

UNESCO - NOTIFICATION OF WITHDRAWAL BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

On 29 December 1984, the US gave notice that she would withdraw from UNESCO. The text of the letter follows:-

December 28, 1983

His Excellency
Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow
Director General
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural
Organization
Paris

Dear Mr. Director General:
The purpose of this letter is to notify you within the terms of Article Two Paragraph Six of the Constitution that my Government will withdraw from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization effective December 31, 1984.

You may be assured that the United States will, within the terms of the Constitution, seek to meet fully all of its legitimate financial obligations.

The Government of the United States, along with the American people generally, believe in the great principles enunciated in the Constitution of UNESCO. Today, as in the early years of the organization, these principles summon us to a commitment of effort, and resources, in the interest of building a stable and enduring framework for peace in the world. Today, as in the early years, we believe that education, science, culture and communication are significant, even essential, elements in building a peaceful world.

But while the United States continues to devote substantial resources to the attainment of these goals, it must choose carefully the precise methods and means through which these resources are to be used. There are many groups and organizations whose purpose we approve, but which are not effective at carrying out the kind of international cooperation which will contribute to the making of a peaceful world. Good intentions are not enough.

For a number of years, as you know from statements we have made at the Executive Board and elsewhere, we have been concerned that trends in the management, policy and budget of UNESCO were detracting from the organization's effectiveness. We believed these trends to be leading UNESCO away from the original principles of its Constitution. We felt that they tended to serve—willingly or unwillingly, but improperly—the political purposes of a few member states. During this period we worked energetically to encourage the organization to reverse these trends; to redirect itself to its founding purposes; to rigorously avoid becoming a servant of one or another national policy; and to manage itself in a way that rewarded efficiency, promoted fearless program evaluation and followed priorities based on program value rather than on past habit, political expediency or some other extraneous consideration.

At the same time, we also recognized, and expressed our strong concern about, those pressures to divert UNESCO to politically motivated ends which emanated from member states, rather than from within the organization itself. We consistently worked in the Executive Board and General Conference to minimize or eliminate the resulting political content—tendentious and partisan—from UNESCO resolutions and programs.

Many of these efforts, yours and ours, have been productive, at least in relative terms. The results of the recent General Conference prove the point, and we appreciate the role you played in the outcome of that Conference.

Viewed in a larger sense, however, the General Conference proves a different point: if the results of the Conference demonstrate the best that can be expected from the organization as it is presently constituted, and as it presently governs itself, there can be little hope for a genuine and wholehearted return of the organization to its founding principles.

For the United States, that conclusion has become inescapable. The responsibility to act upon it is equally inescapable.

You, Mr. Director General, have our esteem, our appreciation and our pledge of the fullest cooperation to make the year intervening between this letter and the date of our withdrawal as harmonious as possible. We recognize that you will continue to do your best, in the difficult circumstances in which you operate, to make UNESCO activities productive, and relevant to unmet needs of the world. For our part, we are convinced that we can develop other means of cooperation in education, science, culture and communication, which better embody the principles to which we subscribed in UNESCO many years ago. We are convinced that such cooperation need not be diminished by the injection of political goals beyond its scope; that its authority need not be weakened through the compromise of such simple and lofty goals as individual human rights and the free flow of information. It may yet be appreciated that our shared aims could have been accomplished effectively through attention to the principle that a few things done well have more impact than superficial examination of all the world's ills.

It is likely that the resources we presently devote to UNESCO will be used to support such cooperation. Any alternative programs which the U.S. develops could, in principle, serve as a basis for future cooperation between the U.S. and UNESCO, should both parties find that advantageous. We would be pleased to consider that possibility at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. SCHULTZ

On the same day the US Secretary of State, Mr George P. Schultz also wrote to the UN Secretary General Senor Perez de Cuellar. The text of that letter follows:-

December 29, 1983

His Excellency
Javier Perez de Cuellar y Guerra
Secretary General of
the United Nations
New York

Dear Mr. Secretary General:
We are delivering to the Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization a letter giving notice that the United States will withdraw from the organization, effective December 31, 1984.

While the decision to withdraw from UNESCO is firm, we will remain a full member during 1984, paying our financial obligations. This year will give UNESCO a potential opportunity to respond to the serious concerns that have caused our withdrawal. We remain open to indications of significant improvement. We would, of course, welcome meaningful changes that would eliminate the suppression of minority views within UNESCO, and restore fiscal integrity to the organization.

We wish you to understand that our withdrawal from UNESCO does not presage any wider disengagement from the United Nations or its other Specialized Agencies. On the contrary, as President Reagan made clear at the General Assembly last September, the United States is deeply attached to the principle that genuine international cooperation is essential to our shared purposes in the world, and to the attainment of peaceful progress for all.

As you are aware, the United States had been concerned for many years over a growing tendency on the part of UNESCO to depart from the principles upon which it was founded, and the purposes which it was originally called upon to fulfill. For several years, we have been working actively with other countries to reverse this unacceptable trend. Some progress has been made toward this end, but we have concluded, with respect, that under present circumstances we can no longer justify continuing United States membership in UNESCO.

For our part, we are convinced that we can develop other means of cooperation in education, science and culture and communication, which will more clearly embody the principles to which we subscribed in UNESCO many years ago. We plan to use the resources we presently devote to UNESCO to support such other means of cooperation.

In all your activity to promote the cause of international cooperation, we wish you well.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ ■

The Director General of UNESCO, M. Amadou - Martar M'Bow, replied to Mr Schultz on 18 January 1984. The text of his letter follows:-

The Honourable George P. Shultz,
Secretary of State,
Washington.

Dear Mr Secretary,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 28 December 1983 by which, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 6, of the Constitution, you notified me of the withdrawal of the United States from Unesco with effect from 31 December 1984.

I have duly brought your communication to the notice of the President of the General Conference and the Chairman of the Executive Board.

I have furthermore requested the inclusion of the following item in the provisional agenda of the 119th session of the Executive Board, which is due to open on 9 May 1984: "Communication from the Secretary of State of the United States of America concerning the withdrawal of the United States of America."

