

A United Nations Assessment Project Study

October 21, 1982

FOR UNESCO, A FAILING GRADE IN EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization evokes a benevolent popular image. It is associated with restoring the monuments of Cambodia's Angkor Wat or sponsoring the international geological survey, "Man and the Biosphere"--both valuable contributions to the world's culture resources. UNESCO is also connected, popularly, with fostering worldwide literacy--in 1980, for example, it launched a campaign to eliminate illiteracy in all of Latin America by the year 2000. Regrettably, these programs are not the whole UNESCO story. There is a side of UNESCO that goes beyond cultural aspirations to ideological advocacy. Indeed, since UNESCO's birth in 1946, its education programs and publications have lacked political balance. They have been biased increasingly toward socialist economics and a utopian strain of internationalism that is unsympathetic (often hostile) to the free enterprise system. UNESCO's Education and Social Science sectors seem to be targeting the nation state and free enterprise as dangerous enemies. Is this the legitimate purpose of UNESCO, which supposedly is providing a balanced and useful education to those who need it most--the poor people of the Third World? Here, UNESCO has earned a failing grade. Even so, UNESCO still enjoys the support of the United States, which pays over 25 percent of the organization's triennial "assessed" budget. Together, the Western industrial nations plus Japan pay about 65 percent.

BACKGROUND: UNESCO'S GLOBAL NETWORK

In the years since its founding, UNESCO has become one of the world's largest--if not indeed the largest--think tank. The UNESCO budget in 1947 was \$7 million; today it is more than 140 times that size, or more than \$1 billion for the 1981-1983 trien-

nial budget period. Not only does Washington contribute 25 percent of UNESCO's \$600 million assessed budget, but the U.S. also contributes 25 percent or more to other U.N. agencies, such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Food Program, the World Bank and most Regional Banks, which in turn supply most of UNESCO's nonassessed funds (nearly \$400 million in 1981-1983).

According to its Constitution, UNESCO has three main tasks as a specialized U.N. agency: (1) to "maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge," (2) "to give a fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of knowledge," and (3) "to collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual understanding and knowledge of all peoples." It performs these tasks in all of its major sectors: Education, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Culture and Communication, Information Systems, Statistics. In partial fulfillment of this, UNESCO publishes books and documents, holds international conferences and meetings, and provides consulting services and field experts in education and the social sciences to countries requesting them. Most of UNESCO's client states for educational services are underdeveloped nations. UNESCO literature tirelessly repeats that it is not a fund-raising organization or even a "development" agency, but rather, a "catalyst." Some of its officials and professionals privately characterize UNESCO as a giant consulting firm.

In any case, UNESCO's influence scarcely can be underestimated. Its Paris headquarters staff exceeds 2,500. It has several subsidiary organizations such as the International Bureau of Education in Geneva (IEB), the UNESCO Institute of Education in Hamburg dealing with secondary education, the European Center for Higher Education located in Bucharest, and the International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP) in Paris.

UNESCO publishes four or five books a week every week of the year, making it one of the world's largest publishers. By 1978, it had published 7,000 titles in 70 different languages. About 13,000 UNESCO documents are issued annually. During 1979-80, the year of its General Conference in Bulgaria, UNESCO workshops printed approximately 305 million pages of documents.

UNESCO's worldwide network for information distribution is formidable. Through the National Commissions and other UNESCO outlets in the 158 United Nations member states, the Secretariat has access to national libraries, universities, ministries of education, school systems, and national media outlets. In addition, UNESCO is currently discussing with Intelsat the renting of radio and TV channels on as many as three international satellites. Intersputnik, the Soviet International Satellite Organization, has also been involved in the discussions, as have been the world's major news wire services. If UNESCO establishes such an international satellite TV network for its member states, it will acquire the potential to deliver news and information programs to even the most rural parts of the underdeveloped nations. As the

international "referee" between the international wire services and producers of satellite shows for such a network on the one hand and client member states on the other, UNESCO would wield enormous power over the mass media world wide. Decisions concerning the news and information that would be allowed to enter each country via the proposed international satellite network might well be fought out at UNESCO in Paris.

A sponsor of conferences, UNESCO may hold the prize as the world's most prolific. This year alone, UNESCO plans to host 240 international meetings in the fields of education, science, social science, cultural affairs, informatics, and communications. Nearly a third of UNESCO's current three-year budget is earmarked for education programs. An additional \$41 million is allocated for the social sciences.

Permeating programs in every UNESCO sector, however, are arguments advocating the "New International Economic Order." NIEO, as it is generally known, is a simplistic scheme to redistribute the world's wealth and resources to more than 100 underdeveloped nations, creating a global welfare state financed mainly by the U.S. and the Western industrial nations. UNESCO books and documents are filled with NIEO rhetoric, and the issue underlies all important UNESCO conference debates. In short, NIEO appears to be the UNESCO hidden agenda. The debate on the so-called New World Information Order, and the threat it poses to the free press, for example, stem from applying the NIEO concept to the field of mass communications.

NIEO'S IMPACT ON EDUCATION AT UNESCO

What is the New International Economic Order and where did it come from? It is hardly "new." As two British authors have pointed out: "It is the most far-reaching application of Fabian socialist theories of wealth distribution, state control and economic planning to international relations yet attempted by Third World governments and their Western cheerleaders."¹

Swedish socialist economist Gunnar Myrdal essentially set forth the NIEO scheme in An International Economy in 1956. The U.N. General Assembly adopted NIEO on May 1, 1974. More recently UNESCO published what may be the definitive theoretical work on NIEO to date: Towards A New International Economic Order by Mohammed Bedjaoui, the former Algerian ambassador to France.

