

UC San Diego
Old Archived Documents

Title

Perspectives on the Crisis of UNESCO

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9k79c3mq>

Authors

Kohn, Walter
Newman, Frank
Revelle, Roger

Publication Date

1986-07-01

Perspectives on the CRISIS OF UNESCO

Report of a Conference

Rancho Santa Fe, California

January 31-February 2, 1986

Supported by grants from the University of California
Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation and
The Carnegie Corporation

edited by

Walter Kohn
Frank Newman
Roger Revelle

July 1987

University of California
Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
U.S.A.

List of Acronyms

AID	Agency for International Development
CASTAFRICA	Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to the Development of Africa
CEPES	European Center for Higher Education
CERN	European Council for Nuclear Research
CPC	Committee for Programme and Coordination
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
IAU	International Association of Universities
IBE	International Bureau of Education
IBI	Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICRO	International Cell Research Organization
ICSU	International Council of Scientific Unions
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFS	International Foundation for Science
IGCP	International Geological Correlation Program
IGO	Intergovernmental Organization
IHP	International Hydrological Program
INGO	International Non-governmental Organizations
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
IPDC	International Program for the Development of Communications
ISSC	International Social Science Council
LDC	Less Developed Country
MAB	Man and the Biosphere Program
NAS	U.S. National Academy of Science
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NSF	National Science Foundation (U.S.)
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
R&D	Research and Development
S&T	Science and Technology
UNCSTD	United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNU	United Nations University
USNC	U.S. National Commission for UNESCO
WHO	World Health Organization

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SESSION I	
UNESCO and International Cooperation in Science and Education	
ISSUE PAPERS	
Some Concerns of the Scientific Community <i>Philip W. Hemily</i>	4
UNESCO and International Cooperation in Higher Education <i>William H. Allaway</i>	9
REPORT OF DISCUSSION	
<i>Mary Martha Treichel</i>	16
SESSION II	
UNESCO and the Developing Countries	
ISSUE PAPER	
UNESCO: Science, Technology, and Africa <i>Isebill V. Gruhn</i>	19
REPORT OF DISCUSSION	
<i>Walter Kohn</i>	27
SESSION III	
Restructuring UNESCO	
ISSUE PAPERS	
Restructuring UNESCO? <i>Federico Mayor</i>	29
The UNESCO Withdrawal: A Lost Opportunity <i>Barbara W. Newell</i>	36
REPORT OF DISCUSSION	
<i>Virginia Leary</i>	39
SESSION IV	
The United States, UNESCO, and Global Cooperation in Science, Education, Culture, and Communications	
ISSUE PAPER	
How to Think about the Future of Multilateral Cooperation in the Fields of UNESCO: What Do We Do Next? <i>John E. Fobes</i>	41
REPORT OF DISCUSSION	
<i>G. Allen Greb</i>	47

SESSION V

Concluding Observations and Proposals

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Sandra Coliver 49

APPENDICES

Conference Agenda 53

About the Participants 54

Addresses of Participants 59

Proposal for an Improvement of the Voting Procedure for UNESCO
Walter Kohn 61

Proposal for the Establishment of a "United States Science
Liaison Office with UNESCO"
Walter Kohn 63

Report on the United Nations 1986-87 Financial Crisis
Frank Newman and Sandra Coliver 65

Medium-Term Plan (1984-1989) of UNESCO 67

List of Acronyms 71

A first subprogram (*Development and improvement of higher education for the advancement of society*) will aim to encourage:

- the adaptation of syllabi, courses, and types of education, training, and research activities to the needs of society and the new tasks of higher education;
- the participation of women at all levels and in all fields of higher education and the adjustment of education to include the female perspective;
- the optimum use, especially through national and regional cooperation, of research and training potential, with particular reference to postgraduate studies;
- the exchange of information and experience, in particular through the activities of the regional centers for higher education;
- international and regional cooperation, in particular through collaboration with the United Nations University and with international and regional intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

A second subprogram (*Research and training with a view to the development of education*) with aim to strengthen, and at the same time to coordinate, the research activities in the field of education sciences carried on at establishments of higher education and activities for training the various categories of educational personnel at the different levels, including higher education.

Program V.6: Action with a view to better integration of training and research activities

This program will be carried out in close conjunction with other programs of the major programs *The sciences and their applications to development and Science, technology, and society*. Starting from a clearer identification at the national level of those requirements of society that call for greater efforts of training and research, the program will aim to promote harmonization between the various research and training activities undertaken in a particular field, in order that this harmonization may be extended into different areas pursuant to integrated policies for training and research.

The promotion of mobility among teachers, students, and researchers in higher education will constitute one of the means of intensifying international cooperation in this field.

A first subprogram (*Analysis of data on needs, trends and available resources in the field of training and research*) will aim to provide a better knowledge of present trends in training and research and to develop cooperation with competent national, and regional or subregional institutions in compiling inventories of trends, needs, and capacities in the field of training and research.

A second subprogram (*Promotion of interdisciplinary training and research in UNESCO's fields of competence*) will aim to encourage:

- the execution of pilot projects for integration of training and research activities in a given field in one or more establishments;
- the coordination, within one establishment, of training and research activities in different disciplines and in different fields of action and learning.

A third subprogram (*Promotion of integrated training and research policies*) will constitute the starting-point for long-term action aimed at promoting the gradual formulation, trial, and implementation of integrated training and research policies.

"In the uninterrupted series of initiatives through which humanity throughout its history, had to clear the paths towards a better future, the second Medium-Term Plan which had just been approved would perhaps mark just one step among many others. But we would like to hope that for our generation, it would be a great step forward," said Mr. M'Bow in conclusion of the Conference.

Major Program VIII: Principles, Methods and Strategies of Action for Development which has three aspects:

- to explore more deeply and extend the field of development studies and to pursue the task of perfecting methods of integrated development planning;
- to bring together, extend, and give a greater measure of consistency to the whole range of studies and advisory service activities that the Organization is able to offer member states;
- to execute, in cooperation with member states, projects to be financed wholly or in part from the resources of the ordinary budget.

Major Program IX: Science, Technology and Society has as objectives the identification and promotion of the ways of integrating science and technology in the social fabric as well as that of formulating national science and technology policies based on needs and aspirations of societies.

Major Program X: The Human Environment and Terrestrial and Marine Resources seeks to help bring about the necessary changes in regard to the environment and the rational management of natural resources.

Major Program XI: Culture and the Future is aimed at promoting the creative assertion and encourage the mutual enrichment of cultures.

Major Program XII is concerned with **The Elimination of Prejudice, Intolerance, Racism and Apartheid.**

Major Program XIII deals with **Peace, International Understanding, Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples.**

Major Program XIV recapitulates the activities related to the status of women provided for in Major Programs I to XIII.

Education, and its training and research components in particular, are considered to contribute to economic and social progress and at the same time to the self-fulfillment that enables each individual to place his abilities and talents in the service of his community.

Higher education is particularly concerned by Programs V.5 and V.6.

Program V.5: Higher education, training, and research.

This program aims to promote the development and improvement of higher education as well as an increased contribution of this branch of education to the advancement of society by making its organization content and methods better suited to its various functions, and in particular to its new tasks.

To this end the organization will endeavor in particular:

- to encourage improvements in the operation of existing institutions, the establishment of new types of institutions and programs, adaptation of the content and expansion of the range of courses of training according to the needs of development, and the adoption of interdisciplinary approaches to research and training;
- to support efforts to train managers in the different countries at the higher educational level;
- to encourage measures of international and regional cooperation undertaken for this purpose.

Introduction

Planning for this conference, under the auspices of the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation of the University of California, began in November 1984, just before the final U.S. decision to withdraw from UNESCO. The fact that UNESCO was in deep crisis was already evident. In the meantime Britain and Singapore followed the U.S. lead. UNESCO, faced with major reductions in funding, has undergone substantial internal reviews and reduction in its staff. The crisis, evident at the end of 1984, persists at the end of 1986.

As organizers of the meeting, whose areas of expertise are oceanography, physics, and law (including international law), we believed that the UNESCO crisis needed to be addressed constructively. We were convinced that multinational cooperation in education and in science is indispensable, in view of inextricable linkages existing between all parts of the globe, for example, in problems of global pollution. Cooperation is also the most effective way to deal with current disparities in scientific and educational development between the developed and the less developed world.

We believed that the crisis of UNESCO had two distinct roots: serious shortcomings in UNESCO's operation and a seeming preference on the part of the U.S. government for bilateral relations—often linked to political considerations—rather than for a global, multilateral system such as represented by UNESCO.

We were aware of UNESCO's defects: excessive administrative costs (about 40 percent of its budget); lack of overall program-planning and of mechanisms for program evaluation; excessive concentration of staff in its Paris headquarters; poor qualifications of many staff members; budgetary irresponsibility; and unnecessarily broad and vague concerns. Other criticisms—pervasive politicization, inordinate influence of Third World and Eastern Bloc countries, apparent anti-American bias—are more debatable.

We recognized that in some ways UNESCO has the most difficult task of all global intergovernmental organizations because it inevitably deals with pride and prejudice, with disparate traditions and widely divergent political beliefs.

It has often been said that if UNESCO did not exist it would have to be invented. Now, in this time of crisis for the organization, there is an opportunity to re-invent UNESCO. Important bases for re-invention could result from reexamination of its various activities, not in normative or historical terms, but in terms of their potential future effectiveness and impact.

Underlying such a reexamination must be an appraisal of changes in the world during the 40 years that have elapsed since the founding of the United Nations and of UNESCO.

Changes in the World Since the Formation of UNESCO

1. *Proliferation of nation states.* In 1946 there were 51 member countries in the United Nations system. Now there are 159. Most of the new countries are small, less developed countries. But in the United Nations system each has one vote regardless of its area, population, or stage of economic or political development.

2. *2.5-fold increase of world population.* Nearly all this increase has taken place within the poor, so-called less developed countries, so that they now contain nearly 80 percent of the population of the earth.

3. *Intensification and apparent permanency of the Cold War between members of NATO*

and of the Warsaw Pact. Further, there are "shooting" wars in less developed countries, including the Iran-Iraq conflict, Vietnamese occupation of Kampuchea, Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and civil wars or guerrilla revolts in Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Chad, Philippines, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Peru, and elsewhere. In the United States and the Soviet Union major parts of the national budget are spent for military "security," and arms expenditures in other countries, both developed and developing, also are very high.

4. *Great advances in communications technology, both in the diversity of communications media and in their range and effectiveness.* Satellite communications have made the earth an interconnected global system.

5. *Decline of U.S. influence.* A decline in U.S. influence has occurred because of the economic, scientific, and social development of Western Europe and East Asia (e.g., Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia), and certain Latin American countries, particularly Brazil. The decline has been accompanied by a progressive diminution of U.S. public interest in multinational affairs, a "profound and growing apathy."

6. *Increase in the urgency of global environmental problems.*

- a. Rapidly increasing concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide and other radiatively active gases;
- b. Ozone depletion in the Antarctic stratosphere;
- c. Problems of disposal of high-level radioactive waste and other toxic substances;
- d. Acid rain and other trans-boundary pollutants;
- e. Greatly accelerated extinction of species.

7. *Increased need for multilateral scientific cooperation.* This need is most obvious in the ocean, atmospheric, and solid earth geochemical and geophysical sciences. All three of these earth realms are global, and it is now possible to study them on a global basis because of the development of satellite technology. Global scientific communications through agreed-upon radio and acoustic channels are needed to transmit the observations to scientists who will study them. Instruments for observations must be intercalibrated or standardized on a world-wide basis. Part of the global coverage can be accomplished by satellite observations; but these must be supplemented and extended by surface and sub-surface measurements in many different countries, mostly developing countries. The vast amounts of data to be collected must be stored, processed, and distributed globally or multilaterally.

There is an equal need for multilateral cooperation in ecological sciences, and in particular in the preservations of species habitats. We may now be exterminating species at the rate of one every 15 minutes by destroying their habitats, especially the tropical rain forests of Africa, Asia, and Central and South America, which apparently contain most of the world's species. The developing countries of these regions need international support and assistance in conserving their forests. A world-wide program for habitat conservation and species preservation is needed.

Objectives of the Conference

The main emphases of the conference were on (1) an analysis of the need for a multinational governmental organization such as UNESCO, (2) the role of non-governmental international organizations, and (3) possible functional and structural changes in UNESCO to make it more effective.

As these proceedings show, while there were widely divergent views on most subjects, a number of issues crystallized quite clearly. We have tried to summarize them in this introduction.

Medium-Term Plan (1984-1989) of UNESCO*

The General Conference at its fourth extraordinary session adopted the Medium-Term Plan of the Organization for 1984-1989 on 3 December 1982.

A thorough analysis of the world problems concerning: the context of worldwide scale, asymmetries and inequalities, the international economic system, peace and the arms race, human rights, the environmental and natural resources, communication between people and between cultures, science, technology and society, was the starting point for identifying the "tasks" of UNESCO in the years to come which are grouped under 14 "major programs." These major programs, enumerated below constitute the new line of action for UNESCO.

Major Program I: Reflection on World Problems and Future-oriented Studies foresees the setting up within the organization of a kind of observatory of the world situation area, a "laboratory of ideas," as well as the launching of an international future-oriented study which should constitute an important original contribution from UNESCO.

Major Program II: Education for All has two objectives: to eradicate illiteracy through universal access to primary education and through adult education, and to promote the development and democratization of education.

Major Program III: Communication in the Service of Man aims to contribute to the establishment of a more equitable situation in the field of communication and the media.

Major Program IV: The Formulation and Application of Education Policies is focused on the establishment and improvement of the various components and aids (material and non-material), resources (human and financial), which together make up the very tissue of education systems. In this program, special emphasis is laid on the educational sciences, on theoretical and practical progress in training methods, on the possibilities opened up by the use of the media and the new information and communication technologies in education, and on the renewal of subject matter.

Major Program V: Education, Training and Society focuses on educational action from the point of view of its interaction with society:

- links between education, culture and communication;
- the modernization and development of the teaching of science and technology at all levels and in all types of education;
- development and consolidation of links between education and the world of work;
- promotion of physical education and sport;
- relations between *higher education, training and research*;
- integration of training and research activities.

Major Program VI: The Sciences and Their Application to Development focuses on research, training and cooperation in the natural sciences, the social and human sciences and technology.

Major Program VII: Information Systems and Access to Knowledge indicates the importance accorded to scientific and technological information, including information relating to the social and human sciences. Particular emphasis is placed on the development of the normative tools required for information processing, on the application of new technologies (especially computer technologies) in the creation of national data bases and on the strengthening of national, regional, and international information systems and services.

*Reprinted from *Higher Education in Europe* 8, no. 1 (1983):105-109.

cally, in their collective resort to illegality, Congress and the administration have injured America's status and credibility as a defender of international law at precisely the time that it is exhorting others to join in the defense of international law against terrorism." ("Denying the United Nations Its Dues Is Unlawful," *Washington Post*, reprinted in the *International Herald Tribune*, 21 May 1986, p. 4.)

Now that the UN has taken steps to meet U.S. criticism, will the Administration and Congress hold up their end of the bargain? There are grounds for doubt. In its budget proposal to Congress for fiscal 1988 the administration requested payment of only \$130 million of the \$330 million withheld. Though that proposal was submitted in January, administration officials say it was drafted before the General Assembly action and apparently have promised to request the remainder. (*NYT*, 18 May 1987, *supra*.) The House increased the administration's figure to \$142 million; on May 15 the Senate increased it to \$192 million.

In the face of such dogged efforts the Norwegian delegate and chair of the group that wrote the Assembly package considers the U.S. stance to be "very bad" and harmful to the advances made with Mr. Walters' concurrence. Congress's refusal to authorize a more substantial payment "will be perceived as a letdown on the part of the U.S. Many countries will question the wisdom of going further with the restructuring." (*NYT*, 18 May 1987, *supra*.)

Supplementing his testimony to Congress on 19 February 1987, Assistant Secretary of State Schifter has written, "Even some democracies, which respect human rights domestically, are not prepared to support human rights at the international level. Given these facts, no tangible benefits are likely to be derived from structural reform." That comment is disturbing. (*Cf.* Lewis, "West Seeks Budget Reprieve for a U.N. Human Rights Effort," *New York Times*, 9 June 1987, p. 10.)

* * *

We take this occasion to thank those who submitted the position papers which constitute the main portion of this report: W. Allaway, I. Gruhn, J. Fobes, P. Hemily, F. Mayor, and B. Newell. We are also grateful to the discussion rapporteurs: S. Coliver, A. Greb, V. Leary, and M. Treichel, and to C. Beran and N. McLaughlin for superb conference organization and management. Generous support was received from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation of the University of California.

A list of participants is appended. They represented a wide cross-section of backgrounds, including citizens of Canada, France, Italy, Spain, and Venezuela as well as the United States, representatives of academia, two former deputy directors general of UNESCO, representatives of the current UNESCO administration, one present and one former ambassador to UNESCO, a former chairman and members of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, representatives of the U.S. Congress, the Department of State, and the National Academy of Sciences. In addition three graduate students of the University of California participated as observers.

It is hoped that these proceedings will contribute to a constructive discussion of how to strengthen as promptly as possible multinational cooperation in the areas of science and education, which in our view is not only in the interest of global progress but also very much in the long-range national interest of the United States.

Walter Kohn
Frank Newman
Roger Revelle

SESSION I
UNESCO AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
IN SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

ISSUE PAPER

Some Concerns of the Scientific Community

Philip W. Hemily

General Considerations

The key issues in assessing the UNESCO crisis pertain to defining and clarifying *objectives, needs, and mechanisms* for promoting the natural, social, and engineering sciences through multilateral collaboration. This should be done in the context of overall multilateral intellectual and development assistance interests, yet not in the sense of assuming that any one single UNESCO-type intergovernmental body (reformed or reconstructed), concerned with the wide range of current educational, cultural, and scientific interests, would be a desirable institutional arrangement.

Many of the original purposes of intergovernmental institutions, such as UNESCO, to advance frontiers of knowledge and further understanding and communication have been diverted and adjusted to try to fulfill pressing needs from the developing world. This latter objective is certainly an extremely important one to pursue. However, conflicting financial demands in the support of the advancement of knowledge and development assistance, and the differing institutional mechanisms required to meet such demands, are a root cause of the "UNESCO syndrome." Neither recent-past treatment (benign neglect coupled with questionable budgetary oversight) nor the reactionary behavior of withdrawal from global multilateral institutions will have much constructive effect in dealing with this syndrome. U.S. national interests and prestige in fulfilling global intellectual goals and development assistance responsibilities can only suffer from this stand-off.

Furthermore, it is important to define desirable intergovernmental-non-governmental organizational structures and interactions to pursue intellectual and developmental objectives currently contained within the purview of UNESCO. The key point is to pursue explorations and discussions at a serious pace to come up with workable bases for significant reforms as well as new institutional structures. There could be major changes in the planning and management of UNESCO-sponsored activities because of the current UNESCO crisis. It is important to participate in and guide such change in support of our own as well as global intellectual interests.