While it is not for me to voice an opinion on a sovereign decision by your Government, I cannot but say how deeply I regret the withdrawal from the Organization of one of its founder members, whose authorities, educators, scientists and intellectuals of all kinds have hitherto made an outstanding and constant contribution to the work of Unesco and have undoubtedly themselves benefited from that co-operation.

I have always emphasized the need to maintain the universality of the Organization and have tried, making use of all the prerogatives which are mine under the Constitution and of the confidence placed in me by the Member States, to counsel them in such a way as to avoid the expulsion of any one of their number from Unesco being envisaged. Your Government's decision to withdraw, if it were to come into effect, would affect the very principle of that universality.

I thank you for the esteem which you express for me and for the words of appreciation concerning the efforts I have always made within the Organisation for the successful outcome of its work. Since you were so good as to refer in this connection to the recent session of the General Conference, let me say how much I, for my own part, valued the positive contribution which the United States delegation, led by Ambassador Edmund P. Hennelly, strove to make the work of the Conference. Ambassador Hennelly's success to establishing a climate of mutual confidence with many delegations and his constant readiness to engage in dialogue were, I am sure, instrumental, in bringing about a better understanding of certain of the United States' point of view, which could thus be taken more fully into account when the final decisions were adopted.

I am all the more gratified by this outcome because, ever since I was called to the post of Director-General, I have endeavoured to help the Member States to achieve the widest possible measure of agreement, by means of consensus, whenever controversial problems arose in the course of their deliberations. It was, for instance, on my initiative that a drafting and negotiation group was first set up in 1976, at the time of the nineteenth session of the General Conference in Nairobi; its mandate has been regularly renewed since then. Every time that a matter has been submitted to it, the group has been able to bring the viewpoints closer together and to work out texts on which unanimous agreement has been reached by all delegations - including the United States delegation, which has always taken an active part in the deliberation of that body.

At the close of the general policy debate, during the twenty-second session of the General Conference which ended on 29 November last, motivated by this same concern to achieve the widest possible consensus, suggested, on the basis of a proposal by the Nordic countries, the adoption of a budget ceiling lower than the one which I had originally proposed and which had also been recommended by the Executive Board - and this despite the fact that more than two thirds of the Member States, i.e., more than the majority required for the approval of the budget, were prepared to support the Executive Board's recommendation. The budget adopted for 1984-1985, totalling 374,410,000 dollars, is thus 56,247,000 dollars less than the budget (430,657,000 dollars) for the years 1982-1983. This, if I am not mistaken, is the largest such reduction ever to have been made in the United Nations system.

The annual payment of the United States, which amounted to 49,790,000 dollars for the 1981-1983 financial period, will be accordingly reduced to 43,087,500 dollars, a reduction of 6,702,500 dollars. What is more, in accordance with Unesco's budgeting techniques, a sum of 17,703,250 dollars - or 25 percent of the provision for currency fluctuation under Part VIII of the Programme and budget adopted by the General Conference at its twenty-first session (1980) - will now be surrendered to the United States and will be deductible from its assessed contribution. Thus the payment which is requested of the United States for the first year of the 1984-1985 biennium is 25,384,250 dollars.

As you very rightly say in your letter, "education, science, culture and communication are essential elements in building a peaceful world". I sincerely believe that in spite, one might even say precisely because, of the present difficulties in the world, Unesco's role and the tasks which it carries out are essential for the international community as a whole.

At this time of transition when all societies are undergoing and will increasingly undergo profound changes, it is vital for mankind that there should be some institution for co-ordination and action where all those who think and work in Unesco's field of competence can reason together, establish programmes together and carry those programmes out. The Organisation has endeavoured to fulfil this mission in the interests of the educational, scientific and cultural communities with which it co-operates and those of the very great majority of its Member States, despite its meagre resources.

Of course, no human institution is perfect and we ourselves are well aware of the need to be always improving the methods of planning, programming, executing and evaluating the Organisation's activities. With this in mind, we have constantly sought the views of all those who, whether in the Member States or in the international governmental and non-governmental organisations, co-operate in the work of Unesco.

In order to increase the concentration of the programme and to ensure that it is attuned to the changing problems and needs of Member States and the requirements of international co-operation, the Organization accordingly began several years ago to undertake medium-term planning. Much effort has gone into this process. The initial results were duly analyzed, enabling the General Conference in 1980 to define, with the full and whole-hearted participation of the United States, methods which it was possible to put into practical effect during the preparation of the Medium-Term Plan for 1984-1989. As you know, consultations on an unprecedented scale were undertaken. As a result, replies were received from 105 Member States, 19 intergovernmental organisations and 83 international non-governmental organisations representing the most varied educational, intellectual and scientific communities. These were then analyzed and a synopsis was submitted to the Executive Board. These consultations, in the course of which the widest range of viewpoints was expressed, formed the main basis on which, taking account of the convergence that emerged, the second Medium-Term Plan was prepared. This Plan, which defined the objectives to be aimed for and the strategies to be employed by the Organisation, in its fields of competence, for the period 1984-1989, was approved during the fourth extraordinary session of the General Conference, held in Paris in the latter part of 1982, by a consensus to which the United States was a party.

As regards the biennial programme for 1984-1985, prepared within the framework of the second Medium-Term Plan, the vast majority of Member States stressed its relevance, the quality of the conception behind it and its concentration on objectives of acknowledged priority. Some of them may, it is true, have considered that further efforts towards concentration were needed, which is also our own point of view. The experience acquired in the execution of the first instalment of the Plan will undoubtedly allow tangible progress to be made in this direction.

As concerns budgetary matters and questions of management, it has to be remembered that, until the end of the 1981-1983 budgetary period, the system in force was that of semi-full budgeting. Under this system, only the costs of inflation occurring during the first half of the budgetary period were covered. In other words, in order to cope with the effects of inflation occurring during the first half of the budgetary period were covered. In other words, in order to cope with the effects of inflation occurring during the second half of that period, the Director-General was obliged - as nowhere else in the United Nations system - to make substantial cutbacks in spending, particularly under the heading of staff

coats, so as to be able to carry through the programme approved by the General Conference. This was what was done throughout the whole period of the first Medium-Term Plan, by means of a strict management of financial and human resources, but also the price of an excess workload for very many categories of staff.