Bedjaoui's book is actually a formula for creating a global superstate. He declares that there must be a "joint pooling of all the riches and resources of the planet, a pooling free of any

¹ Peter Bauer and John O'Sullivan, "Ordering the World About: The New International Economic Order," Policy Review, Summer 1977, p. 55.

national self-seeking."² Bedjaoui sees NIEO as a new "law of mankind." He foresees the developing nations establishing "an international regime and machinery," which would regulate the use of earth's resources by the developed nations. This "international authority" would also make "capital and technology" available to the Third World so underdeveloped nations could compete in the mining of earth's natural treasures.³

What Bedjaoui is really talking about is a world government with the power to enforce NIEO. British economist Peter Bauer and Policy Review editor John O'Sullivan have responded to such arguments by noting just how powerful an "international authority" would have to be in order to enforce NIEO. They maintain that:

only a world government with extensive, or indeed, almost dictatorial powers would stand a reasonable chance of enforcing such an economic order indefinitely.⁴

Bedjaoui is one of a school of Arab radical intellectuals who have been making their mark at UNESCO. Mustapha Masmoudi, a Tunisian, was the author of The New World Information Order (NWIO), a frontal attack on the world's free press, especially the international wire services.

Professor Richard Bissell, a University of Pennsylvania political scientist and expert on the U.N., notes the heavy influence of French left-wing intellectuals of the Jean-Paul Sartre persuasion on UNESCO during the 1950s. Bissell observes that the French government "nearly became communist" around 1948. About this time many leftist French foreign service officials returned to Paris, and according to Bissell, "had a tremendous influence on UNESCO."⁵

Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow of Senegal, Secretary-General of UNESCO since 1974, is a very important player in the harnessing of UNESCO's resources to the NIEO. He has frequently enunciated NIEO as UNESCO's most important product:

UNESCO has made the search for a new international economic order one of the major directions of its actions--perhaps even its main focus.⁶

² Mohammed Bedjaoui, "Towards A New International Economic Order, (Paris: UNESCO; and London: Homes and Meier, 1979), p. 235.

³ Ibid. p. 237

⁴ Bauer and O'Sullivan, op. cit., p. 68.

⁵ Dr. Richard Bissell, Dept. of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, interview, July 26, 1982.

⁶ Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, "Towards a New Form of Dialogue Between the Nations," address delivered at the 11th Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly, September 2, 1980; also this passage given again in one of M'Bow's addresses at UNESCO General Conference, September-October 1980, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

In 1976, M'Bow commissioned the writing of Moving Towards Change: Some Thoughts on the New International Economic Order, an outline of UNESCO's role in promoting NIEO. During his term as UNESCO boss, he has shifted the focus of UNESCO's mission away from its original goal of creating world "intellectual cooperation" toward emphasis on Third World "development," which translates to NIEO.

Moving Toward Change, moreover, explicitly rejects the Western free market economy, stating that the "'Western model of development' is not generally applicable in space or in time." The book implores developing states to turn away from "the centers of economic power (e.g. the United States) as the sole repositories of truth, civilization and universality."⁷

It calls for a "strengthened power structure at the international level." This "strengthening" would serve to weld the U.N. specialized agencies closer together, apparently under the umbrella of a superagency that would operate by "planning procedures" rather than "market mechanisms." What this adds up to is a planned world economy under the jurisdiction of a U.N. economic planning agency. "...[T]he instruments of free exchange, (i.e. dollars) favour the strongest, so that planning is essential to allow of participation by the weakest countries which are in the majority."⁸

Thus, in looking more deeply into UNESCO's commitment to NIEO, it becomes clear that M'Bow and his staff see the U.N. as the focal point for such a new socialist, planned economy employing a new monetary system and a new medium of exchange.⁹ Not only does M'Bow's UNESCO ignore the arguments in support of capitalism but, what is worse, it ignores the decades of evidence that free enterprise and a strong private sector are indispensable ingredients for economic development in the Third World.

Perhaps M'Bow's motive is to guarantee perpetuation of UNESCO's own bureaucracy. Indeed, Moving Towards Change strongly suggests that the creation of a new international economic regulatory agency under the U.N. canopy may be the only way to right the world economy and to avert eventual war. According to this treatise, UNESCO is supposed to make four major contributions to NIEO: (1) facilitating the transfer of science and technology from the West to the Third World; (2) broadening the scope of education and directing its course "so that the people of each country will be fitted to see their own development"; (3) "developing communications and information systems for the developing countries"; and (4) helping peoples of the Third World to make

⁷ Moving Towards Change; Some Thoughts on the New International Economic Order (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1976), p. 19.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 37-38.

⁹ Ibid., p. 53.

the change to the technological world without losing their cultural identity by teaching them how to "examine" themselves and their values through the modern social sciences.¹⁰

How much influence does the United States have in return for its 25 percent support of the UNESCO budget? Not much. For example, a Soviet national is an Assistant Director-General at UNESCO--Sioma Tanguiane, in charge of the extremely important educational programs--but there is no American in a comparable Assistant Director-Generalship. Americans make up only 5.1 percent of the UNESCO professional staff of directors and senior posts, despite the huge U.S. financial backing. The combination of M'Bow's NIEO sympathies and the scarcity of free enterprise oriented Americans and Westerners in positions of authority has made UNESCO a veritable broadcasting center for the myths of a share-the-wealth, global utopia.

