource Development; Energy; Choices for Environmental and Development Industry; Producing More with Less: the Urban Challenge. On some of these global issues I have been privileged to be involved. I refer not only to peace and security, but development, the environment, and the interrelationship of all of these issues. I don't think many students would want to read all of this book outlining the Brundtland Commission Report. It would be marvellous if all of us here had read it and had it impressed indelibly on our consciousness and were able to convey the messages contained in that report to those with whom we come in

contact. I'm not merely talking about students; I find that I regularly meet people in a variety of fields of endeavour who don't seem to feel as strongly about these environmental issues as they should. I

tend to assume that people are conscious of these global issues, and when they are not it shocks me, and disappoints me. It doesn't deter me, or defeat me, however, and I go right on pressing on these questions, as I hope you do also.

Maybe it's worth noting in passing that even bureaucrats have these concerns. I would like to have a better world for my children and not a gradually declining world. The problem is not merely how to martial the resources, but how to do what is intended, how to teach about these global issues in the school environment, but also in the home environment as well as other environments, such as television, the media, etc. I haven't come here with any pretense of giving you a magic solution. I came primarily to listen and to learn about how you think these questions can be addressed.

#### THE RELEVANCE OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

I have seen a few articles which I thought were worth looking at, but you probably know many others. I was impressed by a speech by Doug Roche, which I mentioned earlier, attempting to show, as he saw it, why this global education program is so vital. I won't take your time with details, but his article is in volume 22, No. 2, Winter 1986-87 of the *History and Social Science Teacher*. He says, from the point of view of the Advanced Group for Disarmament: "Global education will have a profound effect on the forums in which questions of arms control and disarmament are discussed. Over time, these global graduates will take their place at the negotiating table and will bring with them an understanding and deeper appreciation of the integrity of global relations on an individual and national basis." Well, I couldn't agree more. He sums up some of the conclusions he has reached, and one of them is "that there can be no justice while there is great injustice in so many nations; that there can be no true development while there is



subject underdevelopment, and poverty in three-quarters of the world; that there can be no true peace when numerous wars are waging around the world; that there can be no true human security, while there exist vast arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons that threaten the very existence of our inhabitants of the planet itself." This was well said, and bears repeating in your classrooms.

#### THE NEED TO UTILIZE A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

One encouraging thing I can tell you; the kind of issues on which I've been working for almost exactly half my life is the kind that you are particularly fitted as teachers to teach. I think it's a mistake to assume that your words fall on deaf ears. Let me mention by way of analogy what my first Ambassador once told me -- one of the best diplomats Canada has ever produced -- incidentally a woman, Margaret Meagher -- our ambassador to Israel, later an active participant in the negotiations with China which led to our recognition of China and, as a consequence, recognition by many other countries, -- which in turn led to China's entry into the UN. I once said to her that I couldn't stand cocktail parties, and she said in reply, if you go to a cocktail party, and have one, two or three useful discussions worth following up, then it isn't a waste of time. So I adopted that somewhat modest approach, and it works. On another kind of "social function", I've been accused many times of institutionalizing what is called the working luncheon, to create opportunities for informal negotiations, or, in some cases, to create interest groups in a forum where we didn't want to be alone, as a means of determining who might be allies due to sharing our objectives. I am accused of making everybody talk at working lunches and dinners, and this is deliberate, but it is not easily done. Eventually the Canadian working luncheons at the law of the sea conference, for example, evolved into shirtsleeve luncheons, with sandwiches and softdrinks. Wine, we found, didn't help. I have learned, by this process, that informal discussions can quickly become negotiations for we learn from each other by listening to one another. You could do the same.

### A VARIETY OF RESOURCES

I don't know if you are aware of a major resource available to you consisting of many of my colleagues who are now retired diplomats, with wide varieties of expertise on a par with anything any government or any international intergovernmental institution can bring to bear, many of whom live in the lower mainland or Vancouver Island. You also have as resource people teachers who have gone to other countries, especially developing countries, essentially because they're concerned about the questions you're addressing today. B.C. is particularly lucky because it's such a marvellous place to live. I know a lot of retired diplomats who have come out to B.C. to live. Even though they tell you they're interested only in sailing and gardening, the truth is that they would be delighted to show up at a particular school or undertake a speaking tour relatively close to home, to tell what they know from first-hand experience, about successes and failures in development, environment, arms control, etc. The Department of External Affairs and CIDA possess other kinds of "official" people resources you could draw upon.