I have on many occasions drawn the attention of the Executive Board and the General Conference to this anomaly which has weighed heavily upon the work of the Secretariat. I have frequently emphasized what a paradox it was that the Member States accepted full budgeting for all the institutions of the United Nations system but would not accept it in Unesco, thus subjecting its management to greater uncertainty than was the case in the other organizations.

The objective of the budgeting techniques themselves - ie. using a constant dollar value and introducing two sets of corrective measures dealing separately with inflation costs and the effects of fluctuations in the exchange rate of the dollar - is to ensure the greatest possible transparency in the computation of the budget. Thanks to these techniques, Unesco, it should be stressed, is doubtless one of the few organisations of the United Nations system to be able to surrender to Member States, after the closure of the budget for the period which has just ended, the surplus accruing from the rise in the exchange rate of the dollar during that period.

I would also like to recall the fact that, in his report to Congress of 14 September 1979 entitled "Unesco programming and budgeting need greater US attention", the Comptroller General of the United States gave the following assessment: "Although Unesco activities were not studied in detail during that review, we regarded the management procedures to be unique and forward-looking compared to other UN agencies examined; and further, as having the potential for improving the effectiveness of US participation in Unesco and in other international organisations as well....After closer study of Unesco planning and budgeting processes, we believe they are conceptually sound and permit progress toward improved disclosure of program aims and their financial implication to member governments".

The programme and budgeting processes on which judgement is here passed are basically the same as those employed in the preparation of the programme and budget approved by the General Conference in November 1983.

Certain appraisements are also made in your letter of the general policy of the Organisation, from which it would appear that certain "trends" have emerged within Unesco, leading it away from the original principles of its Constitution, that the Organisation now tends to serve the political purposes of Member States rather than the cause of international co-operation, and that it has compromised on certain fundamental goals such as individual human rights and the free flow of information. It is for the Member States, who decide on the lines of emphasis of the Organisation's programmes and activities, to reply to these observations.

Unesco is an organisation of States; the rules and standards whereby it operates and the methods by which it takes decisions, i.e., the manner in which it governs itself, are laid down in its Constitution. Its governing body, the General Conferences, is composed of representatives of governments. This was the choice of the founding Member States who wished thereby to ensure that an organisation whose ultimate purpose is to "contribute to peace and security" possessed all the necessary authority and effectiveness. The founders of the Organisation also considered it essential, however, to involve the educational, scientific and cultural communities of the Member States closely in its work. Three sets of provisions were accordingly made: the formation of National Commissions for Unesco, including members appointed in a personal capacity, to advise the governments of Member States on the Organisation's programmes and activities; the establishment of relations of co-operation with the international non-governmental organisations, relations which have expanded in recent years; and the provisions

whereby "in electing the members of the Executive Board the General Conference shall endeavour to include persons competent in the arts, the humanities, the sciences, education and the diffusion of ideas, and qualified by their experience and capacity to fulfil the administrative and executive duties of the Board." The original text of the Constitution in fact stipulated that "the members of the Executive Board shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the General Conference on behalf of the Conference as a whole and not as representatives of their respective Governments".

The Government of the United States was one of those on whose initiative it was decided in 1954 that the members of the Board should thereafter each represent the government of the State of which he or she was a national. The Board, which had previously been made up of independent personalities of the intellectual world on whom the founders of Unesco had wished to confer the greatest possible freedom of opinion and action vis-a-vis their governments, thus lost one of its fundamental characteristics.

The fact that Unesco is an organisation of States and that its governing bodies are intergovernmental in character explains why the debates among delegates of the Member States reflect different viewpoints and outlooks on the world.

This was the case during the debates on the attitude and the measures which were adopted by the Organization in relation to the Korean War or on the investigations carried out by the United States Loyalty Board on American members of the staff of Unesco.

Within bodies composed of representatives of Member States, delegates who sometimes express opposing points of view may indeed endeavour to gain acceptance for those positions best serving national interests. This only makes it all the more essential to seek out the common ground on which a consensus can be reached.

A distinction should in any case be drawn between the viewpoints expressed by Unesco's individual Member States or groups of Member States and the activities of the Organization itself, whose ethical role dictates that it should transcend particular ideologies - without, however, ignoring them. As the head of the United States delegation at the twenty-second session of the General Conference, Mr Edmund P. Hennelly himself recalled during the general policy debate "this distinction between what we as governments discuss, and what we expect this Organisation to do, is a critical one, too often neglected". This distinction is indeed too often neglected by Unesco's critics, who attribute to the Organisation itself the specific viewpoint expressed by a particular delegate, representative or government.

As far as the Organisation itself is concerned, the manner in which the lines of emphasis of its general policy and its programmes of activity have been determined in recent years excludes, as I see it, any possibility of it serving any interests other than those of the community of Member States as a whole. The vast majority of the decisions taken by the General Conference since 1976 have, as you know, been reached by consensus; in other words, the activities carried out by the Organisation have been decided not by a majority of States neglecting the viewpoints of the minority but by all the States represented. Far from weakening the authority of Unesco, this has rather strengthened it, for the very reason that it has succeeded in remaining, throughout all these years, a place for co-ordination and dialogue where it has always been possible for those present, transcending tensions and ideological confrontations, to find a common ground whereon action could be based.

It is true that, in the thirty-seven years since its foundation, there may have been some changes in the subjects of immediate concern to Unesco and in the weight of emphasis placed by the General Conference on particular aspects of the programmes which it has adopted. The fact is that immense changes have taken place in international society as a result of decolonization and the accession of the peoples of the former colonies to independence and their entry into international life. The number of Unesco's Member States has increased from 28, mainly Western countries, at the time of its establisher, to 161 today. The peoples represented by these new Member States belong to the most widely varying cultures and spiritual traditions, and their economic and social situations differ very greatly. These peoples have enriched the Organisation with their diversity but have also brought with them their own subjects of concern. It is in keeping with Unesco's mission to help them solve their problems in order to attain its "objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind", a mankind which has at long last found its true dimensions.