UNESCO is an organization that is asked to do too much in too many diverse fields and within conflicting demands on modest resources. There are some important accomplishments. However, there are also a large number of marginal activities, subcritical in impact. This points up a number of issues of a general nature:

- a. Should science, education, culture, and communications be dealt with in the same IGO? Is there sufficient interaction among these various subjects to justify overseeing many diverse activities in a single IGO? With respect to UNESCO it appears there are few interactions at the present time. Doesn't including this mix of subjects in one organization, just compound the bureaucracy?

Report on United Nations 1986-1987 Financial Crisis

by Frank Newman and Sandra Coliver

When they met in 1986 the San Diego conferees' assumption was that, within the UN, only UNESCO was having to confront drastic financial curtailment. Participants occasionally referred to the fact that individuals who advocated withdrawal from UNESCO might extend their attack to the UN generally. No UN crisis of the present magnitude, however, was foreseen.

That scenario required radical revision during the spring of 1986. Yet is it not true (possibly because of lack of interest within the U.S. media, possibly because of the November 1986 elections) that the emerging crisis for the entire UN seemed to inspire less comment and less concern than had the earlier UNESCO crisis? (Cf. Dante Fascell's "Enough U.N.-Bashing" in the September 19, 1986, *New York Times*, p. 31.)

The UN General Assembly in December 1986 approved a budget reform package (G.A. res. 41/213 of 19 December), wherein significant components are: (1) a commitment to reduce the staff budget by 15 percent, including a 25 percent cut from 57 to 43 in senior positions (over 3 years); and (2) expansion of the functions of the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC), whose 21 members include major contributors to the UN budget. Previously the CPC met biennially to consider the secretary general's budget for the next biennium. Now in addition it will meet during "off-budget" years, in order to approve his preliminary budget. The consensus nature of the CPC decision-making process combined with the preliminary review virtually assures major contributors a veto power as to the budget ceiling, its broad priorities, and a contingency fund to cover unforeseen expenditures. Further, Americans and others sympathetic to U.S. views have been appointed to head influential departments including some, such as press research, which formerly were the subject of U.S. charges regarding politicization.

U.S. diplomats seem satisfied by the new measures. Joseph Reed, former Chase Manhattan vice-president soon to become under secretary general for special political and general assembly affairs, says the measures presage "a new page in the United Nations' history. The real reorganization has taken place." ("Diplomats say U.N. Has Made Changes," *New York Times*, 18 May 1987, p. 6.) Yet many diplomats are concerned that U.S. failure to pay its assessed contributions could seriously damage the reform effort as well as harm U.S. credibility and undermine gains the U.S. has made during the tenure of U.S. Ambassador Walters. (*Id.*)

The U.S. currently (June 1987) is in arrears for \$330 million. Its annual assessment of \$210 million, 25 percent of the regular UN budget, was set by the General Assembly based on GNP. (U.S. GNP is approximately 27 percent of world GNP.) Some U.S. delegates recognize that the UN Charter imposes a treaty obligation to pay assessed dues, but they nonetheless argue that the U.S. is obliged to pay only "legitimate" expenses as determined by the U.S. officials. In the words of former Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick, "An expense is legitimate, and therefore binding, only if it bears a reasonable relation to the purposes of the Charter." ("Withholding Payments to the U.N." reprinted in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, 1 October 1987, p. G3.)

In strong disagreement is Elliot Richardson, former cabinet member and ambassador in the Nixon and Ford administrations. He notes that Article 17 of the Charter does not "permanently shackle a country to payment of any particular percentage contribution. On the contrary, at U.S. urging the General Assembly has already reduced the U.S. share of the bill on three occasions. . . . But [this time] the legal course has been ignored. Ironi-

Among the functions of this office will be:

1. Dissemination of information about UNESCO, using *Science* and publications of the various professional societies as well as, possibly, a quarterly newsletter. The emphasis will be on projects in which there are opportunities and/or needs for American participants.

2. Providing specific information about UNESCO-sponsored projects to U.S. scientists, as requested.

3. Providing information to UNESCO about developments in U.S. science, relevant to UNESCO's activities.

4. Support, on a very modest scale (\$50,000/annum), of travel expenses (shared with UNESCO) for participation of U.S. scientists in critical UNESCO planning activities.

5. Conveying to UNESCO suggestions by American scientists about ongoing or future UNESCO-sponsored activities.

6. Facilitating cooperation between UNESCO-sponsored activities and related activities in the U.S.

Afterword

In addition to the concrete functions of this office, its establishment by the U.S. scientific community will dramatically emphasize the broad commitment of this community to multilateral scientific cooperation. This would help maintain the good standing of the U.S. scientific community in the global science community and facilitate a return to full-scale vigorous participation in international scientific affairs, at an early date.

- b. How can the pursuit of complementary yet frequently conflicting objectives for the advancement of knowledge and development assistance be dealt with in the same IGO? Should they be joined together? Is the promotion and oversight of activities within these two objectives different? Should not an IGO with primary responsibility for the advancement of knowledge provide, yet limit, its support of development assistance to facilitating the participation of scholars and researchers of the developing world in global intellectual endeavors, leaving primary multilateral development assistance to other more suitable IGOs? Should not the major role of IGOs concerned with the advancement of knowledge be limited in any case to that of facilitator, coordinator, and the assurance of financial accountability?
- c. How can NGOs contribute more effectively to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of activities aimed at (a) the advancement of knowledge, and (b) development assistance? Should not NGOs, in any case, be charged with the primary responsibility for guiding if not managing advancement of knowledge activities? Where would primary responsibilities be for development assistance? Would it not be advisable for NGOs (and their activities) to be funded from multiple sources of support such as national adhering bodies and several (more than one) IGOs?

UNESCO Science Programs

A brief update of the NAS assessment¹ (September 1984) of the impacts of U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO science programs underscores a number of issues of specific concern to the scientific community. A number of those issues in Chapter 3 of the assessment, entitled "Preliminary Conclusions" are next considered.

Assessment of UNESCO Programs

Key Areas. The key scientific areas remain the global observational programs (IOC, MAB, IGCP, Natural Hazards, IHP), and those associated with the planning, oversight, and training activities sponsored by NGOs. UNESCO work in engineering sciences, social sciences, and science policy are of lesser significance.

Objectives. There is great need to enhance understanding of the complementary and interactive nature of the objectives to support the advancement of science and science for development since these activities seem destined to continue to be combined.

IGO Role. UNESCO's IGO role provides an important instrument in carrying out global observational programs. The authority and financial support of governments is often critical to the success of field operations which must take account of the sovereignty of host countries. UNESCO's key role is that of facilitator, coordinator, and accountable agent to member governments.

Scientific Community. There is an impressive involvement of the scientific community in UNESCO activities. At the same time, UNESCO's programs could greatly benefit from fuller participation and association with NGOs. NGOs should be given a more responsible role in program planning, management, and evaluation in collaboration with the facilitator role of IGOs. The managerial and oversight capabilities of NGOs should be strengthened.

U.S. Focal Point. The lack of a responsible U.S. governmental agent (focal point), having the requisite technical capability as well as significant international policy respon-

sibilities, continues to be a serious handicap in overseeing and supporting American participation in multilateral science programs, particularly those of UNESCO. Such an agent must be linked closely to the U.S. scientific community through U.S. NGOs.

Impact of U.S. Withdrawal

Scientific Relations. U.S. science interests and the quality of UNESCO science programs have been harmed by the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO. In order to maintain confidence both here and abroad in U.S. participation in international science programs, withdrawal should be accompanied by a serious commitment, expressed in policy, institutional, and budgetary terms, to a continued and strengthened American role. This has not been the case to date.

Participation in Governance. The U.S. has forfeited the right to participate in the governance of most UNESCO-sponsored cooperative international programs. However, in the short term, the U.S. scientific community has provided leadership in selected programs (IOC and to a lesser degree, the IGCP and MAB) through membership in the IOC Executive Council and membership on advisory bodies, particularly via NGOs. Yet even this association may be compromised by the severe short-fall in U.S. funding of UNESCO-sponsored activities. It is also true that the U.S. scientific community has shown a rather sporadic and unfocused concern over the consequences of U.S. withdrawal—with the qualified exceptions of MAB, the IOC, and certain NGO-sponsored activities.

Discontinuities. There have been major discontinuities in UNESCO planning and program implementation because of U.S. withdrawal, and (as of the end of 1985) the U.K. and Singapore withdrawals. Program cut-backs of an order of 30 percent have forced the establishment of priorities with many determinations made on a questionable basis. This, coupled with major staff cuts, has left UNESCO with serious management and morale problems. There will probably be a rapid decrease in the number of U.S. nationals in the UNESCO secretariat with negative long-term implications for U.S. professional participation in program planning and management should the U.S. decide to rejoin UNESCO.

Disruptions in U.S. Participation. Disruptions, in the short range (1985), in U.S. participation in major UNESCO science programs have been limited, in large part, because U.S. scientists have maintained involvement, in their personal capacities. However, continuing interactions will most likely diminish due to the cuts in the UNESCO budget and the severe short-fall in U.S. funding of selected UNESCO science activities.

Disruptions in International Research System. A period of uncertainty, stemming from withdrawals, will be disruptive to the larger world system of international cooperation in science and may strain U.S. scientific relations with peer groups in other countries. As already noted, major budgetary cuts have already hurt UNESCO-sponsored science programs of priority interest to the U.S.; severe cuts in UNESCO subventions to NGOs, particularly ICSU and the ISSC, are disruptive to the international research system.

Capabilities of NGOs. The search for alternative interim (or permanent) arrangements to support global science activities will and should involve NGOs to an increasingly important degree. The NGOs will need to be evaluated and assessed in terms of how effectively they are able to handle new and more substantial responsibilities.

Proposal for the Establishment of a “United States Science Liaison Office with UNESCO”

by Walter Kohn

Background

After giving due preliminary notice the United States formally withdrew from UNESCO in December 1984. Among the reasons given were dissatisfaction with UNESCO's management, especially the role played by the present director general, and improper politicization, usually over the objections of the United States and other Western countries. Since then Great Britain and Singapore have also withdrawn.

The record indicates that, although members of the U.S. scientific community generally agreed to a greater or lesser degree with the State Department's criticisms of UNESCO, the great majority favored continued U.S. membership in UNESCO coupled with vigorous pressure for major reforms.

Assumptions

Informal discussions with members of the U.S. scientific community strongly support the following assumption: a large majority of this community is deeply committed to multilateral and/or global scientific collaborations in those areas where these modes are called for. Examples are studies of global environmental effects and the furthering, in developing countries, of appropriate basic scientific programs, both research and education. Facilitation of such activities is among the important functions of UNESCO.

It is also assumed here that the great majority of the U.S. scientific community would strongly support re-entry of the U.S. into UNESCO as soon as certain major reforms have been accomplished. In the absence of such reforms they would support active U.S. participation in international (including multilateral) science under appropriate alternative organizational arrangements.

Objectives

In the present situation it is considered important that, in spite of the U.S. non-membership status in UNESCO, the U.S. scientific community participate as effectively as possible in appropriate multilateral programs. Maintenance of such participation, in addition to its intrinsic value, would also facilitate the eventual U.S. re-entry into UNESCO.

Proposal

It is proposed that a United States Science Liaison Office with UNESCO be established by the U.S. science community. The general purpose of this office is to facilitate participation of U.S. scientists in UNESCO-sponsored activities. It appears appropriate that this office be a part of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the nation's largest and broadest independent science association. In particular it should be closely linked with the AAAS's Division for International Science(?).

This office is visualized as a two-to-three-person operation in Washington plus a one-to-two-person operation in Paris, the site of UNESCO headquarters. The annual budget is estimated in the vicinity of \$200,000–\$300,000. This budget is to be provided by contributions from the AAAS and the international divisions of the various professional societies, such as the American Physical Society (APS), American Chemical Society (ACS), etc.

Remarks: The proposed system makes *no change whatsoever* in the formal equal voting power of each member state. However, it gives member states the *option* to take into account the support for the motion as measured by population (one person-one vote) and by financial support (one dollar-one vote). It is hoped that this system would not be objected to by states with small populations and/or small financial contributions, since their power remains unchanged. At the same time it assures states which are under-represented by population and/or financial contribution that the degree of popular and financial support for a given motion is *known* to all voting member states and also explicitly recorded. It is expected that the degree of popular and financial support for a given motion in the non-binding vote will often have a significant effect on the final, binding vote.

Alternative (Interim) Arrangements

No Viable Overall Alternative. There is, at present, no viable overall alternative to UNESCO's IGO role in supporting global multidisciplinary scientific investigations. Furthermore, there is no simple set of alternative interim arrangements that will ensure future U.S. collaboration with current or future UNESCO projects. Whatever alternative mechanisms are implemented, it is extremely important to ensure continuity of funding—*an extremely critical problem, as of the end of 1985*. Otherwise, irreversible damage to valuable current programs is inevitable. Proposing alternative mechanisms is also complicated by the possibility that the U.S. might rejoin UNESCO at a later date.

Fragmentation. Putting in place a variety of interim alternative arrangements for future funding and participation will result in a fragmentation of scientific and administrative relations, with possible serious substantive, managerial, and financial costs. UNESCO's combination of both development assistance programs and those aimed at supporting the advancement of scientific knowledge makes the search for a single alternative extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Specific Interim Program Support to UNESCO. In many cases, the most attractive and administratively simple alternative might be specific program support to UNESCO through the mechanism of Funds-in-Trust and the secondment of professional staff. However, provision of funds in this way suffers from the fact that the U.S. would lack direct oversight of program planning and the effective use of such funds. At the very least, a strong focal point in the U.S. government would be extremely important in ensuring the accountable use of appropriated funds.

Cooperating Organizations. Subject to acceptance by cooperating organizations, it is relatively simple to propose alternative interim arrangements for those activities and programs for which well-established mechanisms of collaboration are in place, as is the case with ICSU, IBRO, ICRO, etc. One special situation is the IOC, in which the U.S. retains membership—this membership is subject to provision of requisite dues, which is a critical problem as of the end of 1985.

Consultations. The designation of another IGO or NGO to act in the interim, on behalf of U.S. interests, requires careful negotiations and understandings that are agreed to by all sides involved. Consultations with colleagues in other countries are critical in proposing or designing effective alternatives.

Role of ICSU. With respect to NGOs, ICSU is considered the most logical candidate to facilitate U.S. participation in some well-established programs. It is also the fundamental instrument for the planning and coordination of new major global observational programs in collaboration with IGOs to ensure financial support and access to national territories.

U.S. Management Responsibilities. There must be a governmental focal point, preferably a single agency, to provide oversight, management, and funding of U.S. scientific participation in multilateral programs such as those of UNESCO. The NSF is an obvious candidate, although the NSF has not been especially active in the area of multilateral science cooperation. Clearly, there must be a non-governmental focus as well, such as the National Research Council, to provide a mutually beneficial, solid foundation for expanded and strengthened U.S. participation in international science.

Future of International Institutions for Science Cooperation. Considerable thought needs to be given to the kinds of multilateral entities that might be established to deal with the contemporary requirements of international science cooperation. It is essential to consult with colleagues here and abroad regarding their concerns, interests,

aspirations, and resources. Consideration must be given to new models for facilitating international cooperation, both for the advancement of scientific knowledge and for strengthening infra-structures in developing countries. It may be necessary in the longer term to consider radical institutional changes, ranging from establishment of a separate IGO entity for international science coupled to stronger NGO managerial responsibilities to a complete reorganization and restructuring of present institutions.

Note

1. *UNESCO Science Programs: Impacts of U.S. Withdrawal and Suggestions for Alternative Interim Arrangements; A Preliminary Assessment* (Washington, D.C.: Office of International Affairs, National Research Council, NAS Press, 1984).

A Proposal for an Improvement of the Voting Procedure for UNESCO

by Walter Kohn

Summary

A technical change in the UNESCO voting procedure is proposed. The present one state-one vote rule is not affected. However, before the final vote *information* about the degrees of support calculated by population and by financial contribution is provided to the voting members.

The current voting procedure of UNESCO is based on *one vote for each member country*. This does not reflect that the *population* of the most populous member countries exceeds those of the smallest by factors of the order of 10,000, and the ratio of the largest *financial contribution* (before U.S. withdrawal) to the smallest is of similar magnitude. As a result some of the most populous member states and those making the largest financial contributions have often considered their influence in the decision-making process to be unacceptably small.

Various proposals for major changes in the system of voting have therefore been discussed for a number of years. These include bicameral (and even tricameral) voting; having a portion of UNESCO's program subject to the present system, while another portion is subject to a voting system which reflects financial contributions, etc.

Here we do not wish to enter into the merits of these proposals. Some major change in UNESCO's decision-making process may or may not become necessary and/or possible in the future.

Our present proposal makes *no change in the equal voting power of each member state*. However, it reflects populations and financial contributions in an *informational manner* as follows:

1. A proposal is ready for a vote.
2. A *non-binding* vote (which is recorded state by state) is taken.
3. The results of this vote are electronically evaluated and the following percentage figures are *immediately* communicated to the representatives on a screen, in the following manner

	YES	NO	NOT VOTING
By state	65	35	11
By population	45	55	8
By financial support	38	62	9

These figures have the following meaning: The *Yes* and *No* percentages reflect *voting* states only (hence they always add up to 100 percent); the "Not-voting"—volume reflects the degree of non-participation.

4. After this non-binding vote some time is allowed for *further discussion*. (The rules for this must be established.)
5. A final *binding* vote is taken and again recorded state by state.
6. The final vote is communicated to the representatives in the same tabular form as under 3.
7. A motion passes or fails *only on the basis of the state by state vote* (as at present).
8. The published record of the vote *shows the entire table as in 6*.

Professor Sanford Lakoff
Department of Political Science, Q-060
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
619/452-3137

Professor Virginia Leary
Faculty of Law and Jurisprudence
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260
716/636-2459

Dr. Thomas F. Malone
Scholar in Residence
Saint Joseph College
West Hartford, CT 06117
203/232-4571

Professor Federico Mayor
Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science
Autonomous University of Madrid
Canto Blanco
Madrid 34, Spain
638-2345

Dr. Barbara Newell
School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
617/495-5960

Professor Frank Newman
School of Law (Boalt Hall)
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720
415/642-1419 or 4457

Professor Roger Revelle
STPA, Q-060
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
619/534-4849

Ambassador Marcel Roche
Permanent Representative of Venezuela
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris, France
45-68-25-32

Dr. Walter A. Rosenblith
Foreign Secretary
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20025
202/334-2800

Institute Professor
70 Memorial Drive, Rm. E51-232
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02138
617/253-1990

Mr. William C. Salmon
3601 Peary Street
Arlington, VA 22207
703/527-5782

Professor Herbert I. Schiller
Department of Communication, D-003
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
619/452-3572, 4410

James M. Skelly
Associate Director
Institute on Global Conflict
and Cooperation, Q-068
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
619/534-3352

Mary Martha Treichel
Executive Secretary
Advisory Committee for the International
Council of Scientific Unions
National Research Council
2101 Constitution Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20418
202/334-2800

Professor Herbert F. York, Director
Institute on Global Conflict
and Cooperation, Q-068
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
619/534-3352

ISSUE PAPER

UNESCO and International Cooperation in Higher Education

William H. Allaway

Before dealing specifically with the topic assigned me, there are a few comments which need to be made with regard to the origins of the crisis in U.S.-UNESCO relations.