These myths, of course, are most harmful to the developing nations themselves. Instead of urging the advantages of hard work and independent business enterprise and investment, NIEO preaches that poor nations can become affluent by demanding the wealth of the developed, industrial countries--a sure way of condemning the already poor nations to even more poverty.

Consistent with encouraging such myths, UNESCO has for some time given education money to national liberation movements--most of them Marxist. These have included the FRELIMO of Mozambique and the MPLA of Angola, both of which are now in power in their respective countries. Aid has also gone to the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization; to the Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO), a Marxist group with a long record of terror in Namibia; to the African National Congress (ANC), another Marxist guerrilla group using terrorist warfare against South Africa; and the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), a Maoist spinoff faction of the ANC. The PLO, SWAPO, ANC, and PAC have been allocated UNESCO education funds totaling at least \$8 million for 1981-83.

In backing liberation movements, however, UNESCO, like the rest of the U.N., invokes a double standard. While Marxist and anti-Western terrorist groups get the money and support, the non-Marxist liberation movements in South Africa, Namibia, and the Middle East are not funded or recognized by UNESCO. Apparently, UNESCO is not opposed to factions that would impose the socialist NIEO by armed force. Indeed, FRELIMO and the MPLA have already done just that in Mozambique and Angola, in part with UNESCO funds. UNDP and the World Food Program, which also have given large sums to these liberation groups, help to fund and cooperate closely with UNESCO.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 85-86.

NIEO and UNESCO's Education and Social Science Programs

Director-General M'Bow and the UNESCO Secretariat see the Education and the Social Science sectors of UNESCO as the means of realizing the "new international economic order." In line with its Fabian socialist underpinnings, the NIEO gradually has politicized all of UNESCO's sectors, including Education and Social Science.

How can UNESCO influence the world's education systems in favor of NIEO or any other theory? The answer lies in UNESCO's resolve to help with science and technology transfer, to "broaden the scope of education," "to develop communications and information systems," and to help societies with self-examination through social science techniques. In each of these activities UNESCO offers the same kind of assistance: information in the form of books, studies, and surveys; conferences of experts hosted by UNESCO; and training natives of UNESCO member states in disciplines such as education and science.

In the case of training, UNESCO acts as a consultant and middleman. For a literacy program, for instance, UNESCO recruits experts from among its 158 member states and pays their salaries, expenses, travel, and equipment either out of its own funds, the funds of the requesting country, another international organization, or a combination of these funding sources. This role of "catalyst" makes UNESCO attractive to scholars and politicians alike. It provides an international clearinghouse for experts and ideas. As a huge think tank, it is a major organizer of conferences for experts in fields ranging from educational administration to computer science and biophysics. Scholars and scientists, interviewed for this study, who have attended UNESCO meetings, often remarked that UNESCO conferences attracted professionals from more countries than any other organization. It is through providing this international forum, "intellectual cooperation" as UNESCO calls it, that it wields so much influence.

UNESCO itself, then, is almost a kind of university where the world's thinkers and planners can meet. Such a forum is especially attractive to professionals and government officials of the developing nations. Were UNESCO to provide them with information and training on the full spectrum of rationales, strategies, and tactics for various systems of economic development and other matters, it would be fulfilling the terms of its charter. Instead, UNESCO has been betraying its charter. Under Director-General M'Bow, the UNESCO Secretariat has been transmogrified into an advocate, even a lobbyist, for one system--the NIEO.

Translating NIEO into Educational Planning

A key to UNESCO's NIEO education strategy is set forth in Moving Towards Change when it calls for the "remodelling of present educational systems."¹¹ In this regard, UNESCO intends

¹¹ Ibid., p. 89.

to influence the top officials of governments to carry home the NIEO formulas and seed them in their local school systems.¹² Thus will UNESCO transmit these NIEO ideas to Third World classrooms and students.

One way to seed these development schemes into education systems is through planning and management procedures. During the last fifteen years, largely through its subsidiary, the International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP) in Paris and its Regional Training Centers and Regional Offices for Education, UNESCO has trained many high and middle-level personnel for the Third World.

UNESCO educational planning models exhibit a dangerous drift toward highly centralized, state controlled educational systems modeled closely after socialist style planned economies. This is in particular contrast to education in the United States, which enjoys one of the few truly decentralized school systems.

Daniel Haag, an education expert and professor at the University of Neuchatel in Switzerland, writes in a new UNESCO book that too much decentralization may interfere with the "right to education" proclaimed in the 1948 U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

Decentralization accompanied by broad local authority may without corrective mechanism, run counter to an extension of the right to education, either because certain regions are poorer in relation to others, or because certain local administrations deliberately devote fewer resources to education than elsewhere.¹³

Haag makes it clear that he favors a business style of school management modeled after systems theory. This has been tried in the U.S. under the aegis of the planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS). The effect is to standardize all subjects taught and classwork through the use of mechanized teaching "modules." Whereas systems theory management might work well for an auto assembly line, it makes classroom teaching less spontaneous and more artificial. Through its application of accounting procedures to students, it also lends itself well to Pavlovian "behavior modification" techniques. PPBS is one of several models for centralizing an entire country's education system under a single ministry or department. The centralized ministry, through a computer data bank, can be directly tied to the computers of each school district, region, or state. This makes for a high degree of standardization of curricula and gives tremendous control to the state education authority. Completely discarded

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Daniel Haag, The Right To Education: What Kind of Management? (Paris: UNESCO, 1982), p. 95.

are the private and decentralized systems of education that have proved so valuable in the developed West. Haag suggests PPBS-type systems lead to "decentralization." What he really means is they lead to fragmentation of local school districts and more centralization of power at the top--at the ministry level.