The new factor whose fundamental nature has perhaps not always been sufficiently appreciated in this: the most deprived countries have realized the basic importance of the assertion of their cultural identity in the process of taking full possession of their rediscovered dignity. They have also realized that none of the major problems they face can be properly solved without suitable development of education at all levels, without a surer grasp of science and technology, and without an increase in their potential in the various fields of information and communication, given the extent to which the techniques of communication are effecting and will increasingly affect the life of both individuals and societies.

In spite of the great diversity of peoples now represented in Unesco and the divergences of outlook which the considerable differences in their traditions, structures, economic and social situations and needs inevitably entail, I do not believe it possible to cite a single case where the activities proposed by the Director-General or the programmes adopted by the General Conference have included say item whatsoever which was contrary to the ideals announced in the Constitution and more especially to "universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations". Nothing in the texts either of the Medium-Term Plan for 1984-1989 or of the Programme and Budget for 1984-1985 seems to me to run counter to those principles. No wording can be picked out in these texts which contradicts the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; there is not a single line or a single act for which the Organisation as such has borne responsibility which could have been taken as justifying or even countenancing any restriction whatsoever upon the full and undivided exercise of human rights or upon the principle of the free flow of information.

It is reassuring to note, with the Ambassador of the United States to Unesco, the atmosphere of understanding, moderation and common sense which typified the debates at the last session of the General Conference and the consensus whereby most of its decisions were adopted.

Speaking at the closure of the twenty-second session of the General Conference on behalf of the group of Western States which, as she emphasized, was closely associated with the founding ideals of Unesco, Mrs Gerard stated:

"We can take pride in the work and in many of the accomplishments of this General Conference. It has been marked, in many instances, by agreement on issue about which such agreement has not always been easy. More importantly, I believe - I hope - that we have laid the groundwork here for greater efficiency and effectiveness in Unesco programmes - programmes which must serve the intellectual and practical needs of all Member States, and which will inevitably determine the support of Member States for the Organization's great tasks....Often during this Conference, we have reached our decisions by consensus. When so many states can come to common agreement through reasonable discussion of the issues at hand, it can be something valuable indeed."

In conclusion, Mr Secretary, I cannot but express the wish that your Government, after reconsidering the whole situation, will decide to remain in Unesco and continue to give the Organisation its full and whole-hearted co-operation. It would thus preserve the universality of Unesco, a universality which is the ideal towards which all the institutions of the United Nations aspire. I wish to assure you that, for my own part, I am ready to lend my full support to the pursuit of that objective.

Yours sincerely,

Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow

The following document is an Executive Summary of the Department of State's Policy Review of US-UNESCO Relations forwarded by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Newell to the Chairman of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the U.S. Senate. This document was supplied by the U.S. Embassy, Canberra.

US Allies

Of the US allies, only the United Kingdom, and according to the BBC World Service 20 July 1984, the Netherlands have expressed similar disquiet as to the activities of UNESCO. Neither have given notice of withdrawal. Australia has expressed concern at the US action; and indicated that it wants the US to remain in UNESCO. The Australian Ambassador, former Prime Minister E.G. Whitlam, has conveyed this view: (1984) Australian I.L. News 234.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF U.S./UNESCO POLICY REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

- SINCE TAKING OFFICE IN 1981, THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION HAS SYSTEMATICALLY REVIEWED ALL OF THE MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THE U.S. PARTICIPATES AND TO WHICH IT CONTRIBUTES. THE ADMINISTRATION'S DIRECTION HAS BEEN TO:
 - REASSESS AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN MULTILATERAL AFFAIRS;
 - IMPLEMENT A BUDGETARY POLICY OF ZERO NET PROGRAM GROWTH AND SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION OF NON-DISCRETIONARY COST INCREASES FOR THE FIRST HALF OF THE DECADE;
 - OBTAIN ADEQUATE U.S. REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE SCOPE OF MULTILATERAL AGENCIES;
 - REDUCE THE FINANCIAL BURDEN IMPOSED ON ALL PARTICIPANTS BY AN EXCESSIVE NUMBER OF LENGTHY INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES; AND
 - ADVOCATE A ROLE FOR THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS.

WITH RESPECT TO EACH OF THESE GOALS, UNESCO'S PERFORMANCE HAS BEEN MUCH LESS SATISFACTORY THAN THOSE OF OTHER MAJOR MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS. OUR POLICY ON BUDGET GROWTH, FOR EXAMPLE, SUBSTANTIALLY PREVAILED IN EVERY ORGANIZATION EXCEPT UNESCO, WHICH CONTINUED TO INCREASE ITS BUDGET WITHOUT REGARD TO THE WISHES OF THE MAJOR DONORS. THIS UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE WAS BUT THE LATEST CHAPTER IN A U.S./UNESCO RELATIONSHIP THAT

HAS BEEN TROUBLED FOR YEARS. EARLIER STRAINS IN U.S./UNESCO RELATIONS LED TO THE WITHHELDING OF U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS DURING 1974-75, FOLLOWING EXCESSIVE UNESCO POLITICALIZATION. BY THE LATE 1970S, UNESCO HAD BECOME A MAJOR FORUM FOR ATTACKS ON THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION IN THE NAME OF THE SO-CALLED NEW WORLD INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ORDER (NWICO).

IN RECENT YEARS UNESCO HAS INCREASINGLY BEEN USED AS A FORUM FOR SOVIET "PEACE AND DISARMAMENT" PROPAGANDA. THE SOVIETS AND THEIR ALLIES HAVE ATTEMPTED TO INSERT THESE THEMES INTO VIRTUALLY EVERY ASPECT OF UNESCO'S ACTIVITIES. THEY HAVE INTRODUCED PROGRAMS THAT CALL FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF SCIENTISTS, EDUCATORS, COMMUNICATORS AND CULTURAL WORKERS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE — AN APPROACH WHICH FRAYS THE POLITICAL ISSUE IN SOVIET BLOC TERMS AND PLACES IT IN CONTEXTS WHERE IT DOES NOT BELONG.