This first relates to the history of the politicization of UNESCO. In his foreword to the book *War and the Minds of Men* by Frederick S. Dunn, Percy W. Bidwell stated the following:

On August 26, 1950, the Executive Board of UNESCO, in special session in Paris, unanimously condemned the aggression against the Republic of South Korea. On August 28, after three days of debate behind closed doors, the Board in a series of resolutions authorized the Director-General to employ the resources of the Organization to bring about 'a full understanding of the principles of the United Nations action for peace and security.'

These resolutions may open a new chapter in UNESCO's history. 'The decision of the United Nations to aid the South Koreans in resisting the aggression against them,' writes Professor Dunn, 'immediately provided UNESCO with the opportunity to educate the public in regard to the significance of the United Nations action and to gain support for it.'

The action of the Executive Board seems to have settled, at least for the moment, a long-standing dispute regarding the purposes and functions of the Organization, whether it was to be purely cultural (i.e., non-political) or whether it was to take sides in the cold war. Now it has chosen political action.¹

It appears clear that the Executive Board action was at the instance of the U.S. delegation to serve U.S. political ends and that the current concerns over the politicization of the UNESCO program center primarily on the fact that the U.S. is no longer in a position to command a majority within the governing bodies of UNESCO on political issues.

Dunn goes on to cite a number of reasons why the concept of working through the minds of men to prevent war was an attractive one, but he points out that in the early stages of UNESCO's existence governments did not take this potential very seriously. In fact, as an assistant to the chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in the late forties, I can testify that the Department of State was very much concerned with citizen involvement in what was viewed as the proper role of diplomats and spent every effort to minimize rather than maximize citizen involvement in UNESCO.

That this remains government policy is illustrated by an excerpt from a letter from David Jenness, executive director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations, and Michael Pallak, executive officer of the American Psychological Association, to the Honorable Daniel A. Mica of the U.S. House of Representatives as follows:

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO was not asked to participate as a body in the 1984 Monitoring Panel on UNESCO (although some members of the Commission, including Chairman James Holderman, served on it). Similarly, the USNC was not assigned the role of monitoring the UNESCO reform process. This task has been turned over to a newly appointed Reform

Observation Panel that includes one eminent scientist (Dr. Fred Seitz), several members of the 1984 panel, and several new members (including Ursula Meese). The Commission appears to have been bypassed, even though it was relating to UNESCO. It is composed of 100 members representing organizations predominantly in the private sector. In 1982, the Commission produced a 'Critical Assessment of U.S. Participation in UNESCO' that was unanimous in recommending 'that the United States not only continue to remain a member of UNESCO, but that the effectiveness of U.S. participation in the work of the Organization be increased.' In December 1983, the Commission again expressed this view, voting 41-8 in favor of the United States remaining a member of UNESCO.²

So much for U.S. government cooperation with the private sector on UNESCO.

However, lest we feel that withdrawal from UNESCO is a plot by government to prevent higher education from exercising its natural interest in international cooperation through UNESCO, the following statement from the U.S./UNESCO Policy Review prepared in early 1984 by the Department's Bureau of International Organization Affairs may give us some cause to reflect on the role higher education in the U.S. has played in this problem. I quote from the section on the "Extent and Nature of Direct U.S. Participation":

American professional education associations are not heavily involved in UNESCO activities. Perhaps half a dozen associations contribute annually to UNESCO questionnaires and participate in specialized meetings. While many American educational organizations have international interests, their overseas activities tend overwhelmingly to be conducted bilaterally rather than through UNESCO. The American Council on Education, the Consortium for International Cooperation in Higher Education, and the Institute for International Education are among the most active organizations in these bilateral programs. Institutional involvement of the American higher education community with UNESCO is greater than that of the professional associations, but that, too, is relatively slight.³

I would like to propose that there are channels for cooperation in higher education related to UNESCO's goals and that this meeting should agree on needed steps to draw American higher education into a stronger commitment to international cooperation.

Before turning directly to these channels, permit me to note the wide-ranging program in education by UNESCO as evidenced by a summary of the Medium-Term Plan (1984-1989) of UNESCO which begins with the following statement:

A thorough analysis of the world problems concerning, the context of worldwide scale, asymmetries and inequalities, the international economic system, peace and the arms race, human rights, the environmental and natural resources, communication between people and between cultures, science, technology and society, was the starting point for identifying the 'tasks' of UNESCO in the years to come which are grouped under 14 'major programmes'. These major programmes . . . constitute the new line of action for UNESCO.⁴

The full text of the summary is an attachment to these remarks.

The three channels for active cooperation are directly tied to UNESCO, each in a different way. The first is the European Center for Higher Education (Bucharest)

Addresses of Participants

William H. Allaway, Director
Education Abroad Program
1140 Girvetz Hall
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
805/961-2755

Dr. Herschelle S. Challenor, Director
UNESCO Liaison Office
918 16th Street, N.W., Suite 301
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/457-0770
Cables: UNESCO WASHINGTON

Ms. Sandra Coliver
Law Offices of Ephraim Margolin
240 Stockton Street, Third Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
415/421-4347

Mr. Jonathan Davidson
United States National Commission for UNESCO
1750 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/785-4949

Professor John A. Ernest
Department of Mathematics
South Hall 6722
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
805/961-3252, 92171

Professor Lawrence Finkelstein
Department of Political Science
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, Illinois 60115-2887
815/753-1011

Dr. John E. Fobes
Box 357
Webster, NC 28788
704/586-9705

Mr. Thomas Forstenzer
UNESCO
212/754-5988

Ms. Margaret E. Galey
Staff Consultant Committee
on Foreign Affairs
2170 Rayburn H.O.B.
Washington, D.C. 20515

Professor Roger Gaudry, C.C.
Rectorate Universite de Montreal
Case postale 6128, Succursale "A"
Montreal, P.Q. H3C 3J7
514/343-7761

M. Vincent Giroud
Department of French
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
301/338-7227

G. Allen Greb
Associate Director
Institute on Global Conflict
and Cooperation, Q-068
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
619/534-3352

Professor Isebill V. Gruhn
Stevenson College
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
408/429-2555

M. H. A. Hassan
International Centre for Theoretical Physics
P.O. Box 586
I-34100 Trieste
Italy
224-4281
Cable: CENTRATOM
Telex: 460392 ICTP

Dr. Philip W. Hemily
P.O. Box 57160
Washington, D.C. 20037
202/296-0749

Professor Walter Kohn
Department of Physics
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
805/961-3061



July 1987

Enclosed are the proceedings of a conference, "Perspectives on the Crisis of UNESCO," held in Rancho Santa Fe, California, during the early part of 1986. Although the impetus for this conference was the decision by the United States government to withdraw from UNESCO, we believed that a thoroughgoing evaluation of the organization's functions and modes of operation was timely in any case, because of the profound changes in the world during the forty years since the founding of the United Nations and of UNESCO.

There were thirty participants in the conference discussions, including residents of Canada, France, Italy, Spain, Venezuela, and the United States, in addition to graduate students and administrative and editorial personnel of the University of California.

The conference was sponsored and partially supported by the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation of the University of California. Major support was generously provided by the Carnegie Corporation of Washington.

These proceedings consist mainly of reports of the discussions at five sessions, together with "issue papers," prepared by some of the participants, which served as a basis for the discussions, and a series of appendices.

During the course of the meeting an attempt was made to analyze the needs for one or several multinational intergovernmental organizations in the fields of education, science, culture, and communications now covered by UNESCO. What should be the proper roles of intergovernmental and of non-governmental international organizations in these fields? What functional and structural changes in UNESCO would enable it more effectively to carry out its responsibilities?

The final session of the conference was largely devoted to questions and suggestions for possible reforms in UNESCO, including the voting system and the relative roles of the General Conference and the Executive Board. Could an international professional civil service be established for UNESCO? What staff functions should be concentrated in Paris, and which dispersed in field offices on a regional or even a national basis? Should the organization's interests be narrowed? It is not obvious that the combination of

education, science, culture and communications makes much sense. But several reasons in favor of such a combination can be advanced, such as the need for education in the sciences at all levels, including the training of scientists and engineers. Should UNESCO's primary role be facilitation of programs rather than detailed project administration?

UNESCO is one of the United Nations bodies that notably promotes and supports basic research. In our view, this emphasis is essential because of the dramatic, indeed radical, changes in the world that must result from the seemingly inevitable future doubling of Earth's human population.

However, longterm interests in science and education will be served both by advancement of knowledge and by the provision of technical and other assistance by developed countries to less developed ones. Global programs in these areas could contribute significantly to the actual security of the United States; those objectives depend in part on intergovernmental cooperation.

Finally, from the long range point of view, establishment of a world system of law and orderly international procedures is very much in our and others' national interest. UNESCO can help with the fundamental underpinning of ideas, mutual understanding, and cooperative experience that is needed if such a system is to exist.

Walter Kohn

Walter Kohn
Professor of Physics
University of California, Santa Barbara

Frank C. Newman

Frank C. Newman
Professor of Law
University of California, Berkeley

Roger Revelle

Roger Revelle
Professor of Science and Public Policy
University of California, San Diego

tion *In The Age of the Fortune 500* (1981); and, *Information and the Crisis Economy* (1984). Also, a monograph for the McBride Commission. He is vice-president of the International Association for Mass Communication Research.

Dr. James M. Skelly

Associate director of the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation of the University of California. Dr. Skelly did his undergraduate work in psychology at the University of Minnesota. He holds an M.A. in sociology and was recently awarded a Ph.D. in the same field from the University of California, San Diego. He is working on a book on the social bases of the demise of the citizen-soldier and is involved in a research project at IGCC on the strategic and policy implications of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Mrs. Mary Martha Treichel

Executive secretary of the National Academy of Sciences' Advisory Committee for ICSU (International Council of Scientific Unions). A senior professional in the NRC Office of International Affairs, she serves also as special assistant to the NAS foreign secretary. During her fifteen years of service with the academy, Mrs. Treichel has worked primarily in the area of international science organizations and programs. She also spent a year at the ICSU Secretariat in Europe on secondment from the NAS.

Professor Herbert F. York

Director, Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation; former chancellor, University of California, San Diego; former U.S. Ambassador for Nuclear Test Ban negotiations; former deputy secretary of defense for research and engineering.

which, while a formal part of UNESCO, enjoys a limited autonomy with its own advisory board. It serves as a channel for regional cooperation in higher education and has played a major role in establishing the Regional Committee for the Application of the Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees Concerning Higher Education in the states belonging to the Europe region.

The second channel is the United Nations University, which is an autonomous agency of the United Nations, but with important ties to UNESCO. The third channel is the International Association of Universities, a non-governmental organization which was founded with the assistance of UNESCO and continues to have close ties to it, including office facilities in UNESCO House in Paris. Some of you may recall that UCLA served as host to the Eighth General Conference of the IAU in August 1985.

The European Center for Higher Education (CEPES)

Created as a result of actions taken at the First Conference of Ministers of Education of European Member States of UNESCO, organized in Vienna in 1967, CEPES has evolved into a major UNESCO focal point for the implementation of its objectives in the European region. In addition to its role in implementing the work of the Regional Committee cited above, CEPES has also taken the lead in the promotion of interuniversity cooperation in the European region and conducted a major study on that theme. To provide some insight into the scope of CEPES' activities, it is perhaps useful to quote from a report of the Eleventh Session of the Advisory Committee of CEPES meeting in 1983:

The 11th Session of the Advisory Committee of the European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) was held in Bucharest, Romania, from 10 to 12 October, 1983.

The Committee examined the Report on the activities of CEPES in 1983 and noted with satisfaction the improvements that have been achieved in the activity of the Centre in a number of fields, particularly in that of publication as well as in those concerned with documentation, information, and cooperation.

Thorough discussion was devoted to suggestions for specific activities in 1984 and to outlining the Centre's programme for 1985. It was pointed out that the intersectorial and interdisciplinary character of the Second Medium Term Plan for 1984-1989 and the Programme and Budget of UNESCO for 1984-1985 will allow CEPES to extend its field of action to activities of the organization other than those included in Major Program V (Education, Training, and Society), the one which provides the basic framework for the Centre's activities.

The Advisory Committee paid particular attention to establishing priorities and to clarifying the nature and scope of the activities of CEPES in 1984 and 1985. It gave its support to the following priorities envisaged by the Centre for 1984: the further extension of the documentary resources and the more efficient processing of and access to them by the introduction in 1984 of a computer-aided information and documentation system, the extension of the liaison and cooperation activities by the development of stronger and more permanent ties with a wider range of organizations, authorities, institutions, and university representatives on a national and international level, and the increased participation in joint activities with other units of the UNESCO Secretariat.

Given the enlargement of CEPES' professional staff, the Centre is called upon to initiate and publish new studies on topical questions related to higher education and, with the support of Member States, shall attempt to produce an increased number of monographs on the higher education systems of the countries of the Europe Region.

The new format and structure of the quarterly 'Higher Education in Europe' was particularly appreciated by the members of the Advisory Committee. CEPES was encouraged to further improve the standards of this publication which is considered to be a major means of international communication in the field of higher education.⁵

It should be noted that the sponsorship of research and meetings on higher education and the publishing of the very useful journal entitled "Higher Education in Europe," coupled with a strong desire on the part of the Secretariat to work closely with U.S. institutions and organizations, make it appear that CEPES is a very useful channel for U.S. cooperation with UNESCO, particularly on the sharing of information. In particular, CEPES is playing a very active role in various aspects of student and faculty mobility, which ties in with very strong interests in the U.S. on such questions.

The United Nations University

A brochure describes the university's functions and priorities as follows:

According to its Charter, the United Nations University (UNU) is to be 'an international community of scholars, engaged in research, post-graduate training and dissemination of knowledge in furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.' It is enjoined to 'devote its work to research into the pressing global problems of human survival, development and welfare that are the concern of the United Nations and its agencies.' This work is carried out, as the Charter instructs, through a network of research and post-graduate training centres in both the developed and developing countries, with planning and co-ordination provided by the central headquarters in Tokyo. As a world-wide system of research and training centres and programmes, the UNU has—in the words of its Charter—'its location at the site of each centre or program.' It is strikingly different in structure and mode of operation from the usual campus-based teaching university.

Established by the United Nations General Assembly, the University functions under the joint sponsorship of the United Nations and UNESCO as an autonomous academic institution and not as an intergovernmental organization in the usual sense. The Charter guarantees the academic freedom the University needs if it is to be truly an instrument through which the scholars and scientists of the world can collaborate freely to share their knowledge and perspectives for the benefit of all people. . . .⁶

The University's priorities are defined by five themes which range across the modern world's most urgent concerns: (1) peace, security, conflict resolution and global transformation; (2) the global economy; (3) hunger, poverty, resources and the environment; (4) human and social development and the co-existence of peoples, cultures and social systems, and (5) science and technology and their social and ethical implications. In practice, the University's work has been organized into nine programme areas. These are, (1) peace and conflict resolution; (2) the global economy; (3) energy systems and policy; (4)

administrative capacity at the University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, Purdue University, University of Michigan, and the University of Pittsburgh.

Professor Frank Newman

Ralston Professor of International Law at the University of California, Berkeley, and a Justice (retired) of the California Supreme Court. With R. Lillich he authored *International Human Rights: Problems of Law and Policy*, published in 1979 and now being revised. At many meetings of UN bodies he has represented NGOs, including Amnesty International, The International Commission of Jurists, and Human Rights Advocates. He has served on UC Berkeley's MacArthur Foundation Grant Committee and the UC Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation's Steering Committee.

Professor Roger Revelle

Professor of science and public policy, University of California, San Diego. Former member and vice-chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; member of U.S. delegation to several UNESCO General Conferences; former director, Scripps Institution of Oceanography; he was one of the founders of UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.

Ambassador Marcel Roche

Born Caracas, Venezuela, 1920; M.D. Johns Hopkins, 1946; research fellow in medicine, Harvard University 1947-1950; director Instituto Investigaciones Medicas, Fundacion Luis Roche, 1958-1969; director, Instituto Venezolano Investigaciones Cientificas (IVIC) 1958-1969; first president, National Research Council of Venezuela, 1969-1972, and present ambassador of Venezuela to UNESCO. Research fields have dealt with environmental tropical medicine and the sociology of science in developing countries.

Dr. Walter Rosenblith

Institute professor, MIT; foreign secretary, National Academy of Sciences; vice-president, International Council of Scientific Unions.

Mr. William C. Salmon

Mr. William C. Salmon is a retired foreign service officer. From September 1978 until January 1986 he was senior adviser for science and technology to the under secretary of state for security assistance, science and technology. He began his career with the Department of State in 1961 as assistant science adviser; he was a Sloan Fellow at MIT during 1968-1969; he served as deputy director of the Office of Environmental Affairs from 1970-1974 and counselor for science and technology at the American Embassy in Paris, France, during 1974-1978. He received from MIT his undergraduate degree and advanced degrees in mechanical engineering and a master's degree in management science.

Professor Herbert I. Schiller

Professor of communication, University of California, San Diego, he has been studying and writing about international information flows since the mid-1960s. Additionally, he has done work on the characteristics and dynamics of the new international information age. Among his books are: *Mass Communication and American Empire* (1969); *The Mind Managers* (1973); *Communication and Cultural Domination* (1976); *Who Knows: Informa-*

NATO, National Science Foundation, Stanford Research Institute. NATO deputy assistant secretary general for scientific affairs (1976-1982); science counselor to U.S. Mission to OECD (1965-74); NSF senior staff positions (1957-1965); French National Center for Scientific Research (1955-1957). B.S./M.E. University of Michigan (1947); Doctorate University of Paris-Sorbonne (1953). U.S. Army/Ordnance officer (1943-1946).

Professor Walter Kohn

Professor of physics, University of California, Santa Barbara. Initial director of the National Science Foundation Institute of Theoretical Physics, at UCSB (1979-1984). Strong interest in international science. Former visiting professor Universities of London, Paris, Copenhagen, Jerusalem, Zurich. Former lecturer at UNESCO—supported International Center for Theoretical Physics, Trieste. Chairman, Nominations Committee for Foreign Associates in Physics, National Academy of Sciences. Member, Steering Committee of IGCC.

Professor Sanford Lakoff

Professor of political science, University of California, San Diego, and a member of the steering committee of the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation. Has done scholarship and taught courses on U.S. science policy and political theory. Currently studying “warfare in space” from a political and strategic perspective. Recipient of various post-graduate fellowships and grants.