The idea of centralized education has long been brewing at UNESCO. One of UNESCO's bestselling books, Learning To Be: The World Of Education Today and Tomorrow, now available in 35 languages, called for state control of education in 1972:

We would recommend that one single State authority be given general responsibility for educational activity, or at least for the entire school system.¹⁴

In 1960, a decade before Learning To Be, UNESCO adopted a "Convention Against Discrimination in Education." Though it outlaws discrimination of any kind by educational institutions against students and teachers, it also requires all nations party to the treaty to submit regular reports to UNESCO on legislative and administrative measures taken against such discrimination. And Article 8 contains the startling provision that "any dispute between two or more states" party to the Convention shall, failing a negotiated settlement, be referred to the International Court of Justice (the World Court at the Hague) for a final decision. The Convention was hailed by both the USSR and Cuba. It is an attempt at educational centralization on a world scale.

The NIEO inspired revival of the "right to education" idea is the 1980s' version of this Discrimination Convention. On February 2, 1970, Senator William Proxmire urged the ratification of the UNESCO Discrimination Convention by the U.S. Senate. Thus far the Senate has not signed this convention. Nor has the Senate signed two U.N. Human Rights Conventions, one on civil and political rights, the other on economic, social, and cultural rights. Both these covenants--to date signed by less than half of UNESCO's members--are inspired by the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. One of the "human rights" listed in the latter document is the "right" to state-supplied "food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services" as well as unemployment benefits, and a "right to security" in case of sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other lack of livelihood beyond [one's] control. This is shorthand advocacy for the social welfare state, in which each person has the "right" to all material well-being simply by virtue of being alive. This is the essence of NIEO. Similar "human rights" are strongly advocated by UNESCO as ideal school subject matter from the primary grades through university education.

¹⁴ Edgar Faure (ed.), Learning To Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow (Paris: UNESCO, 1972), p. 272.

NIEO AS THE CURRICULUM OF LIFELONG EDUCATION

Another pervasive phrase in UNESCO education documents is "lifelong education." At first the idea seems benign enough--continuing the educational experience throughout an individual's entire life. A closer look reveals that this is another UNESCO planning matrix for standardization and centralization of education.

UNESCO educational theorists define lifelong education broadly as the entire process of a person's life--in and out of school. UNESCO places great emphasis on "non-formal" and out-of-school education for obvious political reasons. It rejects what it calls "elitist education systems in favor of those designed to provide greater social justice."¹⁵ "Elitist" is UNESCO-speak for school systems rooted in the Western middle-class tradition. The objective is to create a new kind of school system devoid of the social-cultural traditions of the Western industrialized nations. This new kind of school tradition has been called "development education," and as "lifelong education," it is reinforced throughout life. It concentrates on the "injustice" worked against poor countries by the developed nations, the main injustice being the very wealth of the developed nations. One of its advocates, Ruth Padrun, writing in a UNESCO Schools Project circular, attacks the Western industrial nations:

The development of certain nations (e.g. the U.S., Western Europe, etc.) is only possible in today's world to the extent that it is rooted in the underdevelopment of other countries.¹⁶

This is pure NIEO, the unsubstantiated argument that Western colonialism and imperialism are the cause of Third World underdevelopment. One problem with the argument is that not all the Third World is poor. Even aside from the oil-rich states, Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Kenya, Brazil, Ivory Coast, and Singapore have all experienced rapid economic growth.

Nonetheless, UNESCO markets, as its educational philosophy, the NIEO concept that the Western industrial nations have acquired their wealth unjustly and that their power in the world economy must be broken and their wealth redistributed.

Ruth Padrun sums this up by saying that present-day education is "still fundamentally conservative and traditional" and must be radicalized with the "development education" ideology as in the internationalist school curricula of Hungary and Sweden.¹⁷

¹⁵ Thinking Ahead: UNESCO and the Challenges to Today and Tomorrow (Paris: UNESCO, 1977), p. 199.

¹⁶ Ruth Padrun, "Development Education in Schools," International Understanding at Schools, No. 28., p. 8.

¹⁷ Ibid.

She notes that centralized school systems like those in the United Kingdom and Switzerland are useful for NIEO-oriented teaching experiments, but "offer no hope of extending the scope of such work." In contrast, under centralized systems like those of France or Sweden "every decision to introduce changes or reform has speedy repercussions throughout the country."¹⁸ Padrun candidly admits that "we do not think that education is neutral; on the contrary, it is an essentially political phenomenon."¹⁹ She adds that children between ten and fifteen years old are ideally suited to be "sensitized" to the "link that exists between the dependence of developing countries on the dominating industrialized nations and the situations of dependence and domination evident within their own countries."²⁰ Was UNESCO created to propagate such theories?