### A VARIETY OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES

I know too that you have to try and use audio-visual techniques. I'm sure you're doing that. I have helped develop two films on the law of the sea. You could do the same. For what it's worth, in terms of my own personal experience, since I'm venturing into a field where I have no expertise at all, namely education, I should make clear that nobody could be an expert on all the subjects I've worked on. However, I have always been able to call on the expertise of other people and have delegated negotiation to them on special issues involving their expertise. you could do the same.

However you determine the approach to develop, or its focus, it's time to begin the process. Things have to begin to move towards the point of no return. Teachers should be able, habitually, to expand their classroom discussions to a global context if the students are to widen their understanding of the world and its problems. I know that it's easy to say; but it's pretty difficult to do. Nonetheless, teachers should be able to incorporate

logical extensions of thought from the local, to the provincial, to the regional, and to the national levels, and then to global levels on particular topics - and vice versa - and through this process to develop global perspectives among the young people of our society.

I know you're already doing a lot of those things. I'm simply saying that I can see how it can and must work, because I saw how it worked on me, and on many colleagues, and thus I think it would work with other people.

I have found increasingly when dealing with bureaucracies -be they local, provincial, national or international, and even universities - a phenomenon which seems to be a product of our age, namely: excessive specialization. What is difficult to achieve is an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approach, which is the kind of overview approach which is vital on global issues. Indeed that's the only way we can proceed on any of these questions. Global issues are interrelated. The more I'm involved with these global problems, the more I'm aware that everything relates to everything. Your challenge is how to project this interrelationship to students.

I think the fact that you're so deeply involved in considering these issues is one of the most hopeful things that I have heard about in many years. I didn't know how to achieve such an international programme, but many know it is needed. I didn't know about this programme concerning global studies, which I interpret to mean studies of global issues. I think it's wonderful and I feel flattered and honoured at being asked to come here. Moreover, I feel quite privileged to be present at this kind of gathering, because if you're even partly successful, what you're attempting to achieve in the direction of global education is, I believe, absolutely vital. I hope you can somehow reach your peers outside your profession and educate both my generation and future ones. This change in attitude--not so much a change as a development of attitudes of concern and orientation towards concrete action, -- could make an immeasurable contribution at a period when, frankly, time is running out.

I had hoped to be able to bring a biologist at UBC named Buzz Holling along with me. He is one the outstanding people in the world, to my knowledge, who could talk to you about the range of pressing environmental and ecological issues, but he would also manage to give you a message of hope,-- from someone who knows enough about the subject to be credible. He's a pioneer in certain fields. He's internationally recognized. This kind of person, an innovator, is always fighting an uphill battle. Nevertheless you have this kind of resource right here in British Columbia. There are many other good people. I think we can get something going through networking, bringing in outsiders to the schools for speaking engagements. You could bring in to your classrooms your own counterparts from other schools or classes. Each of you probably has special expertise that could be linked to other parts of the school system and, of course, the more you exchange and share your expertise, the more expert you become. I know there are environmental projects, environmental groups, and arms control groups which involve students. All I can say is that whatever you do, it's not too much.

### CONCLUSION

I'm going to conclude with something that takes me back to the overview: it's an excerpt from Lester B. Pearson's memoirs. This is what Mike Pearson said:

*"Everything I learned during the war confirmed my views as a Canadian that our foreign policy must not be timid or fearful, but activist in accepting inter-national responsibility. To me nationalism and internationalism are two sides of the same coin. International cooperation for peace is the most important aspect of national policy. I have never waived in this belief. I've learned from experience how agonizingly difficult it is to convert conviction into reality."*

I wholly agree with that statement and humbly associate myself with it. You are involved in a very concrete aspect of that basic concept. I take it that there is a consensus at this meeting on that kind of statement. I find that very encouraging.

Thank you

APPLAUSE