Professor Virginia Leary

Faculty of Law and Jurisprudence, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Dr. Thomas F. Malone

Scholar in residence at St. Joseph College and director emeritus, Holcomb Research Institute, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana. He served as dean of the Graduate School at the University of Connecticut from 1970-1973. He has an earned doctorate from MIT, where he was an associate professor of meteorology. Foreign secretary of the National Academy of Sciences, 1978-1982, he was chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, 1965-1967. Treasurer of the International Council of Scientific Unions, 1978-1984, he served on the ICSU/UNESCO Coordinating Committee during that period. He was awarded the Gold Medal of the International Meteorological Organization in 1985 for his contributions to international science.

Professor Federico Mayor

Professor of biochemistry, Faculty of Science, Autonomous University, Madrid, Spain. Research in the field of perinatal brain metabolism. Author of the Spanish National Plan for Mental Retardation Prevention. Former rector of the University of Granada (1968-1972). Chairman of the Spanish Council of Research (1973). Adviser to the president of the government (1977-1978). Deputy director general of UNESCO (1978-1981). Member of the Club of Rome (1980-). Minister of Education and Science (1981-1982).

Dr. Barbara W. Newell

U.S. ambassador and permanent delegate to UNESCO appointed by President Carter, from 1979 to 1981. In 1981, she assumed the post of chancellor of the State University System of Florida where she served until 1985. She is presently a visiting scholar at Harvard University. Her academic discipline is economics. She has taught or served in an

resource policy and management; (5) the food-energy nexus; (6) food, nutrition, biotechnology and poverty; (7) human and social development; (8) regional perspectives; and (9) science, technology and the information society.⁷

Inaugurated in 1975, the UNU was initiated with a major pledge from the Japanese government, with other governments adding to the endowment which provides much of its income. This form of funding contributes to its autonomy and the objectivity of its activities. Currently, the UNU's research and training activities are carried out in more than 60 countries at associated institutions and research units. It has begun to organize some of its own research and training centers, one of the first of which is the UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research.

The UNU has very close ties to UNESCO, since it is jointly sponsored by the United Nations and UNESCO and reports to the governing bodies of each. The director general of UNESCO sits on the Council of the UNU and is consulted by the secretary general of the United Nations on the appointment of the UNU rector. Since the UNU has autonomy but is closely related to the program of UNESCO, it would appear that the UNU would represent an appropriate vehicle for cooperation between American higher education and higher education overseas as it relates to the educational objectives of UNESCO. The question of U.S. membership in UNESCO would not be a factor in developing close ties with the UNU. It also appears that American higher education has not been as heavily involved in the research program of the UNU as it should be if it is to contribute appropriately to the solution of the research problems cited above.

The International Association of Universities (IAU)

The third channel of communication and cooperation for universities on the international scene is the IAU. One of UNESCO's first steps after it was created was to lure Francis J. Brown of the American Council of Education to Paris to organize a conference of universities in Utrecht in 1948 in order to examine ways in which universities might work together to further their own and UNESCO's goals. The Utrecht conference resulted in the constitutional conference of the IAU in Nice in 1950. My own very modest participation in those two conferences as a student helped to confirm me in my goal of devoting my professional career to the field of international education.

When the IAU assembled in Los Angeles last August, it enjoyed a membership in excess of 800 universities in more than 120 nations and retained its original purposes as follows:

The development of international cooperation in the field of higher education and research and the intensification of exchanges between its member institutions;

The provision of technical services to its members and to academic organizations and the creation of instruments of information and documentation concerning higher education throughout the world;

The study of problems of common interest to universities of different countries;

The building up, through these activities, of a strong international university community able to promote mutual understanding among different peoples and cultures and, in this way, to serve the cause of peace.⁸

The program of the IAU, which is carried forward with modest resources, includes providing information and advice to member universities, research and study with an

emphasis on pulling together members of the IAU to discuss more specialized subjects and publishing the results, cooperation with UNESCO—which includes participation in the “Joint UNESCO-IAU Research Programme in Higher Education,” links with the United Nations University, maintaining a library and documentation centre, and publications which include a quarterly bulletin and periodic editions of the *International Handbook of Universities* and *World List of Universities, Other Institutions of Higher Education and University Organizations*.

As with the other channels cited, including UNESCO itself, American participation in the IAU has been modest, with something in excess of 120 universities holding membership. There is, however, great potential for growth in the program of the IAU and in its membership. Although historically the Association has not been aggressive in developing new programs and building its membership, the Administrative Board, at its most recent meeting, has appointed two new committees, one on program development and one on membership, which bodes well for a substantial increase in the level of IAU’s activity in the years to come. The IAU constitutes a significant network through which universities can relate to UNESCO’s activities in higher education, including questions relating to development in the Third World and exchange of persons and to other members in the IAU as research and program interests dictate.

Conclusions

- a. Significant channels exist both within UNESCO and closely related to it for close cooperation between American higher education and higher education throughout the rest of the world.
- b. Leadership in American higher education has not tended to be pro-active in utilizing these channels for international cooperation extensively, although there are exceptions to this rule.
- c. Since there are NGO channels for communication and cooperation in higher education, and the U.S. Department of State has not encouraged activity between UNESCO and our universities, lack of participation in direct UNESCO program activities has not appeared to be an urgent problem to leaders in American higher education.
- d. Since universities are a major source for fueling UNESCO-related activities, any substantial progress in the U.S. return to UNESCO is going to require a substantial change in attitude on the part of our universities, which is going to fly in the face of the reality of our current political situation.
- e. It would appear that we must view the return to UNESCO as a long-term goal, utilize alternative channels of cooperation and communication wherever open to us, and begin to build a new climate of public opinion toward UNESCO as progress is made in improving its administration and giving a reorientation to its program goals.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from a presentation by Soedjatmoko, rector of the United Nations University, to the Eighth General Conference of the International Association of Universities:

One of the greatest difficulties we face is accepting the enormous diversity, complexity, and vulnerability of modern life. The intricate interlinkages among today’s problems creates in many minds a powerful longing for simple, reductionist explanations, whose foundations in reality are so insecure that

with U.S. economic aid programs (Washington, New Delhi, and Paris), on U.S. delegations to UN conferences, as member of UN advisory bodies and as chair, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; currently: member, Club of Rome; founder of Americans for the Universality of UNESCO; adjunct professor (political science), Western Carolina University; consultant on international cooperation and communications.

Mr. Thomas Forstenzer

UNESCO, New York Office; formerly a member of the faculty of history in Rutgers University.

Ms. Margaret E. Gale

Staff consultant, Committee on Foreign Affairs, United States House of Representatives. Worked on the issue of United States withdrawal from UNESCO. Ph.D. in international relations from the University of Pennsylvania. Follows UN and human rights affairs.

Professor Roger Gaudry

Companion of the Order of Canada, Doctor of Science; professor of chemistry, Laval University, 1940-1954; vice president and director of research, Ayerst Laboratories, 1954-1965; rector of Universite de Montreal, 1965-1975; chairman of the Science Council of Canada, 1972-1975; chairman of the Council of the United Nations University, 1974-76; president of the International Association of Universities, 1975-1980; fellow of the Royal Society of Canada; former president of the Chemical Institute of Canada. Recipient of many medals and eleven honorary degrees. Dr. Gaudry is the author of many scientific papers in organic and biological chemistry.

M. Vincent Giroud

Lecturer in French at Johns Hopkins University and permanent representative of the World Federation of UNESCO Clubs and Associations to ECOSOC. Worked from 1981 until 1985 as technical adviser to the French National Commission for UNESCO at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Dr. G. Allen Greb

Associate director, Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, University of California; research historian, Program in Science, Technology and Public Affairs, University of California, San Diego.

Professor Isebill V. Gruhn

Professor of politics at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Has written extensively about inter-African relations and international policy toward Africa. First examined Africa S&T affairs for her Ph.D. thesis in the mid-1960s. Since then has written monographs and articles on the subject. Has served as a consultant on S&T policy to U.S. and UN agencies over a period of two decades.

Dr. M. H. A. Hassan

Secretary, Third World Academy of Sciences; International Center for Theoretical Physics, Trieste.

Dr. Philip W. Hemily

Foreign service officer, science counselor (retired); currently consultant, international science and technology affairs to National Academy of Sciences, Department of State,

About the Participants

William H. Allaway

Director, Education Abroad Program, University of California. American co-director, European-American Seminar on the Nuclear Arms Race, Dubrovnik, April 1984 and 1986. Executive secretary, International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange. Executive Committee, Board of Directors, CIEEL.

Dr. Herschelle S. Challenor

B.A., Spelman College; certificate, Sorbonne, M.A., Johns Hopkins-SAIS, Ph.D., Columbia University, in Public Law and Government. Dr. Challenor joined UNESCO in May 1978 and currently is director of the UNESCO Liaison Office in Washington. Her previous posts include staff director of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee Subcommittee on Africa (1975-1978), program officer at the Ford Foundation in New York (1973-1975), and assistant professor of political science at Brooklyn College (1969-1972). Dr. Challenor has published articles on Benin, U.S. Policy toward Africa, and multilateralism. She has travelled widely in Africa and the rest of the world and lived in Benin from 1967-1968.

Ms. Sandra Coliver

Part-time research associate of Frank Newman, a criminal and constitutional lawyer, chair of the International Human Rights Committee of the San Francisco Bar Association, and board member of Berkeley-based Human Rights Advocates. She has represented NGOs at the UN Human Rights Commission and Sub-commission.

Mr. Jonathan Davidson

Director, Washington Office, James F. Byrnes International Center of the University of South Carolina and special assistant to the president of the University for International Programs since 1981. Executive secretary, United States National Commission for UNESCO, 1984-1985. Previously a member of the British Diplomatic Service, 1963-1981, serving in London, India, Thailand, Senegal, and Washington, D.C.

Professor John A. Ernest

Professor Ernest is a mathematician at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He also teaches "Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" in the Environmental Studies Program. He is on the faculty advisory committee of the Global Peace and Security program at UCSB. He is interested in the growing "fabric" of global economic and cultural institutions. He represented the International Council of Scientific Unions at a UNESCO conference on education for peace and human rights in Paris in 1983.

Professor Lawrence Finkelstein

Professor of political science, Northern Illinois University, currently director of studies and vice-president, the Endowment for International Peace (1957-1965); study director for Twentieth Century Fund, United States and UNESCO (1978-1983); member Council on Foreign Relations, International Institute for Strategic Studies, International Studies Association; deputy assistant secretary of defense for NATO and European Region Political-Military Affairs.

Dr. John E. Fobes

Former assistant, then deputy director-general of UNESCO (1964-1978); earlier service

they have no capacity for tolerance of other approaches. This intellectual intolerance is one of the greatest dangers of our time. It is a source of conflict in itself, between competing religions or ideologies, for example, and it helps to justify the expression of conflict through violent means. Intellectual intolerance is also linked to the erosion of commitment to multilateral institutions and undertakings, for it makes collaboration with other parties impossible except on one's own terms.

One possible counterweight to intellectual intolerance is an unflagging persistence in the search for new syntheses to serve as the bases for cooperative action on present and emerging global problems. Where can this search begin and be maintained except in the universities? In a world so finely balanced on the brink of self-destruction, there is an urgency about the mobilization of intellectual resources on a global scale, with scholars addressing themselves to the pressing global issues of human survival, development and welfare.

It is important to say this at this juncture of human history, when the commitment to multilateralism and international cooperation seems to be eroding. It would be disastrous for all of us if the scholars and educators were to join this trend. What is needed is for the world's educators and associations, like IAU, to help try to stem and reverse this tide, and to recommit themselves to the kind of international cooperation that is a prerequisite for survival in this interdependent world.⁹

Notes

1. Frederick S. Dunn, *War and the Minds of Men* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1950), vii.
2. Letter from David Jenness, Executive Director, Consortium of Social Science Associations, Washington, D.C., and Michael Pallak, Executive Officer, American Psychological Association, to The Honorable Daniel A. Mica, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., March 4, 1985, p. 3.
3. *U.S./UNESCO Policy Review*, February 27, 1984, p. 4.
4. "Medium-Term Plan (1984-1989) of UNESCO," *Higher Education in Europe* 8, no. 1 (1983):105.
5. "11th Session of the Advisory Committee of CEPES," *Higher Education in Europe* 8, no. 4 (1983):57.
6. Brochure, *The United Nations University, What it is, What it does, How it works*, Tokyo, February 1985, p. 3.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
8. Brochure, *The International Association of Universities*, UNESCO House, Paris (August 1983), p. 6.
9. Soedjatmoko, "The International Dimension of Universities in an Independent World," an address to the Eighth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, University of California, Los Angeles, August 12, 1985, pp. 8-9.

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Mary Martha Treichel

Introduction

In his opening remarks T. F. Malone, chair of the session, stated that the conference could have significant implications with respect to the future of international science cooperation. The crisis in UNESCO is symptomatic of a crisis in the world order and in the institutional arrangements necessary to implement collaborative, international, scientific activities. He assumed that all participants were familiar with the UNESCO program and budget document, with the National Academy of Sciences preliminary assessment of the UNESCO science programs, and with the conference issue papers. He then sketched a rough annual budgetary profile of UNESCO: total budget—\$300 million, of which \$100 million is from extra-budgetary sources; the overhead rate is 69 percent, leaving approximately \$180 million for direct project costs, largely in support of basic education in developing countries and of scientific programs in hydrology, oceanography, geology, ecology, and laboratory and theoretical science.

He suggested that consideration be given to the underlying objectives and functions of international scientific and educational cooperation, matching these requirements against how UNESCO operates. In the science area there are two basic objectives: the pursuit of knowledge and the application of science to development. In education there are concerns with science education, with scientific literacy, and with the inculcation of a zest for learning in general, with priority attention devoted to overcoming illiteracy. In his view, all these objectives are consistent with U.S. national interests. In terms of functions there are four key areas: strategic planning, program implementation, facilitation/coordination, and funding. He encouraged the conference participants to think further about these common objectives and functions, particularly with respect to the responsibilities of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

Structures and Constituencies of International Cooperation

A valuable structure of international cooperation in science and education has grown up during the last 40 years. It is important for the U.S. to help preserve and promote the mechanisms of this international cooperation and to encourage even more meaningful international exchange, whether it be through UNESCO or some other structure. However, science is increasingly perceived as a valuable national resource and it cannot be assumed that everyone will see internationalism in a positive fashion. Consequently, it is essential to demonstrate why some kinds of science must be conducted on an international basis and how other scientific disciplines will be benefited by international collaboration.

Differences in the international interests of scientists and educators were noted. The science community has had a continuing, almost altruistic, preoccupation with the training of young people from many countries. The U.S. educational community has responded similarly when a clear need for international cooperation has been established, but it appears to have had a somewhat lesser need for global interaction in general. Science has a long tradition of global interactions, while education is perceived as more of a national enterprise. However, as science and technology become more pervasive in society the necessity for a more global approach to education will become greater. Higher education in particular needs a better transnational network.

The absence of a strong constituency for UNESCO within the U.S. educational

APPENDICES

Conference Agenda

PERSPECTIVES ON THE CRISIS OF UNESCO

Rancho Santa Fe, California
January 31-February 2, 1986

SESSION I

UNESCO and International Cooperation in Science and Education

Chair: T. F. Malone
Rapporteur: M. M. Treichel
Issue Paper: P. Hemily, "Some Concerns of the Scientific Community"
Issue Paper: W. Allaway, "UNESCO and International Cooperation in Higher Education"

SESSION II

UNESCO and the Developing Countries

Chair: M. Roche
Rapporteur: W. Kohn
Issue Paper: I. Gruhn, "UNESCO: Science, Technology, and Africa"

SESSION III

Restructuring UNESCO

Chair: F. Newman
Rapporteur: V. Leary
Issue Paper: F. Mayor, "Restructuring UNESCO?"
Issue Paper: B. Newell, "The UNESCO Withdrawal: A Lost Opportunity"

SESSION IV

The United States, UNESCO, and Global Cooperation in Science, Education, Culture, and Communications

Chair: H. F. York
Rapporteur: G. A. Greb
Issue Paper: J. Fobes, "How to Think about the Future of Multilateral Cooperation in the Fields of UNESCO? What Do We Do Next?"

SESSION V

Concluding Observations and Proposals

Chair: S. Lakoff
Rapporteur: S. Coliver

Areas for Further Study

UNESCO's Priorities and Organization

- Examination of which UNESCO programs could be handled more efficiently through other channels of multilateral or bilateral cooperation (particularly among non-governmental organizations) and of ways in which the remaining programs might be reorganized with less overlap and duplication.
- A geographical, functional, and historical evaluation of UNESCO's performance. What actions or trends provoked the U.S.'s disaffection? How do countries other than the U.S., Britain, and Singapore view UNESCO?
- Exploration of what steps, including weighted voting, might be initiated that would help satisfy the concerns of governments that contribute major funding and/or that represent large populations.

The U.S. and UNESCO

- Study of U.S. participation in and withdrawal from UNESCO, including examination of State Department and congressional pronouncements and actions, and selection and composition of U.S. delegations to UNESCO meetings.
- Study of U.S. current approach to multilateralism generally, including withdrawals from IGOs and equivocations as to multilateral treaties and negotiations.
- Identification and analysis of missed U.S. opportunities to exercise responsible leadership in UNESCO activities.
- Study of ways to review the effectiveness of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and to improve its relation with the State Department and U.S. delegations to UNESCO. Two practical steps were suggested:
 1. A UNESCO liaison office for scientific cooperation might be established within the American Association for the Advancement of Science, with the functions of organizing studies and publicizing programs of UNESCO that are of interest to U.S. scientists.
 2. Faculty members and graduate students in U.S. universities should be encouraged to undertake research on possible changes within the present UNESCO organization or, alternatively, on the formation of other intergovernmental organizations which would carry out UNESCO's present functions.

community was noted. Attention was drawn to a Canadian publication titled "Education in the UNESCO Context," which lists areas in which UNESCO has done important educational work, and it was suggested that this report could make academic communities more aware of what UNESCO has accomplished.

Inherent Value of Intergovernmental Multilateral Cooperation in Science and Education

There is a need to understand better what is meant by an international activity and to convey to the general public, which may not necessarily perceive the value of international collaboration, what is intended and what are the benefits. Science and science education have a transnational tradition and need. Depending on the nature of the particular program, intergovernmental organizations can perform useful facilitative services for international scientific cooperation. The value of an intergovernmental organization in the general education area is not as obvious as in the science area, although continuing linkages between science and education were emphasized.

Even though the transnational nature of science is generally acknowledged, much progress in science does not in fact require UNESCO or any other intergovernmental body. It is only in the environmental or field sciences, e.g., oceanography, geophysics, geology, ecology, where access to another nation's territory is essential, that the assistance of an intergovernmental body is necessary. Cooperation among scientists who can participate directly in field programs as well as influence governments to grant access should be emphasized. The problem with such an approach, however, is that there are not enough scientists in the developing countries who could do this. It is essential to train more scientists in these countries; thus, development assistance cannot readily be separated from advancement of knowledge.