THE U.S. AND ITS ALLIES HAVE FOGGED TO COUNTER THESE NOTES, WHICH HAVE DIVERTED RESOURCES AND ENERGIES FROM UNESCO'S CENTRAL AND LEGITIMATE ACTIVITIES. DESPITE THESE REPORTS, UNESCO REMAINS PROGRAMS THAT ARE CLEARLY VEHICLES FOR SOVIET PROPAGANDA (E.G., THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN FOSTERING PEACE AND DISARMAMENT).

THE U.S. IS ALSO GREATLY CONCERNED WITH THE TENDENCY IN UNESCO TO SEEK STATIST SOLUTIONS TO COMPLEX TECHNICAL, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS. A STATIST APPROACH HAS BEEN EVIDENT IN UNESCO'S COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS. A PRIME EXAMPLE OF THIS TENDENCY IS NWICO. IN THE LATE 1970S, UNESCO BECAME DEEPLY INVOLVED IN PROGRAMS WHICH SEEMED TO BE LAYING THE GROUNDWORK FOR GREATER STATE CONTROL OF THE MEDIA. UNDER U.S. LEADERSHIP, THE "FREE PRESS" COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD REACTED VIGOROUSLY AND DEFEATED THE WORST UNESCO COMMUNICATIONS EXCESSES. NONETHELESS, SIGNIFICANT ELEMENTS WITHIN UNESCO STILL PROMOTE PROGRAMS THAT SEEK TO DEFINE THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNICATORS, TO STUDY THE NEED FOR "PROTECTION" OF JOURNALISTS, AND TO CHANNEL RESOURCES IN THE COMMUNICATIONS AREA TO STATES AS OPPOSED TO THE PRIVATE MEDIA.

THIS STATIST TREND HAS BEEN EVIDENT IN UNESCO'S HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVITIES. THE U.S. WAS FOREMOST AMONG THOSE COUNTRIES SIGNIFICANTLY INVOLVED IN THE TEACHING AND PROMULGATION OF TRADITIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS THROUGH UNESCO. IN RECENT YEARS, HOWEVER, UNESCO HAS BEEN PRESSURED, PARTICULARLY BY AFRICAN STATES (ENCOURAGED BY THE SOVIET BLOC), TO GIVE SQUALOR GREATER ATTENTION TO "THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLES."

A POLITICAL "RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION" HAS LONG BEEN RECOGNIZED AND ENDORSED BY THE U.S., BUT OTHER PURPORTED "RIGHTS OF PEOPLES, GENERALLY ECONOMIC IN CHARACTER, SUCH AS THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT, ARE PRECEDINGLY VAGUE AND ILL-DEFINED. THIS STRESS ON COLLECTIVE RIGHTS TENDS TO STRENGTHEN THE PROLEGATIVES OF A NON-DEMOCRATIC STATE, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS.

IN THIS REVIEW, WHICH BEGAN IN JUNE 1983, AN EFFORT WAS MADE TO GATHER THE VIEWS OF A NUMBER OF U.S. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS THAT BENEFITED FROM PARTICIPATION IN, OR CONTRIBUTED TO UNESCO ACTIVITIES IN EDUCATION, SCIENCE, CULTURE, AND COMMUNICATION. THIRTEEN U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND OFFICES ALSO CONTRIBUTED TO THE REVIEW -- FROM THEIR PARTICIPATION PERSPECTIVES -- AS DID THE U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO.

THE STUDY SEEMS TO PRODUCE, IN LIGHT OF INFORMATION GATHERED, AN ANALYSIS OF OVERALL POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL TRENDS IN UNESCO. IT PROVIDES THE BASIC INFORMATION FOR A JUDGMENT ON UNESCO'S OVERALL UTILITY TO THE UNITED STATES. THE STUDY, ACCORDINGLY, LOOKS AT THE PRINCIPAL SECTORS OF UNESCO, THEIR MANDATES, THE BENEFITS THEY PROVIDE TO THE UNITED STATES, THEIR PROBLEMS, THE CONSEQUENCES OF NON-PARTICIPATION BY THE U.S., AND POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENTS. THE STUDY ALSO EXAMINES SPECIFIC QUESTIONS SUCH AS THE QUALITY OF UNESCO'S MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, THE NATURE AND IMPACT OF POLYACTIVIZATION OF UNESCO PROCEEDINGS, AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF UNESCO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS. THE REVIEW DESCRIBES NOT ONLY UNESCO'S FAILURES AND STRENGTHS, ALWAYS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF U.S. INTERESTS.

EDUCATION SECTOR

THE MANDATE OF UNESCO'S EDUCATION SECTOR IS TO PROMOTE EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY, COMBAT ILLITERACY, IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION (AND ITS RELEVANCE TO PERSONAL AND SOCIETAL NEEDS), AND FOSTER INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING. IT IS THE LARGEST OF UNESCO'S FIVE SUBSTANTIVE SECTORS.

AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES HAVE PLAYED A PRIME ROLE IN DEVELOPING UNESCO EDUCATION PROGRAMS. ADDITIONALLY, UNESCO HAS UTILIZED A LARGE NUMBER OF PRIVATE AMERICANS AS CONSULTANTS, FIELD EXPERTS, AND AUTHORS, A REFLECTION OF THE ORGANIZATION'S HIGH REGARD FOR AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL EXPERTISE. NONETHELESS, U.S. INFLUENCE IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR HAS DECLINED IN RECENT YEARS. FEWER U.S. EDUCATORS NOW AUTHOR UNESCO EDUCATION PROGRAMMING, AND A SOVIET NATIONAL IS THE CURRENT ASSISTANT DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR EDUCATION. MOST AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS ARE NOT HEAVILY INVOLVED IN UNESCO ACTIVITIES. THEY TEND, RATHER, TO CONDUCT THEIR OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES BILATERALLY AND ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS.

UNESCO HAS DONE VALUABLE WORK IN EDUCATION PLANNING AND TRAINING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. IN COMBATING ILLITERACY, IN COLLECTING STATISTICAL DATA NOT EASILY AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE, AND IN COORDINATING EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS INTERNATIONALLY. THE U.S. BENEFITS INDIRECTLY FROM THESE EFFORTS.