Lifelong education now permeates UNESCO thinking on education. It was one of the objectives of the U.N.'s International Education Year in 1970. It was a major theme of the International Conference on Education sponsored by UNESCO's International Bureau of Education in Geneva in 1975. Edgar Faure, former French Prime Minister and Minister of Education, highlighted it in Learning To Be in 1972. It is a main theme in a 1977 UNESCO book Education Today for the World of Tomorrow by the then Secretary-General of the Swiss National Commission for UNESCO, Charles Hummel. UNESCO Director-General M'Bow commissioned another book in 1977 called Thinking Ahead: UNESCO, The Challenges of Today and Tomorrow, which promotes lifelong education. In 1979, UNESCO's Institute of Education (UIE) in Hamburg solicited studies from member states around the world on the subject of "School Textbooks for Lifelong Education." The Northwest Regional Education Laboratory of Portland, Oregon, prepared the U.S. study for UIE with financing from the federal government's National Institute of Education. Lifelong education is also a major theme in UNESCO's Associated Schools Project and is often discussed in the Project's journal, International Understanding at School.

The lifelong education theme has become as well a strategy for breaking down the traditional "Europe-centered" educational traditions, which are called too "rigid" to accommodate the "global perspective" that UNESCO views as the guiding principle in education at all levels. The impetus for this global perspective was formally stated in the "Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms," drafted at the 18th UNESCO General Conference in Paris in October-November 1974.

18 Ibid., p. 6.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.

This document is essentially the UNESCO version of the NIEO, which was drafted on May 1 of the same year in the U.N. General Assembly. The global perspective UNESCO is promoting for the world's education system is specific. Both in the "Recommendation for International Understanding" and in other UNESCO writings, the direction is toward making the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights "an integral part of the developing personality of each child, adolescent, young person or adult." UNESCO encourages inclusion of the Declaration as part of a national policy on international education. As such, the universal "welfare right" of that controversial Declaration is to be promoted by UNESCO as an essential element in education. The 1974 "International Understanding" also recommends that:

Education should emphasize the true interests of peoples and their incompatibility with the interest of monopolistic groups holding economic and political power, which practice exploitation and foment war.²¹

Certainly no one can be against a policy that decries exploitation and fomenting war, but words have very special meanings in the U.N. context.²² When filtered through the NIEO prism, "monopolistic groups" becomes for school children not only all agencies with enormous power (such as the ruling parties of one-party states), but also multinational corporations and governments of the Western industrial nations. This is what Adelaide Kernochan suggested in UNESCO's Associated Schools Project journal International Understanding at School. For teaching children the concept of "economic injustice," Kernochan recommends:

Insights concerning the unjust division of the world's resources, materialism and human values can evolve from investigation of a single commercial product, such as aspirin. Students can research price-fixing, advertising, the power of the producer and consumer, the availability of health care and medicine for the poor, and role of multinational corporations.²³

²¹ UNESCO "Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms," adopted at UNESCO 18th General Conference, Paris, October 17-November 23, 1974, Section V, item #15.

²² See Juliana Geran Pilon, Ph.D. "Through the Looking Glass: The Political Culture of the U.N.," Backgrounder #206, The Heritage Foundation, August 30, 1982.

²³ Adelaide Kernochan, "Suggestions for Innovative Programmes and Projects in Associated Schools: An Account of the Meeting held at UNESCO Headquarters, July 21-25, 1975," printed in International Understanding at School, #30, p. 5.

UNESCO'S LOBBYING FOR NIEO EDUCATION

What kind of dividends has UNESCO realized on its investment in publicity and publishing to promote the teaching of NIEO redistribution and welfare economics in the schools? As a thriving think tank and international intellectual forum, UNESCO influences education from the top down. This policy has been pursued consciously--especially under the aegis of "lifelong education"--through its regional conferences of Ministers of Education, its International Conferences on Education of the IBE in Geneva, meetings with the senior education officials of the 25 least developed countries, the International Commission of the Development of Education, as well as its publications and international meetings of experts.²⁴ And this is paying off.

In the recommendations of the UNESCO Regional Conferences of Education Ministers from 1976-1980, there are endorsements by the participants of various NIEO-oriented education programs. The 1976 Conference of Ministers of Education of the African Member States held in Lagos, Nigeria, resolved to "Encourage (Director-General M'Bow) strongly in the efforts which he is making to involve UNESCO in the establishment of a new international economic, social and cultural order" and assured "him of their resolute support in all his efforts to overcome the obstacles to which his action may give rise."²⁵

The 1977 Arab Education Ministers Conference in Abu Dhabi requested increased UNESCO aid for education to the PLO.²⁶ At the 1978 Regional Conference for the Education Ministers of Asia and Oceania, M'Bow endorsed NIEO and its corresponding "New International Social Order" in his closing remarks to the participants.²⁷ The 1979 Regional Conference of the Education Ministers of Latin America and the Caribbean in Mexico City ringingly endorsed NIEO, requesting UNESCO "to continue to collaborate assiduously in the speedy inauguration of a New International Economic Order...." The Ministers at this conference blamed the low funding of education in the Latin American and Caribbean region and even the region's low "gross national product," not on these nations' own woeful economic policies, but on "major problems stemming from an unjust international economic order."²⁸

²⁴ Thinking Ahead, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

²⁵ Final Report, UNESCO Regional Conference of Ministers of Education of the African Member States, Lagos, Nigeria, January 27-February 4, 1976, p. 34.

²⁶ Final Report, UNESCO Regional Conference of Education Ministers, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 1977, p. 36.

²⁷ Final Report, UNESCO 4th Regional Conference of Ministers of Education for Asia and Oceania, Colombo, Sri Lanka, July 24-August 1, 1978, p. 12.