Political Context in Which UNESCO and Other International Organizations Operate

It is a political world and intergovernmental organizations by their very nature cannot be completely free from politics.

The meaning of "politicization" varies, and it is worth noting that in some languages the words policy and politics are the same. The legitimate interests of governments will inevitably give a political cast to the affairs of intergovernmental organizations.

Because the overriding purpose of UNESCO is to advance the cause of peace through international scientific, educational, and cultural cooperation, in a world where there is no consensus some political controversy in a UNESCO-like forum may even be useful.

All the specialized agencies of the UN are intergovernmental and all have political debates to some extent. However, the quality of management of these agencies has varied. UNESCO, in particular, is widely recognized as having serious management problems.

Strengthened IGO/NGO Collaboration

Non-governmental organizations provide a forum for program initiation, planning, coordination, and evaluation by the professional communities of the world. This is essential to assure high-quality endeavors. Strengthened interactions and collaboration among non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations would be mutually beneficial.

For example, a program such as the one the International Council of Scientific Unions is contemplating in the area of global change will involve remote sensing technologies and will obviously require the assistance of governments and appropriate inter-governmental agencies. It is unlikely that there will be a single model for this interaction among governmental and non-governmental organizations. Increased emphasis on regionalism and decentralization, in addition to the need for flexibility and responsiveness, means that in the future a variety of institutional arrangements can be envisaged to promote international cooperation.

Breadth of the UNESCO Mandate

Several views were expressed on the breadth of UNESCO's mandate, with some participants in favor of retaining education, science, culture, and communications in a single organization, while others raised serious questions about the arrangement. Links between science and education were seen as important. Concerns were also expressed about the large number of UNESCO programs and what is perceived as an expansion of UNESCO's areas of interest beyond its original mandate. A refocusing of the UNESCO agenda may be warranted. In addition, further clarification is required of UNESCO's responsibilities for the advancement of knowledge vis-a-vis activities related to development assistance. The training of developing-country scientists is an urgent need from both points of view.

Diversity of Mechanisms for International Cooperation in Science and Education

The mechanism for implementing international cooperation in science and education will vary depending on the nature and content of the program being implemented. In some cases it should be UNESCO; in others it could be another organization. In fact, it may be useful to stand back from UNESCO and to look more broadly, both at the array of international institutions that exist for facilitating international cooperation and at the various functions that are performed by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in their relationships with the scientific community and with governments. It is likely that there should not be a single model; a variety of institutional arrangements may be necessary to facilitate future cooperation.

Need for Further Analysis

It was the sense of the discussion that issues raised in this session should be further examined in detail, perhaps through additional meetings or the issuance of policy papers that would illuminate in some depth the views that were expressed. This session may be viewed as a potentially significant point of departure for further analysis.

Concluding Observations and Proposals

UNESCO is unique among United Nations bodies in that it promotes and supports basic research. This emphasis on gaining new knowledge and new understanding is essential in view of the dramatic, indeed radical, changes in the world that must result from the inevitable doubling of human populations in the next 50 years. Food supplies must triple; new sources of energy must be found which will provide on a sustainable basis four or five times existing supplies; and new kinds of human relationships and organizations will have to be developed. At present, we do not have the knowledge to achieve any of those goals.

Many experts and organizations throughout the world are involved in applied research and applying knowledge to develop technology. Only UNESCO among the inter-governmental organizations is taking the long view. It must work to stimulate efforts to attain the new knowledge that will be needed by the next generation, the generation that will be struggling to survive within just a few decades.

Another characteristic of UNESCO is its continuing recognition that scientific research and technical development are done by human beings, not by member states. Hence, UNESCO gives great attention to the education of scientists and engineers. At the same time it is essential to keep in mind that young scientists need jobs as well as educational opportunities to do satisfying and productive research in their own countries which will allow them and their families to survive economically. In the future, UNESCO increasingly should emphasize the creation of the right kinds of employment opportunities for young scientists and engineers.

There is something to be said for the view that some *short-range* United States interests will best be served by bilateral rather than multilateral negotiations, particularly when the multilateral actors are so diverse in interests, political attitudes, and levels of development as in UNESCO (or in the United Nations for that matter). As we have indicated, however, some activities, especially in the earth and biological sciences, can only be carried out multilaterally.

Moreover, long-term interests in science and education are served both by advancement of knowledge and by the provision of technical assistance by developed countries to less developed countries. Global programs in these areas could contribute significantly to the actual security of the United States. Both objectives depend in part on intergovernmental cooperation. Consequently, United States interests require that the United States continue to play a leading role in multi-governmental organizations concerned with education and science. While UNESCO may presently not be structured to promote those two objectives most efficiently, it arguably provides the best existing institutional framework. For that reason and in the absence of practicable alternatives it is important for the United States government, scientists, and educators to work with UNESCO so as to enhance its capability to further goals in the U.S.'s interest. During the present period of the United States government's non-membership in UNESCO, U.S. scientific and academic communities should maintain ties with UNESCO and its supporters and should consider alternative frameworks only if sustained efforts to reform UNESCO prove to be inadequate.

From the *long-range* point of view, establishment of a world system of law and orderly international procedures is very much in the interests of the United States. UNESCO can contribute to the fundamental underpinning of ideas, mutual understanding, and cooperative experience that must be encouraged if a world system of law and order is to be developed.

for development, the experience of different AID agencies indicates that much work of the organization could be handled more effectively if dispersed in branch offices on a regional, or even national basis. Should discretionary funds be made available to these branch offices, and in what proportion of the total budget? If this were done how could fiscal accountability be maintained?

Should UNESCO's Fields of Interest Be Narrower?

Does the combination of education, science, culture, and communications in a single organization make sense? What do these different activities have in common, and/or how do they complement one another? In most member states each of these fields is under a different ministry. Moreover, different kinds of cooperation are needed in these different fields. Science calls for cooperative research programs with agreed-upon standards, methods, and presentation of results. Storage, processing, and distribution of data should be accomplished multilaterally. One of the principal problems of science cooperation is provision of access to research areas for nationals of different countries.

In education the principal needs are for free transfer of information about school and university structures, curricula, standards, textbook materials, teacher and supervisor training, etc. In almost all countries education is a government subject, and, hence, international cooperation must be accomplished intergovernmentally. Arguing in favor of continued combination of science and education in one IGO is that such combination may be useful in advancing the education of scientists and in insuring that a major share of research is conducted in universities.

In cultural areas the principal problems attacked by UNESCO have been the preservation of national monuments and cultural objects and the organization and administration of museums. UNESCO's work in the area of culture was praised as important and cost-effective. There was, though, a sense that mechanisms for decision-making and administration in cultural areas cannot readily be adapted to fields of science and education where the decisions to be made generally are more controversial.

Given that promotion of peace is stressed in UNESCO's charter as a central objective, facilitation of peace education and research in the natural and social sciences is desirable. However, there was general agreement that UNESCO bodies are not appropriate forums for debating basic peace/war issues. Due to the potential for polemics, particular vigilance should be paid to assuring that peace education does not become a propaganda vehicle.

Because of the conference's focus on science and education, controversies regarding UNESCO's work in communications were noted with only brief discussion. No consensus was reached as to the advisability of maintaining communications as part of UNESCO's program.

UNESCO's Primary Role: Facilitation of Programs

In large part because of pressures from individual member states, UNESCO is overextended in an inordinate number of small (usually underfunded and often underplanned) projects and is too much involved in detailed project administration. Instead, UNESCO should concentrate on the facilitation of programs, including holding governmental conferences to arrange for multinational funding and other participation in programs, arrangements for project-planning by relevant non-governmental organizations, and recruiting of experts for specific missions, including advice to governments, personnel training, project evaluation, and field surveys. Decisions made by its governing bodies—the General Conference and the Executive Board—should be limited to consideration of program priorities and allocation of resources to major programs.

SESSION II
UNESCO AND THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

ISSUE PAPER
UNESCO: Science, Technology, and Africa

Isebill V. Gruhn

There is no crisis in Africa; there are crises. It has now become fashionable to assert that Africa must pull itself together, cope with its own problems, and stop blaming the past and the current international situation for its ills. African states are being told to stop depending on others to do things they can accomplish for themselves. This scheme fits congenially with the position of those who argue for a more self-reliant African continent and with those in the international community who are critical of post-World War II development assistance programs. It also suits those who philosophically believe that the poor occasionally deserve charity but that competent states, like competent individuals, can do well on their own. Those who are left by the wayside must surely shoulder part of the blame. The problem for international organizations in such an atmosphere is that they have become victims of their own failures, the failures of their client states, and the failure of the international system to respond adequately to the crises of the least developed countries. And, the obvious shortcomings of institutions like UNESCO loom all the more obvious, because the poor seemingly get poorer while the rich get bored. Under the circumstances the danger is very great that the baby will get thrown out with the bathwater.

It is clear that, with few notable exceptions, African countries are deteriorating economically, unraveling politically, and collapsing socially. Contrary to the development that has taken place in most other parts of the world, in the African case we need urgently to address what measures can be taken to halt the erosion there, and to slow, even better to reverse, the measurable decline in living standards of many African societies over the past decade. However, we also need to harness the spread of despair. Africa is rich in natural resources; astonishingly enough, one-half of the unused arable farmland in the world is situated on the African continent. Africa is not only able to feed itself, it could actually help feed others. Rather than wallowing in despair, we should take a hard critical look at the poor track record to date in foreign development assistance to Africa, and Africa's own contributions to its present unfortunate state. We can no longer tolerate an over-bureaucratized, paper-pushing UNESCO, nor should we channel the energies of international organizations mainly into those parts of the world which are in a developed state. The lesser-developed countries of the world should become the main client states for those UN agencies equipped to offer development assistance. The problem for the scientific establishment in general, and for UNESCO in particular, is not how to perform generally useful services for all countries, but rather how to tailor assistance that is especially suited for and highly responsive to the changing needs of those countries least able to compete in the present market.

Let us first take stock of those activities in science and technology (S&T) which UNESCO does relatively well.¹ Given UNESCO's global scope and its proven ability to identify and attract scientists from around the world to worthy projects, perhaps its best success has been to organize and disseminate information flowing out of large collaborative projects—the inter-government projects broadly classified as air, earth, water (e.g., man and the biosphere, geological correlation programs, mineral prospecting, the study

of eco-systems, programs for arid lands, etc.). All these projects generate important information useful to African government agencies, farmers, and businessmen. UNESCO's organization and dissemination of data in these areas has been a worthy task, areas where the global state of the art in S&T can be creatively employed and usefully targeted to overcome the serious shortage of useable and vital information for other development agencies and their client governments. These activities, which have made UNESCO most visible in S&T and which have engaged the best minds in the scientific establishment around the world, are status projects, and while they are extremely important and deserve to be continued, they constitute merely a fraction of the urgent issues facing this ravaged part of the globe.

A second category is the human resources arm of UNESCO and UNESCO's role as executing agency for UNDP funds. Modest inroads have been made in the training of scientists and engineers, and in this sense it can be called a semi-success, but given the depth and breadth of human resource needs in S&T on the African continent, these activities have barely made a dent. There are also serious qualitative questions worthy of discussion. The question arises with respect to African scientists and engineers trained in Western countries. How well and how appropriately are they trained to address the scientific questions that face their societies and how well-equipped are they to work within the limitations confronting those scientists and engineers in their own countries? In short, though human resource development constitutes an important area of UNESCO's work, the quality and quantity of training of Africans needs to be improved and redesigned to insure that the most urgent problems are adequately addressed.

A third category is CASTA Africa and the various continent-wide efforts to look at African S&T policies, to develop African infra-structure, develop science councils, and set up information networks among scientists and engineers. The success of these activities resides in the fact that the African S&T establishment does participate in such activities and thus UNESCO commands their attention, but the follow-through has, on the whole, been weak and ineffectual.

To summarize, UNESCO has captured the attention of the small groups of African S&T establishment figures. It has targeted some key areas for gathering and generating international research information, and it has on occasion helped African S&T elites integrate with their opposite numbers at the continental and international level. It has also provided training for scientists and established networks of scientists and engineers on the African continent. Yet, the S&T situation in Africa is on the whole appalling, both in terms of available manpower (see Table I) or expenditures (see Table II). We know that there is a relationship between productivity and investment in R&D. For example, Zimbabwe, a reasonably successful agricultural producer country, has been investing approximately 2.5 percent of its profit from agricultural production in research, but Nigeria, whose agricultural failure and decline are only too well known, has been investing only about .75 percent. And, to make matters even worse, the Nigerian government has ordered all 22 of its agricultural research stations to cut their staff by one-third. Unfortunately in 1986, Nigeria, not Zimbabwe, is more typical of how priorities are set by African governments for investments in S&T in agriculture. Yet, World Bank studies show agricultural research yields to be at a return rate of two to three times greater than returns from most alternative investments.²

Why does UNESCO not seek to reverse these trends in Africa? Why is it that UNESCO often seems ineffectual and powerless? What is wrong and how can it be corrected?

Let us address some of the structural problems. UNESCO is accredited, in each country, to the various ministries of education. Accordingly, the contact point is with a

SESSION V CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND PROPOSALS

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Sandra Coliver

Questions and Suggestions for Reform

Voting and Organization

In the governing bodies of UNESCO, would it be feasible and desirable to modify the voting system to take into account differences in population and financial contributions of the member states, perhaps by establishing a "tricameral" or multiple voting system in which the principle of "one nation one vote" would be preserved but concurrence would be required by votes based on national population and assessed financial contribution to UNESCO? Should tripartite voting be pursued only on decisions with major financial implications? Alternatively, should decisions be made only on the basis of consensus rather than by voting?

Should the role of the executive board be strengthened? This would imply a modification of the functions of the General Conference. Should the General Conference meet less often, with most of its work being handled between sessions by committees and working groups such as is done in the United Nations itself? Standing committees of government representatives reflecting a fair regional distribution could carry out studies and formulate recommendations in advance of the General Conference, regarding programs and priorities. These committees in turn could be advised by working groups and by independent experts.

How should the membership of the executive board be selected? How large, how representative, and how powerful should it be? Might representation by region rather than by country be advisable?

An International Civil Service?

Should there be an examination for entry into professional service with UNESCO? If so, what positions should be filled from this civil service? What should be the minimum and maximum ages of entry and security of tenure? Could an international civil service in UNESCO be compatible with staff representation from different countries and regions? Should staff representation from different countries be based on their populations and levels of contribution to the UNESCO budget as well as on geographical distribution? Should there be training of international civil servants such, for instance, as the U.S. provides for its own foreign service?

Alternatively, or in addition, would not the professionalism of the staff be improved by increasing the numbers of qualified employees seconded and paid for by governments for particular projects and programs? Further, in some areas, the quality of expert assistance might be improved if employment contracts could be for shorter terms compatible with academic and other professional pursuits.

Geographic Concentration in Paris Versus Dispersion in Different Parts of the World

It is probably true that in UNESCO's strictly scientific programs (those aimed at advancing world scientific knowledge) a high level of staff and budget concentration in Paris is practical. But in the cultural and educational fields, and in science and technology

case-by-case basis, of U.S. participation in UNESCO activities. However, the U.S. national interest is broader than this case by case approach. We need to learn to accept and to use the changing international political system.

Possible Improvement in Voting Procedures

One needed reform for UNESCO is to reduce the decision-making role of the General Conference, which tends to be dominated by short-term political considerations. Related to this is the question of possible improvements in voting procedures. Perhaps the present system of "one nation, one vote" could be changed for a weighted system in which a nation's population size and its level of financial contributions to UNESCO would be taken into account. In principle it is absurd that China and India, with a third of the world population, should have only 2 out of more than 150 votes, or that countries which contribute 80 percent to the UNESCO budget should have only 5 percent of votes in the General Conference. Alternatively, introduction of a system of decision-making by consensus instead of voting, which was used in the Third UN Conference of the Law of the Sea, might be feasible.

A Greater Role for Non-governmental Organizations

Major non-governmental organizations such as ICSU should be given a greater share in UNESCO decision-making. However, non-governmental organizations, because they are voluntary associations of individuals, are not well suited to take part in the governance of an intergovernmental organization, and can serve more effectively as advisory bodies to government representatives.

The International Responsibility of the United States

The "ground swell of apathy" towards UNESCO was emphasized by several speakers, some of whom claimed that it was part of a growing lack of interest in internationalism in the United States, as shown for example by U.S. failure to contribute financially to the United Nations University. In general, the U.S. has been generous when unchallenged, but tends to withdraw when it is challenged. To regain our former interest we need to proceed by first identifying building blocks of international cooperation which have obvious domestic benefits and, second, by emphasizing the continuing need for the United States to exercise leadership in world affairs, both to serve its own interests and because of its enormous potential impact on the world community. The latter was emphasized by one participant from a Latin American country, who described the disappointment, frustration, and even anger at the United States which has resulted from our withdrawal. In our task of "delayed intellectual maintenance" we need to build a new consensus within the United States concerning our responsibility to contribute to the solution of global problems. Such consensus would not be focused exclusively on UNESCO nor concerned simply with reforms in the international political machinery.

A New U.S. National Commission?

Perhaps the time has come to change the very name of the organization as part of refurbishing and refocusing its role. In any case, a new U.S. National Commission for multilateral cooperation, not simply for UNESCO, should be created. This commission should deeply involve U.S. non-governmental organizations. It should attempt to overcome U.S. apathy and ignorance by providing new avenues of communication and a broader dissemination of information concerning international multilateral cooperation.

TABLE I: Scientific and Technical Manpower Existing in Some African Countries in the 1970s

Year	Country	Population (In millions)	Potential scientists, engineers and technicians ^a	Number of scientists, engineers and technicians actually engaged in research and experimental development
1977	Nigeria	78.9	19,885 (15,241)	3545 ^b
1973	Egypt	37.8	593,254 (NA)	10,665
1975	Ghana	9.9	6,897 (15,096)	9,819
1978	Sudan	17.4	13,792 (2,639)	6,537
1975	Kenya	14.1	5,130 (5,879)	544
1976	Zambia	5.1	11000 (26,000)	400
1976	Cameroon	7.7	11,785 (NA)	329 ^b
1977	Mauritius	0.906	6,264 (NA)	301
1972	Algeria	15.1	(NA)	42 ^b
1971	Chad	3.7	(NA)	187
1977	Congo	1.4	3,461 (NA)	284 ^b
1970	Gabon	0.502	(NA)	28
1975	Ivory Coast	6.8	(NA)	502 ^b
1976	Togo	2.3	461 (211)	445
1976	Niger	4.7	(NA)	94
1976	Senegal	5.1	(NA)	654

Notes: a. Figures in brackets represent the number of potential technicians. (NA) data are not available. b. Data for either actual technicians or for actual social scientists are not available for inclusion.