IN RECENT YEARS, PROBLEMS IN THIS SECTOR HAVE INCLUDED BOTH THE INCORPORATION OF COLLECTIVIST CONCEPTS, ANTI-WESTERN TONES, INTO EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND NORMATIVE INSTRUMENTS, AND ALSO AN INAPPROPRIATE TOP-DOWN MANAGEMENT THAT HAS BEEN SLOW TO RESPOND TO NEW IDEAS.

A U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM UNESCO WOULD GREATLY REDUCE DIRECT AMERICAN INFLUENCE IN UNESCO EDUCATION PROGRAMS. IT MIGHT ALSO LOWER THE WORLDWIDE IMPACT OF WESTERN EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND VALUES -- IN FAVOR OF THE IDEAS OF OTHERS. AS ALTERNATIVES TO UNESCO, HOWEVER, THE U.S. COULD INCREASE ITS FUNDING OF A NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS DOING WORK SIMILAR TO UNESCO'S -- INCLUDING SEWELL (I.E., THE UN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM) WHICH NOW USES UNESCO AS AN IMPLEMENTING AGENCY.

NATURAL SCIENCE SECTOR

UNESCO'S SCIENCE SECTOR PROMOTES RESEARCH, PROVIDES ACCESS TO RESEARCH DATA, ORGANIZES INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC EFFORTS ON A COST-SHARING BASIS, AND OFFERS SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL HELP TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

MAJOR UNESCO SCIENCE PROGRAMS IN WHICH THE U.S. HAS AN INTEREST INCLUDE THE INTERNATIONAL BRAIN RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS, AND THE INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CORRELATION PROGRAM. ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT ARE THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION, WHICH PROVIDES CONSIDERABLE MARINE DATA TO THE U.S. NAVY AND THE U.S. SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, AND THE MAN IN THE BICSPHERE PROGRAM, WHICH INTEGRATES RESEARCH ON THE WORLD'S ECOSYSTEMS.

SCIENTIFIC BENEFITS NOW AVAILABLE TO THE U.S. THROUGH UNESCO INCLUDE WIDE ACCESS TO RESEARCH RESOURCES AND DATA, COST-SHARING IN LARGE-SCALE INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS, CONTACT WITH SCIENTISTS WITH WHICH AMERICANS, FOR POLITICAL AND OTHER REASONS, COULD NOT OTHERWISE EASILY COLLABORATE, AND THE PROMOTION OF AMERICAN MODELS FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE AMERICAN SCIENCE COMMUNITY WITH UNESCO ARE MAINLY ORGANIZATIONAL. UNESCO HAS HIGH ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND POOR STAFF QUALITY. IT EVALUATES PROJECTS INSUFFICIENTLY, AND EXPERIENCES GREAT DIFFICULTY IN TERMINATING PROJECTS. ADDITIONALLY, SOME UNESCO SCIENCE GATHERINGS ARE MARRED BY THE INJECTION OF EXTRANEOUS POLITICAL ISSUES. NONETHELESS, THE RESULT OF UNESCO'S SCIENTIFIC EFFORTS IS USUALLY GOOD TECHNICAL WORK.

A U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM UNESCO COULD FORFEIT OUR PRESENT ACCESS TO AN INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION AND DATA GATHERING THAT HAS BEEN IMPORTANT. THE DECREASE IN INCOME FROM DUES WOULD DAMAGE UNESCO'S ABILITY TO MEET THE U.S. OBJECTIVE OF ASSISTANCE TO LDCs IN DEVELOPING SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TO PERFORM THE SUCCESSFUL INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS WHICH REMAIN A MEMBER OF THE VALUABLE INTERNATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC COMMISSION AND THE INTERNATIONAL COORDINATED COOPERATION PROGRAM. WE COULD STRENGTHEN OUR SUPPORT FOR DOMESTIC AND MULTILATERAL ACTIVITIES THROUGH THE U.S. MAR PROGRAM, AND WE COULD INTENSIFY OUR PARTICIPATION IN OTHER MULTILATERAL SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE SERVED OUR INTERESTS.

SOCIAL SCIENCES SECTOR

UNESCO'S SOCIAL SCIENCES SECTOR AIMS TO BUILD UP SOCIAL SCIENCE FACILITIES IN THE THIRD WORLD, TO STRENGTHEN RESEARCH AS AN INSTRUMENT OF PLANNING, AND TO RELATE THE APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES TO ISSUES SUCH AS HUMAN RIGHTS, DEVELOPMENT, POPULATION, AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE COMMUNITY PLAYED A LARGE ROLE IN THE EARLY ORIENTATION OF THIS SECTOR, AND HAS MORE RECENTLY URGED UNESCO TO PROMOTE STRONGER SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTIONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, A TASK IN WHICH UNESCO HAS HAD SOME SUCCESS.

SOME AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS BENEFIT FROM DATA AND REPORTS GENERATED BY UNESCO SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTERS. AT THE SAME TIME, THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE COMMUNITY HAS HAD DIFFICULTY RELATING TO UNESCO'S SOCIAL SCIENCE ACTIVITIES, WHICH ARE FRAGMENTED AND SMALL SCALE. NOW HAVE U.S. EFFORTS TO FOCUS UNESCO'S ATTENTION ON A LIMITED NUMBER OF SOCIETAL PROBLEMS SOME FRUIT. FINALLY, THE PROGRAMS IN THIS SECTOR SUFFER FROM NUMEROUS INTRUSIONS OF EXTRANEOUS POLITICAL ISSUES SUCH AS DISARMAMENT, APARTHEID, AND PEOPLE'S RIGHTS.

A U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM THIS SECTOR WOULD NOT ENTAIL GREAT LOSSES SINCE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS HAVE MANY OTHER CHANNELS FOR RESEARCH ABROAD. AS ALTERNATIVES, THE U.S. COULD PROMOTE MORE AMERICAN ACADEMIC INTERCHANGE WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, INCREASE BILATERAL ASSISTANCE IN SOCIAL SCIENCE DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, AND STRENGTHEN U.S. PARTICIPATION IN VARIOUS INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE ORGANIZATIONS.