²⁸ Final Report, UNESCO Regional Conference of Education Ministers in Latin America and the Caribbean, Mexico City, December 4-13, 1979, Recommendation No. 29.

In 1980, Europe's Education Ministers met at their UNESCO regional conference in Sofia, Bulgaria. They strongly endorsed UNESCO's program in Education for International Understanding--in effect, a curriculum highly antagonistic to the free market economy and multinational corporations. They also enthusiastically embraced UNESCO's programs in "disarmament education," in opposition, among other things, to needed NATO defense outlays.

UNESCO obviously has mobilized active support for its NIEO based education programs and ideas. It has carried on this lobbying at the highest levels of the education ministries on three continents--Africa, Latin America, and Europe.

UNESCO TAKES NIEO INTO THE CLASSROOM

UNESCO educational theorists have divided the NIEO concept into a number of classroom subjects easily grasped by children. The strong political bias is well disguised. Most of the NIEO classroom curriculum comes under such innocuous titles as, "Teaching International Human Rights," "Disarmament (or Peace) Education," and "Moral (or Values) Education." The term "New International Economic Order" is not heard much in U.S. education, but most NIEO concepts are being promoted in the United States under the title "Global Education" or "Global Perspectives" by a group of radical educators.

UNESCO'S Associated Schools Program

In its Associated Schools Project UNESCO has a small, but growing grass-roots movement for NIEO centered education with a global perspective. At its start in 1953, the program had 33 schools in 15 countries. Today there are 1,500 schools in 79 countries. They report both to their National Commissions for UNESCO and to UNESCO headquarters in Paris. While students in these schools study "other countries and cultures," they also study disarmament, education, and "international human rights" with a NIEO slant. In a recent issue of the Associated Schools Project journal, International Understanding at School, Prem Kirpal of India, former Chairman of UNESCO's Executive Board, called for a new universal form of international education for the 21st Century, "Education for International Understanding," the NIEO rationale for lifelong education.²⁹

The Associated Schools Project consistently runs pro-NIEO articles in its journal, such as "Towards a New International Economic Order," by B.P. Menon of the U.N. Center for Economic and Social Information. This article is a short history of the

²⁹ Prem Kirpal, "Toward an Education for the 21st Century; The Global Prospects," International Understanding at School, #41, pp. 3-6.

NIEO concept designed for teachers to incorporate into their lesson plans. It includes such statements as:

...world peace is impossible as long as two-thirds of the planet's population exist in poverty and the remaining third live in wasteful affluence.³⁰

The bias is palpable. Nothing is said, for instance, about the enormous and exhaustively documented wastefulness and corruption of Third World governments who, after all, are the direct recipients of massive amounts of Western foreign aid. The fact that Western aid is often squandered by Third World leaders before it reaches the Third World poor is never mentioned in UNESCO discussions of the NIEO.

Teaching International Human Rights

UNESCO guidelines for teaching international human rights suggest using certain U.N. human rights documents--particularly the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also the 1959 Declaration on the Rights of the Child, the 1963 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the 1967 Declaration of the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women--as the basis for teaching. There are often references to the human rights violations of apartheid in South Africa or to alleged violations by the governments of Chile, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, or Honduras. These guidelines are strangely silent about the well-known human rights violations in the USSR, Cuba, Mainland China, Eastern Europe, or Vietnam.

Most UNESCO documents on teaching international human rights seem not to focus on what have been regarded traditionally as those human rights essential to a free society such as free speech, free assembly, right to religion, and free press. The emphasis rather is on the various aspects of the "right" to a welfare state society stemming from Article 25 in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In a new UNESCO book on teaching human rights, for example, UNESCO author and former vice-chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Judith Torney-Purta, suggests that "hunger (in underdeveloped nations) is a problem of social and economic rights."³¹ This is the NIEO argument adapted to the classroom. Torney-Purta also suggests "sequencing" techniques like presenting the U.N. "International Bill of Rights" before teaching children about their own national Constitution or Bill of Rights. Reason: if children acquire an international concept first, they will tend to identify with it and thus not develop a first loyalty to their own country and Constitution.³²

³⁰ B.P. Menon, "Towards a New International Economic Order," International Understanding at School, #34, p. 5.

³¹ Dr. Judith Torney-Purta, Teaching for International Understanding, Peace and Human Rights, review manuscript (Paris: UNESCO, 1982), p. 8.

³² Dr. Judith Torney-Purta, from Political Education in Flux, Heater and Gillespie, eds. (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications Inc., 1981) p. 285.

The 1973 International Congress on the Teaching of Human Rights in Vienna heard a report on "Perspectives on the Teaching Human Rights in the European Socialist Countries." Much was made of the "freedom" of East Germans "from exploitation from capitalists" and how East Germans and Poles study racism, apartheid, and international legal regulation of human rights. This report said not a word about violations of free speech in Czechoslovakia, harassment of "dissidents" in Yugoslavia and Romania, and violation of religious freedoms in Hungary and elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

UNESCO's Disarmament Education Strategy

"Oblivion is the only alternative to world disarmament." So proclaims Sean McBride, UNESCO author and winner of both the Lenin and Nobel Peace Prizes, and it sums up well the UNESCO policy on disarmament education. UNESCO has made disarmament education an adjunct to its NIEO development policy by repeating how the achievement of total world disarmament would free over \$500 billion annually in funds for Third World development.³³ The arms race is thereby pictured as yet another form of exploitation of the world's poor nations by the rich.