Sources: Statistical Year Book, 32nd edition, 1981, *International Financial Statistics*, *Europa Yearbook*, "A World Survey," 1971-78, *World Bank World Tables*, 2nd edition, 1980, for population figures of some countries.

Table from *Science and Public Policy* (August 1985), p. 213.

TABLE II: Expenditure for Research and Experimental Development in Some African Countries in the 1970s

Country	Total expenditure	Expenditure financed by government	Expenditure financed by non-government	Amount spent per head ^a	Percentage financed by non-government
In millions of U.S. dollars					
Nigeria	68.0	54.4	13.6	19,182	20
Egypt	11.8	10.5	1.3	1095	11
Ghana	24.8	24.8	-	2,530	0
Sudan	2.1	1.9	0.2	312	9.5
Kenya	12.5	10.2	2.3	22,978	18.4
Zambia	5.0	2.9	2.1	2,500	42
Cameroon	7.1	7.1	-	21,588	0
Mauritius	2.9	2.1	0.8	9,835	27.5
Algeria	19.5	19.5	-	57,060	0
Chad	0.8	0.6	0.2	4,239	25
Congo	2.7	2.7	-	9,492	0
Gabon	0.007	0.007	-	244	0
Ivory Coast	6.2	3.7	2.5	12,350	40
Togo	4.3	3.6	0.7	9,683	16.2
Niger	0.6	0.6	-	6,066	0
Senegal	18.1	15.9	2.2	27,596	12.1

Notes: a. Column 5 (amount spent per head) is calculated by dividing Column 2 in this table by Column 5 in Table I. Columns 4 and 6 are calculated from Columns 2 and 3.

Sources: Statistical Yearbook, 32nd Edition (1981) for Columns 2 and 3. See also *Europe Yearbook*, "A World Survey," 1971-78.

Table from *Science and Public Policy* (August 1985), p. 215.

ministry ill-suited to deal with S&T for its own country, leaving UNESCO ill-placed to make steady and effective contact with S&T personnel and the corresponding institutions in the host country. In addition, there is poor coordination between the UNESCO headquarters in Paris and the regional offices, e.g., UNESCO's regional office in Nairobi. The Science Division of UNESCO also happens to be one of the more centrally managed UNESCO divisions in Paris (compared to Education, for example). In consequence, the regional offices have little authority, little support, and almost no discretionary funds with which to respond to local needs. Paris operates with a sluggish two-year program cycle. The results of these operating methods insure support for only large long-term projects, while local needs and urgent stop-gap activities are almost never supported. In fact, UNESCO is notable even among other UN agencies for its unresponsiveness, which is especially true for science. The above combines to create a situation where UNESCO's S&T efforts in Africa are almost entirely supply-side-oriented and rarely, if ever, "demand driven." It is not that some supply-side orientation is bad—after all, the developing of some infra-structure, all would agree, is both worthwhile and essential—but infra-structure tends to be unused or underutilized when there is no demand. Institutions, over time, become little more than designs on paper; large laboratories deteriorate and machinery wears out. Much of the African continental effort in the 1970s, to look at

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

G. Allen Greb

Introduction

In leading off the discussion, John Fobes summarized some of the salient points in his paper. He pointed out that we are in a critical period for the entire UN system and its part in maintaining world order. The need for change and renewal, not only of UNESCO, is sensed by all. Consequently, scientific and cultural communities throughout the world are concerned about U.S. governmental and citizens' attitudes. It would appear that the United States government is not sure what its future role in international cooperation should be.

In the near term United States citizen groups, such as Americans for the Universality of UNESCO and the participants in this conference, need to send a positive message to the rest of the world that they are concerned about multilateral cooperation in education, science, and culture, as well as about other specialized agencies of the UN system and the strength and effectiveness of the UN itself. Perhaps a presidential commission on the entire United Nations should be appointed. A new non-governmental, national commission on UNESCO, consisting of representatives of universities, scientific, educational, and cultural voluntary associations, and other citizen groups, should be formed as a focal point for interaction with the world community.

The main problem in the United States is not hostility to UNESCO, but simply a profound and growing apathy towards multilateral organizations and actions.

Why Did the United States Withdraw?

The question of why the United States has withdrawn from UNESCO at this time was discussed at some length. The yearning among many Americans for a return to isolationism is a simplistic answer, and it is true that a conservative coalition, led by the Heritage Foundation, took advantage of this yearning. But it did not lead to the general criticisms of UNESCO's budget, its degree of politicization, its structural problems, and the shortcomings of its management, nor the hostility of most American newspapers because of their concern at UNESCO's apparent acceptance of government control of news-gathering in the Third World. There was also a lingering resentment of UNESCO's earlier treatment of Israel. The present administration objected to the "statist" character of the organization and the dominant role played by the developing countries; in other words, to the evolution during the past 40 years of a world system that is not to its liking. In forcing the break, however, the administration was careful to state that it did not reject multilateral cooperation, particularly in assistance to the Third World, and the State Department pledged to use the approximately 50 million dollars which had been contributed by the United States as annual dues to UNESCO for direct measures to assist the developing countries. A much smaller figure of 4.9 million dollars was ultimately arrived at, to be used in the form of voluntary contributions, primarily to UNESCO's scientific programs. This was reduced by the U.S. Senate to 2.7 million and finally to 1.2 million, a token contribution, which nevertheless signaled the US commitment to participation in multilateral activities.

What Can Be Done?

What can be done to improve the situation? One avenue is represented by the approach of the National Academy of Sciences, which has reviewed the benefits, on a

of socio-cultural disarray. At the same time, the sources, variety, and evidences of inspired ideas and idealism today are more widespread and numerous than they were in 1944 to 1946. Today, more individuals and groups, world-around, are working to improve human conditions and institutions. We need not wait for dramatic breakdowns to shake the comfortable complacency of the privileged centers of traditional power before planting the seeds and establishing the networks which will gradually transform the institutions of survival and world order. In fact, social, economic, scientific, and technological forces are already transcending and transforming the patterns and maps of the past, nationally and globally.

Breakdowns there will be, but we only need a small minority which does not succumb to the helplessness and hopelessness of crumbling civilizations. The results of the work of such a minority—the emergence of new orders which they had been working to create, often informally and “underground” or parallel—will be revealed by the crises.

S&T and finally to prepare for Vienna (UNCSTD 1979), turned out to be just so much wheel-spinning. Vacuous studies were undertaken, often by consultants with little feel or knowledge about the grass-roots situation. Infra-structure was developed and built in a haphazard fashion with little appropriate impact research or quality control. While old problems stood only partially solved, new ones were created. Huge gaps in funding were left with no hopes of ever filling them. Science and engineering councils were formed and laboratories built, but little grass-roots investigation preceded these activities and there was almost no follow-up. UNESCO funds were invested within the context of Paris-wrought general recommendations, e.g., to improve S&T communications and to develop some projects to fit the categories, yet, almost all activities were haphazard. No one looked carefully at the local level or sought to generate any agenda based on local needs, and in any event, whenever regional offices tried to respond to local grass-roots needs, Paris declared it unsuitable because it did not fit the context of some two-year program cycle, and as a result locally situated representatives were given neither the resources nor the means to respond.

It could be argued, of course, that UNESCO is doing its job so long as leading African scientists are brought into periodic global forums and as long as they continue to partake of the state of the art in S&T. UNESCO could also argue that as long as it supplies some educational assistance and helps to develop some S&T infra-structure it has met its obligations. But could it not be said that the inability of the African S&T infra-structure to absorb what UNESCO supplies, and its inability to generate conditions where it can adequately and productively absorb the internationally rendered S&T assistance is also UNESCO's problem? It is no exaggeration to say that UNESCO acts as if it knows best, but today only an incompetent or a masochist would agree to work for the UNESCO science office in the African field.

It can be asserted with some confidence that most all of Africa's S&T problems are particularly ill-suited to anything but the most local attention. Commenting on Norman Borlaug's attempts to organize a package to achieve improvements in maize and sorghum production in Africa, Thomas Odhiambo, director of the International Centre of Insect Physiology in Kenya, recently pointed out, yet again, that “much more research work has to be done on African staples and that the techniques developed in India cannot be transferred directly to Africa.”³ Dr. Nyle Brady, former director of International Rice Research, pointed out recently, “the only way we are going to help Africa solve its food problems is to help Africans do their research programmes themselves.”⁴ While agriculture is most sensitive to local conditions, all aspects related to ecological management, and the broad areas of human and animal health require local attention, and hence, local, and by definition locally sensitive capacities. None of this is particularly new; it has only recently been widely acknowledged.

Students of international organizations know, as do recipient countries, that IFAD is a reasonably cost-effective institution sensitive to local needs and conditions, and that UNESCO is at the opposite end of the scale. UNESCO is Paris centered, and in science it is especially over-bureaucratized and supply-side oriented. It is insensitive to local needs and it is structured and managed in such a way that grass-roots assistance is low priority. Yet for Africa, local capacity building at the grass-roots level is what is required.

Possible Solutions

Some possible options are:

1. In the area of S&T, UNESCO could become a more residual organization. It could retrace its roots and declare itself to be an intellectual body, and confine its concern

to the free flow of S&T information, to include exchanges of scientists, while continuing its efforts in science education. This would set UNESCO apart from other UN agencies and leave it to accomplish tasks largely left undone by others. But if UNESCO were to narrow its range of activities in this fashion, that would entail much restructuring, and call for a very different approach than is currently taken. In addition, an infusion of adequate funds would be required in order for UNESCO to perform effectively in this realm. If UNESCO took the above tasks seriously, it would soon discover the least developed parts of the world to be its major client group for S&T education, and that genuine S&T capacity building in Africa would be beneficially assisted. This would require UNESCO to become more professional in this more limited area, to become leaner in administration, and to emphasize a decentralization and improve its capacity to allocate quality assistance with greater speed. Its activities would become increasingly demand driven. Sometimes nickel-and-dime assistance would need to be rendered. For example, a badly indebted national government cuts education and research funds. Teachers, students, and research personnel no longer have access to S&T journals, articles, and books. When the national import licensing practices and controls on exchange keep foreign publications out of the country, school libraries and research agencies need assistance to counter such impediments. African nationals may not have access to regional facilities and may be unable to attend conferences. In such cases, UNESCO's man-on-the-spot can become the facilitator for providing stopgap assistance. In effect, UNESCO would be engaging in the sort of grass-roots S&T education capacity building and, equally important, capacity maintenance, which would foster the development of an indigenous S&T capacity.

This is not romantic work. It is less glamorous than the major projects and less interesting to western S&T establishments, yet, western S&T needs to lend a hand. What I am advocating is a revamping and refocusing of UNESCO's S&T assistance in Africa to enable it to do for S&T what UNICEF does for the welfare of children. High-quality, locally oriented, and flexible programs and policies which are demand driven are needed at the grass-roots level, with effective local representatives who are able to allocate discretionary funds quickly and effectively.

2. Another alternative method of reconceptualizing UNESCO's role in S&T is to confine its role to macro-global activities. The Paris-based capacity could confine itself to initiating and organizing major long-term R&D programs and conferences. Some of these programs—agricultural land surveillance, natural resource exploration, environmental change studies, etc.—could well assist African states to appropriately utilize and deploy their findings, especially once they have developed sufficiently powerful national capabilities. Such a role for UNESCO would not require it to develop greater regional capacity, nor would it require greater decentralization of its staff. Quite the contrary, UNESCO activities could become more centralized, while becoming more streamlined and efficient. Such a role would require it to divest itself of the executive role it now plays for UNDP. It could be empowered to deal directly with the S&T ministries in the individual states. In countries where no such ministry exists, the foreign offices would be preferable to the backwaters of the education ministries. UNESCO could then be responsive to the priorities of the international S&T communities. National Academies of Science and Engineering, UN agencies, the World Bank, FAO, etc., could all identify agenda items for long-term study, organization, and information dissemination. This approach would give UNESCO an honoral task, freeing it from the pretense of rendering development assistance in S&T per se.

3. A third alternative, the least desirable but the most likely, is for UNESCO to continue to muddle through its current range of activities, but even this would require

Each of these actions suggested for extra-governmental groups with regards to UNESCO can be broadened to become actions NGOs can take to assist in the reform and renewal of all parts of the UN system.

5. It will be important also to promote and to sponsor gatherings (and other means of exchange and discussion) in this country whereby concerned citizens can be informed of developments during the "transition period" and can formulate views on policies, strategies, and plans for American participation in multilateral cooperation. It appears that the government will not be self-starting in this respect nor does it intend to involve citizen groups in this form of "public diplomacy." Ideas need to come on the initiative of the extra-governmental communities, even on such matters as finance and voting which are usually seen as solely reserved for politics, "experts," and official diplomacy.

6. The determination to "stay in" for the long-term renewal of multilateral cooperation can be made evident by an invitation to groups in other countries to share images of alternative futures—the goals, principles, functions, structures, and procedures of multilateral cooperation toward which to work. As such images are made known they may be gathered into a draft "meta-constitution" or commentary on the present UNESCO Constitution, a new declaration by "we the peoples of the United Nations."

7. Meanwhile, for the short term, it will be important to identify those positive aspects of the operations of the present system which should be saved and how best to do so. For example, the principle of a competent and independent international civil service is under attack; that concept should not be lost. There is need to assure that selected forums and information flows continue to operate, insulated from disruption during a period of ferment.

Epilogue

1. In conducting an action plan such as that outlined in the preceding sections, there is a danger of too great a concentration on what seems feasible in the short run or on those ideas and projects of immediate attraction or benefit to the discussants. It may help to exercise imagination and a planetary view by first considering, in very broad terms, what world order arrangements would be desirable for the grandchildren of those living today, that is, about 100 years from now. In the light of such broad, speculative, even utopic visions, one may then ask where we would like the world of organized cooperation to be 15 to 20 years from today. Participants in the exercise would need to list their relevant assumptions about the world in the year 2000 and how, in both hopeful and realistic senses, multilateral cooperation is likely to look by that year. The concluding questions would be: To what extent, and how, can the desirable and the likely be reconciled? What strategies and optional paths can be suggested in this regard?

2. The United Nations system emerged out of the tribulation of a world war and the inspired efforts, led by a few groups, to work toward a better world. It is true that the motivations of those hoping to build institutions for peace and reconstruction were sometimes mixed with the intoxication of victory—and in the case of the U.S.A., that of unprecedented world power—leading to visionary and naive dreams. Nevertheless, the period 1944 to 1946 was a creative period for humanity.

Could we expect a comparable burst of determination and inspiration (hopefully mixed with realism and lessons learned) leading toward another progressive step in human institutions? Today the situation in the world is equally troubling—suffering, violence, militarization, super-power rivalry, threats of nuclear disaster, and symptoms

Examples of practical questions:

- Can there be more discrimination in management and administrative methods among different types of UNESCO operations—greater regionalization for some; greater autonomy for others?
- How to relate “operational” (development assistance) work to the basic tasks of promoting the advance and exchange of information and knowledge?

Action in a Transition Period

1. It may be useful to think in terms of an extended transition period as the world moves toward modified forms of universal multilateral cooperation in the fields of competence of UNESCO. Such an approach can allow the world to “get on” with existing useful cooperation while considering and negotiating alternative futures and alternative paths to those futures. Even the presently agreed reform measures will take considerable time for full application. It seems likely, moreover, that further more radical changes will come under discussion, especially in connection with the hoped-for return of the U.S.A. and the U.K. to that part of the universal system now represented by UNESCO. The crisis is one of the entire system of world order. It will impinge upon international organizations for some time, in part because we need to review more carefully the experience of 40 years. There is need also to build an informed public on a global scale.

2. The question must be posed: what specific steps can and should be taken now—by governments and interested non-governmental groups—to save valuable parts of the existing system and to improve cooperation in ways which move toward longer-term goals?

3. *Urgent immediate action.* The message from America in the last few years has been that we think UNESCO is not very important. Now our government seems to think even that multilateral cooperation in education, science, culture, and communications is not worth much attention. Selected bilateral arrangements are acceptable, but a cooperatively identified agenda of action is not, except on our terms. The official message to those in the world who believe in and desire to cooperate on universally determined common ground is that the United States doesn't care. An urgent step, therefore, is for professional, scientific, intellectual, and civic groups in this country to communicate the fact that many here do care and are working to re-establish the practical evidences of that caring.

4. Flowing from that first urgent step—a positive message to concerned communities abroad—are three related actions:

- a. Urge the major international NGOs to take an active interest in those UNESCO reforms most relevant to them;
- b. Urge those NGOs to consult together on common action vis-a-vis the director general and the Executive Board, including showing a willingness to discuss how the NGOs can be most helpful in the reform process, and recommending consideration of further changes which would give the NGOs a greater voice in and responsibility for the work of UNESCO; and
- c. Provide a single, continuing American link with “universality” groups in other countries, with UNESCO clubs and associations, and with selected National Commissions.

reforms. Member governments and scientists need to apply pressure, if not threats, to insist that the next administration clean its house, reorganize itself, and rearrange its priorities. The fact that S&T is central to development needs to be stressed. UNESCO must become, in large measure, demand driven. The Paris Science Division needs to be streamlined, and its activities decentralized into regions and sub-regions, along with new budget restructuring, realignment in its decision-making authority, and reallocation of programs with a maximum amount of flexibility. Programs geared to the least developed of the states need to become “user-friendly” rather than “UNESCO Paris-friendly.”

It should be obvious that sending science teachers to African schools without funding for teaching materials and laboratory equivalent is senseless. Building exotic laboratories in Africa without insuring that they are adequately staffed and maintained well at the local level is senseless. To train an African scientist for cancer research and repatriate him to a locale where no research facilities or funding exists is senseless. To develop elaborate science education programs for secondary schools where they cannot be executed given the paucity of science teachers and equivalent is senseless. In short, UNESCO Paris is ripe for a confrontation with African realities.

Conclusions

One is on reasonably safe grounds to suggest that since under the current administration prospects for serious change are unlikely, the current head of UNESCO should be replaced. The time is propitious for developing alternative models for UNESCO S&T activities for the coming decade, for taking stock of past and present UNESCO failures, and for setting a more realistic focus on actual client needs. To accomplish this, two kinds of pressure would prove helpful: (1) pressure from the international scientific establishment on UNESCO for a restructuring of its goals in line with client S&T needs in ways that are user-friendly; (2) experts should work out alternative plans for UNESCO which are better suited to the needs of the S&T community, and which can be supported by their governments and professional organizations, and by the UN. UNESCO is aware that its programs are ineffectual. It can either be left to die a slow death at the great expense of those states who need its services most, or it can be resuscitated. The process of resuscitation requires that S&T needs be placed center stage in any development plan for Africa. Africa urgently needs to develop national S&T capacities, to conduct local R&D, and to develop national S&T decision-making capacity. The test for UNESCO in the field of S&T development is whether it can help its client states develop national and regional capacities. Since the task is huge, it requires the best efforts of governments and international agencies. African governments have not often given S&T sufficient priority, it is true, but UNESCO has operated ineffectively more often than not. The international S&T community may have little influence over African governments, but the S&T establishment can speak out to urge UNESCO reforms in S&T. This may seem like a small step, but it could be a constructive one at a time when UNESCO's future is uncertain. A reformed, streamlined, and effective UNESCO will be welcomed by everyone, which includes UNESCO's most ardent Third World defenders. For Third World countries, in general, and African countries in particular, there is a large ideological stake in supporting UNESCO. At the moment such political and ideological support can be harnessed and in due course lead to concrete reforms. The relatively high visibility that the UNESCO crisis has produced raises obstacles but also opportunities for constructive change.