CULTURE SECTOR

UNESCO CULTURAL ACTIVITIES AIM TO PRESERVE THE CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE OF MANKIND, PROMOTE CULTURAL IDENTITY, STIMULATE ARTISTIC AND INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITY, AND PROMOTE LOCAL CULTURAL ACTIVITIES, SPEAKING TO ACHIEVE WIDER PARTICIPATION THEREIN.

THE U.S. HAS LONG SUPPORTED UNESCO'S PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES, AND HAS PARTICIPATED IN OTHER CULTURAL PROGRAMS. AMERICANS HAVE BEEN INVOLVED TO A FAR LESSER EXTENT IN UNESCO'S CULTURAL STUDIES PROGRAM AND COMPASSIVE INTERCULTURAL ACTIVITIES. BENEFITS TO THE U.S. FROM UNESCO'S CULTURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM, ITS MOST VALUED PROGRAM IN THIS FIELD, ARE PROVIDED BY ITS RESEARCH AND TRAINING, BY THE IMPACTS IT GIVES TO U.S. CULTURAL HERITAGE LEGISLATION, THROUGH AGREEMENTS TO FURTHER EFFORTS TO PRESERVE THE WORLD'S CULTURAL PATRIMONY, THROUGH SUBSIDIES TO INTERNATIONAL NGOs INVOLVED IN CULTURAL PRESERVATION, AND IN INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGNS TO PRESERVE ENDANGERED CULTURAL PROPERTY.

UNESCO CULTURAL PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN RELATIVELY FREE OF POLITICAL PROBLEMS. ONE EXCEPTION CONCERNS ARAE EFFORTS TO INJECT MIDDLE EAST POLITICAL DISPUTES INTO CULTURAL PRESERVATION DISCUSSIONS, E.G., THOSE CONCERNING THE STATUS OF THE MONUMENTS IN JERUSALEM. WE HAVE STRONGLY OPPOSED NEGATIVE REFERENCES TO CULTURAL INDUSTRIES OF MIDDLE AMERICA IN UNESCO'S SECOND MEDIUM-TERM PLAN.

WITHDRAWAL FROM UNESCO WOULD MEAN THAT UNESCO'S GENERAL COORDINATING FUNCTIONS WOULD NO LONGER BE AVAILABLE TO THE U.S. AND THAT OUR PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL AFFAIRS ON A MULTILATERAL BASIS COULD DIMINISH. BUT WITHDRAWAL WOULD ALSO FREE RESOURCES THAT WE MIGHT USE TO FUND ACTIVITIES WE WISHED TO PROMOTE. BILATERAL CULTURAL CONTACTS MIGHT INCREASE. WE COULD REMAIN A PARTY TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION, AND WE COULD CONTINUE TO BE INVOLVED IN INDIVIDUAL INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGNS TO SAVE SPECIFIC MONUMENTS. WE COULD ALSO INCREASE OUR SUPPORT TO VARIOUS INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS, BOTH DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN.

COMMUNICATIONS SECTOR

UNESCO PLAYS THE CENTRAL ROLE IN COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION IN THE UN SYSTEM. ITS STATED OBJECTIVES ARE TO IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS, TO ENCOURAGE THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION, AND TO STRENGTHEN COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURES. THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY IN UNESCO COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS HAS BEEN DECLINING IN RECENT YEARS.

UNESCO HAS OFFERED THE U.S. A PLATFORM TO ADVOCATE THE VIRTUES OF A FREE PRESS. WE HELPED LAUNCH, FOR EXAMPLE, A VEHICLE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATIONS CAPACITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION — IPDC), AND WE HAVE USED UNESCO MEETINGS TO WARN OF THE DANGERS OF A STATE-DOMINATED PRESS.

UNESCO IS NOW, HOWEVER, A PLATFORM AND A FORUM FOR ANTI-PRESS ACTIVITIES. WE HAVE BEEN TROUBLED BY PROGRAMS THAT SEEK TO ESTABLISH A SINGLE NORMATIVE CODE FOR THE MEDIA THAT CONCENTRATE ON SUCH ILLEGITIMATE NEW RIGHTS AS THE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE OR THE RIGHT OF SOLIDARITY, WHICH COULD UNDERMINE SUPPORT FOR TRADITIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS, OR THAT CONDUCE TO THE STATE THE AUTHORITY TO CONTROL THE PRESS THROUGH PRACTICES SUCH AS CENSORSHIP OR THE LICENSING OF JOURNALISTS.

WE ARE GREATLY CONCERNED WITH THE CONCEPT OF A NEW WORLD INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ORDER. SUCH AN ORDER COULD LEAD TO AN INTERNATIONAL CODE, WITH IMPLICATIONS THAT THERE ARE UNIVERSAL STANDARDS WHICH GOVERN THE GATHERING AND DISSEMINATION OF NEWS AND INFORMATION, ALTHOUGH THE PRESENT 22ND GENERAL CONFERENCE HEAVILY GAVE SOME EVIDENCE OF MODERATION ON THIS ISSUE. THE IDEAS OF A FREE PRESS AND A FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION HAVE ALREADY BEEN SERIOUSLY TERRIFIED BY DEBATE WHICH HAVE PROMOTED THIS NEW ORDER.

WELL OUR WITHELDAL WOULD ASSENTS FROM THESE DEBATES AND THIS LESSON OUR ABILITY TO DEFEND OUR PRESS VALUES WITHIN UNESCO. IT WOULD AT THE SAME TIME UNDERLINE THE FACT THAT WE DISAPPROVE OF RESTRICTIONS ON A FREE PRESS. OUR WITHELDAL, HOWEVER, MIGHT COMPETED TO USE ITS DIMINISHED RESOURCES MORE EFFECTIVELY, AND WOULD ALLOW US TO BE MORE SELECTIVE IN REJECTING ANY PEOPLE SUPPORT WE MIGHT OFFER TO THE PRIVATE MEDIA IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. WE COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, CONTINUE TO SUPPORT WORTHY IPDC PROJECTS BILATERALLY, AND WE COULD INCREASE OUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRIVATE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OFFERING COMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.