Many UNESCO authors link the realization of the NIEO and the accomplishment of world disarmament. Mohammed Bedjaoui, one of the chief UNESCO theorists on the NIEO and international law, writes that without a global redistribution of the planet's wealth to the developing nations "we shall bring down upon our heads the atomic apocalypse."³⁴ Thus the developing nations are made both the underdog heroes and, somehow, the victims of the globe's arms producers. Ignored are the facts that the vast majority of global arms outlays are for non-nuclear weapons and that arms sales to Third World nations are made at the request--sometimes the pleading--of Third World governments:

UNESCO advocacy for unilateral disarmament is well publicized. Whole issues of the monthly UNESCO Courier magazine are devoted to disarmament. The March 1982 edition, for instance, attacked military spending as a waste of (1) manpower, (2) industrial production, (3) raw materials, (4) land, (5) research and development, as well as money.³⁵ No alternative view was given. Nothing was said about the need for national self-defense. Nor, in this sweeping condemnation, was there any mention of arms being used at this moment against innocent civilians in the conventional, biological, and chemical warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

³³ "World Problems in the Classroom, Educational Studies and Documents," (Paris: UNESCO, 1981), #41, p. 16.

³⁴ Bedjaoui, op. cit., p. 240.

³⁵ "Ten Principles of Disarmament Education," UNESCO Courier, September 1980, p. 19.

The September 1980 Courier, entitled "A Farewell to Arms?" also was devoted entirely to disarmament. This issue reprinted the "Ten Principles for Disarmament Education" adopted by the UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament Education, held in Paris on June 9-13, 1980. Among those principles are recommendations for distributing pro-disarmament materials to schools, families, community organizations, work places, universities, research centers, and information media outlets. There is a call for "the most imaginative teaching methods, particularly those of participatory learning" to be employed in the schools to teach disarmament. The trouble is, UNESCO's view of disarmament has become woefully unbalanced. As such, it fails to advance the cause of genuine disarmament that could lead to a safer world.

Rodolfo Stavenhagen, in 1980 the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Social Science and its Applications, told the UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament that there is "a need for a global, multilateral effort to promote disarmament." He also castigated "most of our textbooks, history books and popular literature" for helping "to conjure up a glorified vision of military personalities, feats of arms, wars and conquests to which children are conditioned from an early age."³⁶ Stavenhagen and other UNESCO advocates of disarmament offer no solution, however, to solving the arms race. Nor do they consider what to do about countries with expansionist military policies that do not allow teaching about disarmament violations by their own governments or even allow freedom of expression in their schools or press.

UNESCO And Values Education

UNESCO and Director-General M'Bow, who commissioned Moving Toward Change, consider values education an important part of the strategy to achieve the NIEO. Suddenly introducing high technology and high-speed communications into a relatively primitive developing nation can have drastic social consequences. UNESCO, therefore, looks to its social sciences sector to help developing nations make the technological switch.

There is a point, however, at which so-called values education, values clarification, or moral education--to cite a few of its many names--becomes manipulative conditioning of the mind and emotions. Such manipulative techniques derive from the behaviorist school often associated with the American psychologist, B.F. Skinner. This school regards man as merely a more sophisticated animal who has no spiritual dimension or even free will. This kind of psychology and the values education based on it are very popular among UNESCO's writers and thinkers.

³⁶ In Marek Thee (ed.), Armaments, Arms Control and Disarmament (Paris: The UNESCO Press, 1981), p. 327.

A good example is the UNESCO bestseller, Learning To Be, edited by former French Prime Minister and Minister of Education, Edgar Faure, together with a UNESCO International Commission on the Development of Education. This Commission also included Soviet Education Professor, Arthur V. Petrovsky; an American adviser on international education from the Ford Foundation, Frederick Champion Ward; and professors from Iran, Syria, the Congo, and Chile.

The authors claim to be in search of a "new educational order," which is "based on scientific and technological training, one of the essential components of scientific humanism."³⁷ Scientific humanism allows no room for any religious belief embodying a divine principle or person. Faure and his associates take a slap at the hundreds of millions of believers in the world by stating early in the book that religions and belief in the Divine are the real reasons for "many of the hierarchical forms and discriminatory practices for which current educational systems are blamed...."³⁸

Without God or religious standards, a moral substitute is sought in "relativity and dialectical thought, which would appear to be," say the writers of Learning To Be, "a fertile ground in which to cultivate the seeds of tolerance." In the West this has come to be known as "situation ethics." It accepts no absolute moral principles. All values become relative. Thus, the principles of good and evil are not accepted. Says the Faure book: "An individual should avoid systematically setting up his beliefs and convictions, ...his behavior and customs as models or rules valid for all times...."³⁹ This would rule out the Ten Commandments and other religious imperatives.

W. D. Wall, a British educational psychologist, wrote a bestseller for UNESCO, Constructive Education for Children. It was first published in 1955 to summarize the results of the 1952 Regional Conference on Education and Mental Health of Children in Europe. His 1975 revision of the book for UNESCO echoes some of the familiar themes of the Faure work. Again there is the attack on religious belief as the breeding ground of "intolerance."⁴⁰ Wall attacks the idea of truth itself. The healthy psyche, he writes, should cultivate

Provisional belief rather than conviction, the acceptance of the notion that "truth" may be personal and many-sided, the dynamic tolerance of true agnosticism which accepts that doubt is an essential background to action and that conviction may be a bad master.⁴⁰

37 Faure, op. cit., p. 146

38 Ibid., p. 8.

39 Ibid., p. 148.

40 W.D. Wall, Constructive Education for Children (Paris and London: UNESCO and Harrap, 1975), p. 55.

For this era of "true agnosticism" to be born, Wall says, the world's population must first be reduced through population education and the NIEO must communize at least part of the wealth of the developed nations.⁴¹

Thus, standing solidly in the NIEO camp, Wall's UNESCO book advises the world's parents not to teach their children religious principles of morality, which he calls "moral indoctrination."