Notes

1. I have benefitted from discussions with Dr. Robert Maybury. Since his retirement from UNESCO Dr. Maybury has been a consultant for the World Bank. See also Charles Davis, "L'UNESCO et la Promotion des Politiques Scientifiques Nationales en Afrique Sub-Saharienne 1960-1979," *Etudes Internationales* 14, no. 4 (1983).
2. "Crises of Research," *West Africa*, 14 October 1985, p. 2157-60.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 2158.
4. *Ibid.*

Examples of practical questions:

- What size and method of operation of the UNESCO Executive Board is best?
- What relationship of the Executive Board to governing councils of specialized/functional programs would be more efficient?

4. In considering modifications in the arrangements for both policy-making and operations oversight, a major question will be to examine roles and relationships at all levels for such actors as international non-governmental associations and transnational corporations.

Since establishment of the UN system, the number and diversity of actors on the world scene has increased dramatically. The relationships among those actors and with the intergovernmental organizations are in flux. The issues with which the several actors deal have multiplied and become more complex. Yet the arrangements by which the voices of these actors are heard, in which their interactions take place, and by which their rights and responsibilities are defined and enforced have not been modified commensurate with the changed world environment.

Examples of practical questions:

- To what extent could non-governmental actors be given representation on governing councils and advisory boards?
- How would such representation be arranged?

5. Multilateral cooperation programs are generally administered by central, international secretariats which are supposed to be accountable for performance. To what extent can program and project operations be deconcentrated and in what manner in order to gain flexibility and effectiveness?

It is likely that international cooperative operations will continue to grow more varied and complex. On the one hand, greater international efforts will be required to meet basic human needs (created by increased velocity of transactions and information; greater technological impacts in general; increased concentration of populations—urbanization, population growth, and migration). Moreover, there is, it appears, no reversing the demands and impacts of continued advances in science and technology which call for enhanced exchange of information. The tendency in the past has been to apply the same models of management to all types of operations and for governments to demand frequent possibilities of intervention, review and accountability which result in a high degree of centralization and uncertainty. How can greater continuity, resiliency, and diversity be facilitated in ways which give governments a reasonable degree of assurance as to efficiency and integrity of administration and as to effectiveness?

Just as American and other governments are advocating decentralization and delegation of authority in UNESCO, so should those governments, in the policy-making and supervisory structures and procedures of the international institutions, practice what they preach for others. In this regard, they should welcome greater aid and assistance from the international non-governmental organizations in the processes of international governance. They could give selected INGO's roles and responsibilities in those processes while retaining ultimate authority themselves. This means, of course, that so-called authoritative political judgements by government representatives are reserved to be debated only after careful preparation, at appropriate times, and at highest possible levels.

Principal Factors to Be Considered in Re-thinking Multilateral Cooperation and UNESCO's Mandate

1. At all levels of cooperation (policy-making, oversight, operations) in education, science, culture, and communications, what can be said about relationships among those fields?

Is there synergy to be gained by close working relationships on programs and projects in education, science, culture, and communications? Are there practical political considerations (for governments) in retaining education, science, culture, and communications in one organizational context? Does such a grouping have merit for coordination and interaction with other parts of the UN system? Could any one or more of the UNESCO fields be usefully separated from the others, totally or partially?

The answer to such difficult questions can be illuminated by a re-examination of the basic reasons for multilateral cooperation. Leaving aside the broad goal of "building the defense of peace," the major purposes of cooperation (as revealed in the UNESCO Constitution and related General Conference resolutions) appear to be:

- advancing human knowledge;
- promoting understanding among peoples;
- enhancing human dignity and human rights.

The first two of these purposes can be subsumed under the broad aim of cooperation to advance the learning capacity of all the societies of humankind. More or less directly, moreover, the enhancements of human dignity (opportunity, equality, solidarity) require the development of learning.

Learning capacity depends on a combination of factors: a society and culture which values learning; a system of education (formal and informal); active scientific inquiry; and the communication of and access to information and knowledge. There appears, thus, to be at least a theoretical organic link or mutually reinforcing relationship among education, science, culture, and communications, even though this is not always reflected in a political or an administrative sense, nationally or internationally.

2. How is multilateral cooperation affected by the nature of the *intergovernmental policy-making machinery*? The answer to this question requires consideration of agendas, structures, and procedures (including questions of frequency and phasing) of such policy-making:

- at the "central" (planetary, universal) level;
- the extent and form of deconcentration of policy-making on a geographical (regional) and or functional basis;
- the manner in, and level at which policy and strategy recommendations are developed for transmittal to the principal policy-making organs.

Examples of practical questions:

- What are the relationships between the UNESCO General Conference, on the one hand, and the United Nations General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and regional organizations and commissions on the other?
- Should the UNESCO General Conference meet in full session every two years or less frequently?

3. The manner in which *continuing oversight* of programs and projects is exercised—through interpretation of policy, adjustments in operations, evaluation of operations and of results—needs critical review.

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Walter Kohn

The discussion focused on UNESCO's role in science development in Africa, although other fields (education and technical assistance), and other geographic areas (Asia, Latin America) were also repeatedly referred to.

The main issue was what kind of structural change in the science area of UNESCO would make it more effective.

More centralization in Paris? The majority view was negative as far as science assistance programs were concerned. Centralized administration of UNESCO's science and technology activities would be satisfactory, as long as the organization confines itself to global or regional long-term research and development programs and conferences, such as natural resources surveys and studies of environmental change. But what is needed in Africa is locally oriented flexible programs and policies which are demand driven at the grass-roots level. Agriculture, for example, is most sensitive to local environmental conditions, as are other aspects of ecological management, including questions of human and animal health. For Africa, local capacity in science and technology must be built at the regional and national level.

More regional centers are needed. Here the Bangkok education office was mentioned as a successful example of a center which has taken imaginative and effective initiatives. Projected regional science centers in Latin America were mentioned.

Especially in Africa, because of communication difficulties, continent-wide or regional centers would have to be supplemented by effective local offices. Participants from UNESCO emphasized that UNESCO must work with member governments, which often severely limits possible courses of action. Local governments often give science a very low priority. Other participants took the view that if local UNESCO officials had a small discretionary budget, which could be quickly brought into action, local government officials would be more responsive. The question was raised, however, whether UNESCO's general conference would be at all agreeable to the idea of discretionary budgets.

This raised the broader question whether UNESCO, an intergovernmental organization, is in principle a good agency for science and technology support in Africa. The International Foundation for Science (IFS), a non-governmental organization, was commended for great effectiveness. It is able to deal directly with individual scientists and their universities or research institutions. In contrast, UNESCO in most countries must work with the ministry of education, which is usually completely unsuited to handle science and technology issues.

Other issues discussed included the following:

Is the current strong centralization in Paris in part explicable by the African and French cultural background of the last two directors general, Rene Mahen and Amadou Mahtar M'Bow?

Is there a relative *under-emphasis* of science in African education and, if so, is this a general colonial heritage, similar to what is found in Latin America?

UNESCO should not be judged solely on the basis of its science programs in developing countries. Its record in the global literacy program was said to be very good. The problem of science education is very hard, even in many developed countries.

Centralization vs. decentralization is only one problem concerning development of sci-

ence and technology capacity in less developed countries. The other is *improvement* of the operation in UNESCO headquarters.

An intrinsic organizational problem is that UNESCO is by no means the only UN agency concerned with science. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) are examples of agencies concerned with applied science. Hence the proper emphasis of UNESCO (often hard to sell) should be basic science and science education.

SESSION IV

THE UNITED STATES, UNESCO, AND GLOBAL COOPERATION IN SCIENCE, EDUCATION, CULTURE, AND COMMUNICATIONS

ISSUE PAPER

How to Think about the Future of Multilateral Cooperation in the Fields of UNESCO: What Do We Do Next?

John E. Fobes

Salient Features of the Present Condition

1. The UNESCO General Conference has approved a long list of reforms which apply to the Secretariat, the Executive Board, and the Conference itself. The Board has charged its Special Committee with overseeing the implementation of those reforms. Both organs have expressed the hope that the U.S. will return to membership as soon as possible, leaving initiative in this respect to Washington presumably to announce its satisfaction with changes made by UNESCO and to deposit a note reaffirming its adherence to the UNESCO Constitution. No thought has been given to a negotiating strategy or mechanism which would allow for conversations between the parties concerning understandings or conditions involved in a "return to the fold."

2. Meanwhile, the Organization is passing through a very difficult period resulting from the loss of contributions of the United States and the United Kingdom. Staff and program activities must be drastically reduced, including support for international non-governmental organizations.

3. The U.S. administration gives no public evidence of thinking about reentry into UNESCO.

- It has not specified the terms and conditions on which it would consider reentry.
- It has said nothing about the way in which it would enter into negotiations with the Member States or the main organs of UNESCO.
- This attitude has been noted by other governments, UNESCO National Commissions, and by international NGOs. Some are puzzled by the American attitude; others are dismayed or even angry.

4. The administration shows little evidence of considering alternative forms and channels of cooperation to those furnished by UNESCO.

5. On these points the administration has not taken significant steps to consult interested American institutions and individuals. It has allowed appointments to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO to lapse.

6. At the same time, with a few exceptions, American non-governmental groups have brought little pressure to bear on either the executive or legislative branches, nor have they presented ideas for the future.

7. Nevertheless, there appears to be a slow growth of concern for the future of multilateral cooperation among members of the informed public. Some see the problems related to UNESCO—with the Organization itself or with U.S. participation therein—as symptomatic of the situation of the United Nations system in general. Forty years after the founding of that system, these persons want to promote reform and renewal of international organizations, a rethinking of world order.

What should be the role of non-governmental organizations?

There was general agreement by all speakers that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) should be given a wider role within UNESCO.

Some of the most valuable work in the organization is currently being carried out by NGOs, according to several speakers. The role of the International Council of Museums was cited. One speaker suggested that NGOs might be included in the Executive Board, as occupational NGOs were represented on the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization. Other speakers did not think it was necessary that NGOs be included in the Executive Board but that they should have some role within the executive branch of the organization.

Some speakers were concerned that non-governmental organizations might be too influenced or dominated by their membership from Western countries and might be insufficiently concerned about the problems of the Third World countries. Others pointed out that some NGOs were more representative geographically than many (non-UN) intergovernmental organizations. Some NGOs, it was stated, were too dominated by governments. Several speakers pointed out that it was difficult to make generalizations since there was such a wide variety of non-governmental organizations.

The outstanding role which NGOs have played in the human rights work of the United Nations was mentioned. Speakers also referred to the overwhelming sympathy in the scientific community for an increased role for NGOs within UNESCO.

SESSION III
RESTRUCTURING UNESCO

ISSUE PAPER
Restructuring UNESCO?

Federico Mayor

What seems more advisable? To try to adapt UNESCO to the requirements of the world as it is now, forty years after its foundation, or to design and build up *de novo* another organization or organizations able to fulfill today its permanent aims? Is it really worth undertaking the profound transformation needed? Is it still possible? And, first of all, do the leit motifs, the spirit and needs which led to the creation of UNESCO within the framework of the UN remain unchanged, with the same strength, or have they lost, even partially, their pressure, usefulness, and/or expectations?

I am firmly convinced that the *raison d'être* of UNESCO is at present even more important than at the end of the Second World War. And it is from this very deep feeling that I am addressing this meeting, convened at such a suitable moment. I feel very honoured to be able to discuss with such distinguished colleagues my views on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It was geographically not far from here on a global scale, that the United Nations Charter emerged to tell people all over the world that the dignity of every woman and every man would be henceforth a common concern, that the different nations, regardless of their dimensions and characteristics, should remain united in order to solve their disagreements in a peaceful way, and that education, science, and culture are the only solid grounds on which the future of mankind should be constructed. I speak from these convictions, having especially in mind the experience acquired as former university rector, deputy director general of UNESCO, and minister of education and science in Spain. I feel very free to express to you my opinions and queries, because I can talk about the institution and its future with appreciation for the precious contribution afforded to it in the past and today by a great number of devoted international civil servants, and because of my unchanging personal affections.

As you know, the General Conference of UNESCO held in Sofia last fall, approved several reforms and instructed the Executive Board to oversee putting them into practice. I will not repeat nor discuss these measures and their potential effectiveness. It seems to me more interesting to approach the subject from less conventional angles, focusing my attention on those which I think specially relevant to reshape the organization with more radical changes. I do so without underestimating the reforms already accomplished and those that, as agreed in the General Conference, should be carried out in the near future, despite the special difficulties to be faced during this period.

Concerning the U.S., I assume that it does not consider education and science development less important on a global scale today than in 1945. I assume too that the U.S. does not consider that the creation of another institution (or institutions) can be envisaged right now as more effective and/or convenient for multilateral cooperation in these fields than an adequate renewal of UNESCO. Because, besides the impact of such a decision on the UN as a whole, and the number and dimensions of the obstacles that would oppose its implementation, the world is much more interdependent today than it was four decades ago. Unfortunately, the links based on solidarity are not as well recognized as those of a progressive reciprocal necessity. Multilateral cooperation in education,

science, and culture—interacting in a synergistic way—is essential for development, for the filling of the lacunae that the international scene so bitterly shows.

John Fobes has written some very sensible words on the system of international cooperation in general, and on the right structural and institutional changes to make. Alex King published some very constructive suggestions on UNESCO in *Le Monde*, and T. Trister Gati has collected a valuable set of opinions on the present situation and possibilities for future action in the book *The U.S., the UN and the Management of Global Change*.

What are the requisites needed *sine qua non* to reinstate the organization at the level which is indispensable if it wants to really accomplish its task? The principle of universality and the principle of efficiency, allowing it to face today's challenges with the solutions and means of today, obviously demand: a) the return of the countries that withdrew from the organization (without the reincorporation of the U.S. and U.K., any approach for reshaping UNESCO is devoid of meaning); b) providing the director general (DG) with wide support because otherwise the drastic reforms and innovations that are needed cannot be implemented with the rhythm and vigor which seem to be indispensable. In close collaboration with an ad hoc committee designated by the Executive Board, the DG should be given special powers for two years in order to bring into effect the necessary changes and to draw up and put forward a new program.

This "new" program should be really different from previous ones in that it should include only a few multidisciplinary activities for major global aims. The other activities sponsored or encouraged by UNESCO, either as part of its program or as specific services, should be given their own financial and executive means. In each case, these should be decided in agreement with the respective NGOs and/or IGOs.

A high-level team should be set up, with an advisory committee whose members would be selected from the best world experts, so that the DG, instead of being buried under mountains of papers, has enough time to read, listen, and think—like that lucky Japanese, who, when I asked him what his role in the company was, blushed and told me: "They pay me to think." I realized I had found the key to Japanese progress. The administration of the international secretariat, in particular, must be in the hands of someone really professional.

The decentralization which should be undertaken without delay also requires the special powers I have just mentioned. This decentralization has three facets: a) of the internal structures and competences; b) a suitable territorial distribution with a wide range of delegated capacities; and c) most important of all, a functional decentralization, which means the full use of the educational, scientific, and cultural communities and associations, particularly through the NGOs, to carry out the organization's program and activities.

Consultative arrangements are needed so that UNESCO has at its disposal the potential advice and collaboration of all the world's intellectuals. This is its greatest wealth and strength, and is what makes it possible for the organization to reach its high aims. There are thousands of NGOs. However, as in Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, many organizations are in search of their specificity, or their exact role in an international scenario which is getting more and more accelerated.

One of the crucial tasks of an organization whose mission, as set out in its constitution, is to throw light on ways to be followed and to shape future horizons, must be to encourage a rapid betterment in the general intellectual level. Naturally, the brain of such an organization should constitute the largest part. In fact, the institutions tend to undergo a "dinosaurian" metamorphosis: after a number of years, without the change being noticed, its enormous body contrasts with the relatively stunted development of its

REPORT OF DISCUSSION

Virginia Leary

The Following Questions Were Discussed in Session III:

Is the need for restructuring the real problem in the UNESCO crisis?

Several speakers stated that restructuring is not the main issue in the UNESCO crisis. In their view, the real issue is the antipathy towards multilateral cooperation prevalent in the United States, particularly evidenced by criticism of the United Nations and its agencies. Other concerns in the U.S. relate to a perceived anti-Israeli bias, press and communication questions, and the actions of the present director general of UNESCO. A number of speakers cited examples of the current anti-internationalist spirit in the United States fostered by the Heritage Foundation. The Kassebaum proposal limiting the U.S. contribution to the UN was mentioned in particular.

Restructuring of UNESCO—for what purpose?

One participant asked whether the need for restructuring of UNESCO was a topic raised simply to satisfy the desires of the United States or whether restructuring was needed to improve the work of UNESCO. In the ensuing discussion, it was agreed that some restructuring would improve the work of UNESCO. The complexity of the issues relating to education, science, and culture and the extraordinary developments in these fields since the founding of UNESCO led various speakers to urge that a restructuring would be helpful in carrying out its objectives. It was observed that the organization had taken on too many and diverse functions and some administrative reform was necessary.

What changes would be beneficial in restructuring UNESCO?

A number of suggestions were made for improving the functioning of the organization. Support was expressed by several speakers for the suggestion in the paper by Federico Mayor that the functional activities of UNESCO should largely be taken over by outside organizations, particularly non-governmental organizations. The primary activity of UNESCO would then be to facilitate planning by these organizations on programs relating to science, education, and culture, and international cooperation among member states in funding and carrying out such programs. Mayor's suggestion of a high-level advisory group of intellectuals was supported by several speakers. Some speakers cautioned, however, that a total planning approach with only outside organizations carrying out the functional activities might not be feasible in working with less developed countries, which might prefer direct involvement of a UN specialized agency such as UNESCO.

One speaker suggested that the General Conference be abolished since it was the major source of politicization. Others disagreed but suggested that the Conference could be held much less frequently.

There was much discussion of the one-nation, one-vote representation issue. A suggestion was made that a tricameral type of representation which would take into account member states, their population size, and financial contribution might be useful. Some speakers felt that any effort to change the fundamental voting structure within UNESCO would result in immense controversy which could paralyze the organization for years. Others felt that changing the voting power by recognizing financial contributions would turn UNESCO into a World Bank type of organization and would be unacceptable to member states.

If one felt it productive to use the devices of departure and economic sanctions to bring organizational change, then such action should have been taken in a timely fashion—at the general conference, not the executive committee—and with sufficient negotiation behind the scenes to bring about the desired change concomitantly. Negotiations would have mollified many of the Third World nations. The U.S. chose the extreme position, and we turned our backs on possible new alliances.

In the Reagan world, seen through a prism of “us” and “them,” we have lost the flexibility that had come from the softening of ideologies elsewhere. Unilateral U.S. policy rather than multilateral action in the Caribbean in recent years is a threat to sovereignty in the eyes of the Third World. The image and ideal of America as a microcosm of the world community is fading. Today we could rejoin UNESCO and save what has been accomplished in international patent law. Cultural preservation could be enhanced and scientific agreements continued. But perhaps not again in our lifetime will we have the window of opportunity Reagan inherited and disavowed.

brain. The needs of the huge machine become so demanding that its function drops into second place. It is true that UNESCO has done, and still is doing, an admirable job, but it is not surprising that, after forty years, it has reached the point where it has to spend a good deal of its time checking and repairing the vehicle itself, instead of attending to the direction to steer it in, and its running speed. The solution is either to reduce the size of its body, or to enlarge its brain. Or to do both at once, which would be the best idea.

The measures to be taken to achieve this necessary change should be rigorous and vigorous, which does not mean brusque or inconsiderate. All energy must be applied to the task, since without the maximum effort it will be impossible to adapt to present reality and regain credibility, once the right line of action has been decided. But a firm hand can work delicately. The disease UNESCO has caught, apart from its own special anomalies, is quite a common one. It is the common illnesses, though, which are the most difficult to diagnose and cure. We must use this crisis to preserve everything which should be preserved, and transform all that should be transformed. This is the only way to avoid having to consider a, or some, new organization(s) free from the dead-weights and inertia of the present organization. To shift from recommendations to *recommendations*, from words to achievements, from disenchantment to hope requires not only willingness but the belief that the treatment is the most correct, and that improvement is possible.

We have reached the end of a cycle, produced by scientific progress and technology. It is not a question of changing priorities, but of redefining concepts. It is not a question of reducing the importance of the place occupied up to now, and quite rightly, by education. That would be a terrible mistake, because, with education, science, and culture there is no rivalry for first place, but rather, all three, on the same level, influence each other deeply. However, if science and its practical applications are emphasized, education will not be subordinated but upgraded into the new context. Cultural advances should also benefit from the new possibilities offered by the development of science, whose social impacts should be carefully weighed, to make sure that more positive than negative effects will be the end result. To recognize the present and foreseeable role of science in this interdependent field does not mean to unbalance it but to take into account what Ortega said: “Reality always takes revenge when we ignore her.” Techno-economists often see reality just in monetary terms, without bearing in mind other parameters of social and political reality, which can only be addressed by remaining in the arena. We are not living the decline of an era, but its culmination and the birth of a period in which creativity finally takes the place of routine and, happily, “brain force” substitutes for “work force.”

Since a restructuring is feasible, to look for another solution, instead of up-dating UNESCO would have very adverse repercussions on the system of the United Nations.

In the present situation, UNESCO cannot dissociate itself, when adopting radical solutions, from the rest of the specialized agencies of the United Nations and maybe even from the UN itself. On the other hand, with the present trend towards a higher degree of agreement (hopefully not of condominium) between the superpowers, it is not likely that such an important decision, which could mean the beginning of a sort of “chain reaction” weakening the UN system, would be adopted.

Reshaping UNESCO could set a positive precedent for other institutions. I really cannot believe, sincerely, that anyone is aiming to weaken or leave on one side the United Nations, an organization which has done so much good service to humanity, and will do more in the future. Its main function has been prevention. The trouble is, what has been prevented is never seen, although this is the ideal solution to all problems. It is true that only generals who have won battles get medals, and those who avoided wars are

forgotten. The United Nations has, in spite of all its faults, done immense service to mankind. And UNESCO—including UNESCO in the last few years—has not ceased to work against ignorance and in favor of a strengthening of scientific cooperation, as well as to preserve and increase the natural and artistic heritage of the world, though with special emphasis on those countries whose need is greatest. It is no use looking for evidence of UNESCO's work in the developed countries. These are the ones whose role it is to give generously towards aid and cooperation for the developing areas of the world. It is in countries which still have a long way to go along the road of social progress and justice for all where UNESCO has its more relevant part to play. If there are no boundaries for the negative effects of development, there should not be any for the positive ones. Hope needs some achievements, because the relevance of any activity depends on the results, on the solutions actually provided. Science and technology today help much more those already in possession of them. Soon, 80 percent of the world's population will be in the Third World, and it is their problems (of nutrition, disease, etc.) that the developed countries should think about, in order to find solutions together. To establish networks of institutions in developing countries is extremely worthwhile to strengthen their educational and scientific infra-structure. A private foundation has recently set up a Media Resources Service. To provide the best expertise all over the world to solve (or to study) a particular problem, especially in the LDCs, would be an excellent achievement, preferably in collaboration with ICSU, as a "SOS-Science Service."

How can the intergovernmental requirements and procedures be reconciled with the specificity and the long-term range of the intellectual goals and achievements? How can the decision makers encompass their needs for rapidly visible results with the slow but deep transformation produced by education and science? Enhancing the cooperation to take place at the highest level, and refining the follow-up machinery would be very helpful, together with a sharp and progressive reinforcement of the role of the NGOs both at the advisory and executive levels. These transformations would increase, on the one hand, the feasibility and strength of the governmental involvement at the decision level and, on the other hand, the flexibility and speed of the resulting activities, UNESCO being an indispensable mediator and catalyst among interacting nations united, regardless of their ideologies, towards common goals.

The community of intellectuals needs to give the decision makers proof of its ability to solve problems, its capacity to foresee, its skill in strategy planning and its willingness to cooperate for the good of society. Intellectuals are the salt of the earth—but the earth belongs to others, whose leaders often think salt must be used with great care. It is unusual to find state powers who are not wary of intellectuals, even though this group generally offers an objective and critical vision which can be extremely useful in anticipating and correcting errors.

The transformation of UNESCO requires new concepts, new approaches, new formulae, new perspectives in time, and new procedures. Consensus can be a good solution—provided agreement is not reached at the lowest level. We must also reconcile the interest of governments in visible short-term actions with middle and long-term forecasts.

We need to find the creative, economic, technical, and political forces able to bring about the change: it is essential to have the necessary means and know-how to make a real transformation, from which we shall all benefit, and in which design all should participate—but only those able to work efficiently, at whatever level of formation of training, should do so, without any thought of special gain. "Democratic" procedures are meaningless on a technical level where what matters for society is the result, not

Even if the Soviets were weaker and the U.S. awakening to its potential, was UNESCO the correct vehicle for the exercise of our options? Reagan said no. The factors in the administration's decision seemed to be as follows:

- The budget needed cutting. The UN budget was to be reduced by 25 percent. UNESCO appeared the most vulnerable.
- M'Bow was an impossible leader.
- The Secretariat was incompetent.

My evaluations of these points, which were considered by the administration, differed!

The total budget of UNESCO was pathetically small. We as a world community were trying to eradicate illiteracy along with assisting in all the other good things on the UNESCO agenda all with a sum less than half that spent for higher education in the state of Florida. While the total was small, the funds available were not well targeted. Too much was spent in Paris and on too many underfunded projects. Redirection of the budget was the one area of agreement between the Soviets and the U.S. Slow positive changes had been brought about in recent years. I am in no position to evaluate present budgets. All I know is that the trend line has been in the direction of increased efficiency.

M'Bow was the U.S. candidate for secretary general of UNESCO. He organized a strong, politically sophisticated caucus of the African delegates. On the issue of sanctions against Israel and press censorship he had used his political muscle to bring about resolutions amenable to the U.S.

As an individual, M'Bow looked for U.S. acceptance and never gained it. This personal saga, which included racial discrimination, was a long, sad tale. Unnecessary disaffection was the result. Through 1980 I thought this personal problem could be overcome.

M'Bow was educated in France and was more French than a Frenchman in matters of administration. Every decision was centralized, to the dismay of all raised in an American style of administration.

M'Bow also made the decision to incorporate within his administration professionals from all over the world in as close to representative numbers as possible. This affirmative action approach worked to the disadvantage of the highly trained from educationally advanced countries. Appointments to the Secretariat had been used by M'Bow to enhance his own power base in the organization. Cronyism was the name given by the West to his hiring practices. Added to all these problems was the difficulty faced by all UN agencies of molding an accepted administrative practice from the vast array of expressions and expectations represented in an international Secretariat.

Unfortunately, at no time during the Reagan administration's debate did there appear to be an evaluation of the routine activities of UNESCO. America's stake in international patent law was large. UNESCO patent agreements represented major dollars for American corporations. The U.S. science community would need to invent other avenues for international cooperation if UNESCO channels were to become closed to our participation. Perhaps preservation activities were the most lasting of UNESCO endeavors. I weighed positively these activities and questioned whether we could afford to remain aloof. Debates on the role of Israel and the new information order were hot and heavy. In such matters, I would rather be a party to the discussion than be outside the debate.

Also not weighed in the Reagan equation was the fact that the Third World viewed UNESCO as theirs—good or bad. If one wished to exert leadership in the Third World, one did not abruptly turn one's back on a principle institution that represents the Third World.

The UNESCO Withdrawal: A Lost Opportunity

Barbara W. Newell

The foreign policy of Ronald Reagan has lost this nation a unique opportunity for world leadership. The withdrawal from UNESCO was an early and significant sign of U.S. disregard for Third World concerns. With this action new alliances were made difficult. The luster of America as sensitive to "the huddled masses" was once more tarnished.

To speak of opportunity lost, one must first be persuaded that a new era of U.S. leadership was possible. To a major extent, this optimism rested on a perceived bankruptcy of the Soviets—our chief competitor for leadership. The Russians had proven themselves ineffective in the arena of economic assistance. Only as the receptor of large numbers of Third World students was their impact extensive. Despite Soviet hospitality, Third World students criticized the quality of the Soviet technical training and the racial discrimination they encountered in the USSR. Without question, American educational opportunities were more highly prized, and America's struggle for internal civil rights reform was admired.

Not only had the Soviets proven ineffective as assistants for economic development, their economic model at home was in disarray. Since the twenties the Russian experiment had been a magnet for those seeking economic and social change. That luster was fading. Inefficiencies and recent lack of growth, when coupled with personal and social constraints caused Third World planners to look elsewhere. Yugoslavia, China, and a host of other countries were developing more promising models. A view of the world as purely "Reds" or "Free" was a distortion, which could lead to very faulty policy determinations. The new less dogmatic economic planning should have strengthened the U.S. position, for pragmatism and "know how" are our long suits.

As the Third World looked for "know how," they most frequently translated that to mean "American science." It was to us that they turned for development assistance with a new fervor.

Serendipitously, at the same time developing countries began looking westward, the Soviets committed an extreme act in the eyes of the new nations by violating the sovereignty of Afghanistan. The one issue which united all Third World countries was the issue of sovereignty. This half-century of new nationhood placed a premium on the sanctity of sovereignty. The Soviet invasion provided the "coup de grace" to Soviet effectiveness in the international arena. If Russia could not help development, their economic model did not work at home, their racial policies grated, and they had no respect for the sovereignty of others then, reasoned the leadership of developing nations, let us turn to others.

The United States had positive attributes enhanced by Carter initiatives. Yes, the economy was working and American science was an effective dynamic for economic growth. In the United Nations, America's civil rights movement was hailed as a statement of hope and an illustration of the strength of our democracy. Andrew Young was the symbol, but others joined the corps as well. In UNESCO alone, Ambassador Torres (Hispanic) and career diplomat Hardy (black) opened doors no Anglo diplomats could open. The U.S. was a member of the Americas group, the Pacific basin alliance, and the Western caucus. Add a substantial black presence to the American delegation and the U.S. was the only Western power with informal access to the African delegation. America's place as a truly multi-ethnic, multi-cultural nation, not purely a "Western" nation, was being felt for the first time.

equal collaboration, in the same way as a successful surgical operation depends on each member of the team carrying out his job, and not on everyone using the scalpel at once. The countries of the OECD contribute 74 percent of UNESCO's funds. To forget this would be as wrong as to forget the significance—with its analogies and differences—of the socialist bloc countries; or the cultural and demographic weight of China and India; or the extensive horizon of Latin America (with Brazil at its heart); or the existence of numerous small countries taking their first steps towards independence who find around them many more phagocytes, ready to gobble them up militarily or economically, than offers of aid for their real liberation; or, finally, the weight, equal in terms of human dignity, of any person, from any country, from any educational or social strata. It would put things out of perspective in the same way to forget that, of all the sectors of the United Nations system the most complex and the most vulnerable, the one which is, because of its nature, more open to opinions and less easy to evaluate objectively, is that dealing with culture, education, and science. The need for nutrition, forecasting the weather, or correcting pathological imbalances in the biological substrata are clearly less questionable, and can be approached and decided, even when considered from very different viewpoints, on a purely technical level. In those areas touching the spirit, touching what distinguishes man from the rest of creation, while being the highest and the most important, remain the most defenseless, the ones who are watched most closely from the positions of power, because it is on them that the shape of the future depends.

It is clear that, when we think about how the organization can be renewed and updated completely, we need to define the alternatives that exist. In order to do this, first we must consider the most outstanding work in the sectors which UNESCO carries out at the moment, and decide if it is feasible and advisable for other organizations to do it. Very briefly, and just as examples:

- a. *In communications*, an important task of UNESCO would be to encourage the independence of the IPDC, by creating a fund to make it possible for the developing countries to bring their media up to the necessary level of technology. In this field, it is especially important to concentrate on the practical, since theorizing can produce paradoxical situations, in which some countries support freedom of expression in international texts while denying it to their citizens. Besides, declarations and statements can do little against the overwhelming predominance of external sources of information. The best way is to be able to broadcast one's own news.
- b. *In the social sciences*, to encourage advanced study centers to work on all those questions directly related to UNESCO's area of competence, and particularly, the regional and global implications of technological progress for the present of the world's peoples and for a definition of their future strategies.
- c. *In culture*, the most important action would be to patronize a world-wide fund for the protection of the historical, artistic, and natural heritage of humanity. It should also encourage the enlarging of this heritage. Culture is not the reflection of past times, but rather the strength of a present capacity for creation. All this should be under the auspices of UNESCO, though not administered by it. UNESCO is the promoter, the watchtower, and the signpost pointing the direction to go in, but it cannot, without running the risk of growing so huge as to be totally inefficient, administer everything it originates. The CERN, the IBI, etc., are good examples of this function as inspirer, which corresponds to the nations as a group.

- d. *In science*, to encourage international scientific cooperation, joining forces, counting on the consultantship of the ICSU and other prestigious scientific institutions to draw up large integrated programs, while leaving it to the most suitable NGOs to actually get them going. Promote, channel ideas, supervise—but trust the appropriate international or regional organizations to put the plans into practice. In this way, scientists and administrators would find in UNESCO and its constellation of NGOs and IGOs the best system for receiving advice and carrying it out.
- e. *In education*, the leading sector, in which all governments assume a direct and committed responsibility, the IBE and several NGOs should take on more responsibilities in order to carry out the task of up-grading the educational process actually demanded by the days we are living. Periodic meetings of the ministers of education would guide the action to be carried out or the appropriate correction to the present system, on the basis of suggestions from a UNESCO Council for Education.

Not every country has a science minister. It is true that there are countries with ministers—and no science—and vice versa, countries with science and no minister. However, it is foreseeable that in the era of knowledge, more and more countries will be appointing someone in the government to be responsible for science and its application.

If the requirements I have just mentioned were fulfilled, a medium-term plan to be submitted in 1989, representing a real shift in the direction of the life of the institution, could be worked out, the new road by which to reach agreement together, and achieve results relevant to today's world.

A change of this sort offers undoubted advantages, as it would bring us nearer a "new generation" in international relations: first, the League of Nations, then the UN in its 1945 version, and now a new mode able to address present and foreseeable needs of a world whose sociopolitical, economic, and cultural panorama is very different from that seen by those who formed the United Nations. The main aims have not changed. It would seem logical that UNESCO, because of its special characteristics the first institution in the system to take account of the passing of time, should be the first to point out the new path for international cooperation.

It is vital to look forward. The past, like the rearview mirror of the car, should be looked into just as long and as frequently as is necessary in order to drive more surely to our destination. In the past we can find many lessons, taken from the many and important achievements, and too, from mistakes, not necessarily the fault of the director general of the institution's governing bodies. The transition undergone in the last four decades has been so wide and so deep in the areas covered by UNESCO, that it is here where we have to look for the roots of many of the present shortcomings. We should now make the structural and functional changes needed so that, in future, measures can be taken in time to avoid problems of this kind. Even better, once the organization is freed from the functions which now burden it, distracting it from its main purposes, to foresee the future world stage and, as far as possible, adapt it in the best way for humanity. The future is the great responsibility for the men of our time.

Anyhow, if changes occur in situations far from equilibrium, there is no doubt that change in UNESCO is near, and it will be profound. High goals, inner "attractors" of the system are needed. In this case, all we have to do is replace the main original one: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

It is necessary to redefine UNESCO's range and to adjust its structure in order to attain its full potential. To mobilize the intellectual power, the teachers and scientists

that each country has potentially available, is the major role of UNESCO. Education needs to be more and more personal, diverse, and permanent, making use of modern methodology for teaching. However, methodology should not become more important than its ends.

We must try to guide the process by provoking breaks, rather than run the risk of there being unexpected and violent changes. After a serious crisis, imaginative insights and real breakthroughs are both possible and indispensable. The best way to overcome a breakdown is a breakthrough, a new insight. "Limits to growth" can be opposed by "No limits to learning"—two titles of Reports to the Club of Rome—giving us a good example of how the real challenges are to be tackled. To reinforce intellectual development and creative capacity on a world-wide scale appears as the main objective of international cooperation, in order to build a more peaceful future, a world with better understanding, concern, and involvement.

The new scientific culture should not be seen in opposition to classical culture, but as a way to strengthen the development of education and culture with new methodological resources. It is the end of one cycle, but the beginning of another. These are qualitative changes, mutations which it is important to note.

The question, then, is not to clean the slate completely, but to wake the organization up to the challenges of today and prepare it to deal with needs estimated according to the trends and most reasonable forecasts.

In a meeting held recently in Madrid, I referred to the obstacles opposing change, which have to be overcome. Out of all the resources to do this, the best and the least frequently used is imagination. Is it such a risk to go for talent? In this age of knowledge, it is turning into the best investment you can make. You cannot win future wars with strategies of past battles, particularly in times of crisis and disillusion, which tend to emphasize the bad aspects and minimize the good ones. At these times, Albert Einstein's advice can be really valued: "In times of crisis, only imagination is more important than knowledge."

Everything I have mentioned and suggested is a matter of opinion. But, provided the willingness to perfect the system of international cooperation exists, only one of these requirements is above question: to be convinced that carrying out the reform is worth while, to believe that it can be done, since, as Virgil announced many centuries ago, "possunt quia posse videntur" (They can because they think they can).