Howard D. Mehlinger, a U.S. social scientist and advocate of a NIEO education, has edited a 1981 UNESCO Handbook for the Teaching of the Social Studies. Its purpose is to advise teachers how to teach situation ethics and NIEO concepts to children. These techniques are known to American educators as "values clarification games." The format is usually a student group discussion with the teacher acting as "facilitator" in which the topic is some sort of crisis like a sinking boat crowded with people. Typically, the students are asked to decide who drowns and who lives. This psychological technique is designed to teach youngsters that all values are relative and subject to change with the situation. Thus the term "situation ethics."

In one value game proposed for children in this UNESCO book available through UNESCO in 158 countries, students are given the "problem" concerning a man whose wife is dying of cancer and who does not have the money to buy the rare drug needed for her cure. The man with the rare drug is characterized as a miser, unwilling to lower his \$2,000 price. Students are then asked to decide whether or not the husband should steal the drug.⁴² The problem is designed to prompt the student to decide in favor of stealing. There is no mention of such alternatives as the husband's trying to get an emergency loan from friends or putting up property as collateral. This and the other values games in such books condition students for accepting the NIEO arguments of welfare economics and the redistribution of wealth and the myth that developing countries are poor mainly because developed states are relatively wealthy.

Michel Debeauvais, in a recent issue of UNESCO's Prospects: Quarterly Review of Education, sees the traditional school system as part of the "values problem" in the Third World.

What concerns us here is the social selection performed by the education system insofar as it contributes to the distribution of social roles and jobs in a hierarchized society. The hierarchy of school tends to match the job hierarchy; where expansion of the education system is not matched by changes in the job structure,

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 205.

⁴² Howard D. Mehlinger, UNESCO Handbook for the Teaching of the Social Sciences, (Paris and London: UNESCO and Croom Helm Ltd., 1981), p. 195.

the situation is perceived as a dysfunction requiring corrective measures.⁴³

The assumption here is that there is such a thing as an unhierarchical or classless society and that distributing wealth within an individual country and between countries would equalize all social roles and hierarchical positions. This is utopian-- which is fine were it published by a philosophical journal or a partisan political organization. That such wishful thinking is being funded and disseminated by the U.N., however, is a very different matter.

CONCLUSION

According to its own Constitution, UNESCO's purpose is to increase and diffuse "knowledge" to the world and to "give a fresh impulse" to education. In the past decade, however, UNESCO increasingly has sacrificed education to its obsession with transferring the wealth of the developed industrial nations to the underdeveloped nations and creating a New International Economic Order by the year 2000. This is Director-General M'Bow's agenda and has become UNESCO's.

By promoting the NIEO, M'Bow and his aides mislead rather than serve the developing world. They are quite explicit in what they want, however. Third World development is referred to as a "worldwide New Deal" in the draft of the UNESCO Medium Term Plan (1984-1989). This plus the UNESCO platform of a "strengthened international power structure," the NIEO references to a new monetary system, and the UNESCO promotion of a U.N. based economic planning agency add up to a UNESCO bureaucracy that is trying to perpetuate its own existence. In promoting NIEO so strongly, UNESCO is promoting itself as at least one of the NIEO administrative agencies. It is endorsing "big government spending" in the arena of international agencies and trying to move world opinion in the direction of a planned socialist economy.

The U.S. and the West have more than a simply curious interest in this matter. Americans pay more of UNESCO's bill than any other people. As such, they have a right to demand that their costly investment in education for the developing world will one day pay dividends to those developing nations. M'Bow and UNESCO offer no hope of this.

By emphasizing the NIEO, not literacy, UNESCO's secretariat is ignoring the free enterprise systems which have demonstrated the ability to develop the underdeveloped and to raise the living standards for all within a nation. Ironically, it is precisely

⁴³ Michel Debeauvais, "Education and a New International Economic Order," Prospects: Quarterly Review of Education, 1982, Vol. 12, No. 2, p. 141.

the success of the Western industrial economics that makes UNESCO possible at all. For the U.S. and the Western nations to provide 65 percent of the budget of an international think tank bent apparently on the destruction of the free enterprise system is simply stupid. Even more, it is self-destructive.

What is to be done about UNESCO? To start, the American public should demand a congressional investigation of the promoters of NIEO at UNESCO and their extensive plans to saturate the governments of developing nations with anti-free market advice. And then, Americans should demand that all U.S. tax dollars supporting UNESCO's NIEO based education and social science programs be cut off. The United States should withhold its financial support of these programs until all vestiges of the anti-Western, NIEO policy and its social welfare state schemes are eliminated.

The U.S. should pursue this policy toward similar NIEO based programs in other UNESCO sectors--including Culture and Communication and Informatics--and should encourage its Western allies to follow suit. By so doing, the United States and the West will demonstrate that they are being more faithful to the UNESCO charter and dream than are M'Bow and his UNESCO secretariat.

Thomas G. Gulick
Policy Analyst