COPYRIGHT

UNESCO IS THE SECRETARIAT FOR THE UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION (UCC), WHOSE PROGRAMS UNESCO DEVICES AND CARRIES OUT. THE U.S. RATIFIED THE UCC IN 1955, AND HAS SINCE BEEN AN ACTIVE PARTICIPANT. AS THE WORLD'S LEADING EXPORTER OF COPYRIGHTED MATERIALS, AND AS A NON-SIGNATORY TO THE BERNE CONVENTION ON COPYRIGHT, WE CONSIDER THE UCC EXTREMELY VALUABLE.

OUR INFLUENCE IN THE UCC'S INTERGOVERNMENTAL COPYRIGHT COMMITTEE HAS DIMINISHED RECENTLY, AS THEIR WORLD MEMBERS HAVE ATTEMPTED TO WEST CONTROL OF IT FROM THE INDUSTRIALIZED STATES AND TURN THE COMMITTEE TOWARD SUCH ENDOVORS AS DEVELOPMENT OF SPANET COPYRIGHT LICENSING AGREEMENTS, CREATION OF A-CENTRALIZED COPYRIGHT LICENSING BODY, AND CREATION OF GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING COMPULSORY LICENSING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES FOR THE TRANSLATION AND REPRINTING OF COPYRIGHTED WORKS.

EVEN IF WE LEFT UNESCO, THE U.S. WOULD REMAIN AN ADHERENT TO THE UCC AND A MEMBER OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COPYRIGHT COMMITTEE. ALTHOUGH OUR INFLUENCE ON UNESCO'S COPYRIGHT PROGRAMS MIGHT DIMINISH, THAT INFLUENCE HAS BEEN DECLINING IN ANY CASE. THE REAL STRUGGLE IN COPYRIGHT AFFAIRS CONCERNS CONTINUING TO PUT COLLECTIVE RIGHTS ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH INDIVIDUAL HUMAN RIGHTS. AS ALTERNATIVES TO UNESCO, WE WOULD, OF COURSE, CONTINUE TO WORK BILATERALLY FOR INDIVIDUALS' RIGHTS AROUND THE WORLD, AND WOULD CONTINUE OUR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION AND IN OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES.

HUMAN RIGHTS

HUMAN RIGHTS FIGURE PROMINENTLY IN UNESCO'S CONSTITUTION. ITS COMMITTEE ON CONVENTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (OCR) IS CHARGED WITH EXAMINING CLAIMS OF INDIVIDUAL HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN UNESCO'S FIELDS OF COMPETENCE -- A UNIQUE MANDATE IN THE UN SYSTEM. FOR THE U.S., THE PRINCIPAL ADVANTAGE OF PARTICIPATION IN UNESCO'S HUMAN RIGHTS AREA IS ACCESS TO A WORLDWIDE FORUM TO PROMOTE THE CENTRAL IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS, RIGHTS WHICH ARE ATTACHED TO THE INDIVIDUAL, AS OPPOSED TO COLLECTIVE RIGHTS. MOREOVER, THE CR COMMITTEE HAS INVESTIGATED NUMEROUS CASES OF ALLEGED HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN SOVIET BLOC COUNTRIES.

OUR PROBLEMS WITH UNESCO'S HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVITIES INCLUDE THE PROMOTION OF COLLECTIVE RIGHTS, A PROMOTION THAT COULD POTENTIALLY DENIGRATE TRADITIONAL, INDIVIDUAL HUMAN RIGHTS. ANOTHER PROBLEM IS UNESCO'S TENDENCY TO SEE PREJUDICE AND INTOLERANCE AS LIMITED TO RACISM AND APARTHEID ONLY -- TO THE EXCLUSION OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON ETHNIC ORIGIN, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, OR RELIGION. WE HAVE SEEN, ALSO, A DISPOSITION TO SUPPORT NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS, AN ENTIRELY INAPPROPRIATE ENDORSEMENT FOR UNESCO, IN OUR VIEW.

WITHDRAWAL FROM UNESCO WOULD DEPRIVE US OF AN IMPORTANT PLATFORM FOR THE DEFENSE OF INDIVIDUAL HUMAN RIGHTS, BUT IT WOULD ALSO CLEARLY DISASSOCIATE US FROM EFFORTS TO PUT COLLECTIVE RIGHTS ON AN EQUAL FOOTING WITH INDIVIDUAL HUMAN RIGHTS. AS ALTERNATIVES TO UNESCO, WE WOULD, OF COURSE, CONTINUE TO WORK BILATERALLY FOR INDIVIDUALS' RIGHTS AROUND THE WORLD, AND WOULD CONTINUE OUR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION AND IN OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES.

STATUS OF WOMEN

PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT UNESCO ARE INTERSECTORAL IN NATURE. THIS MEANS A WOMEN'S DIMENSION IS INCLUDED IN MOST UNESCO ACTIVITIES.

THE U.S. HAS USED UNESCO TO GIVE THE STATUS OF WOMEN A CENTRAL ROLE IN ITS PROGRAMS, AND WE ARE SATISFIED WITH THE GENERAL TRUST OF THE ORGANIZATION'S RESPONSE. BUT SOME WOMEN'S ACTIVITIES AT UNESCO REFLECT POLITICAL MOTIVATIONS. E.G. PROPOSALS FOR PROJECTS THAT INVOLVE THE WOMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS OF ARMED "LIBERATION" GROUPS SUCH AS SWAPO.

A U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM UNESCO MIGHT WEAKEN UNESCO'S PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN, ALTHOUGH OTHER INCREASING SUPPORT FOR WOMEN'S PROGRAMS WITHIN THE ORGANIZATION, PARTICULARLY ON THE PART OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, SUGGESTS THAT THIS MIGHT NOT OCCUR. EVEN AFTER A WITHDRAWAL, THE U.S. WOULD CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN'S STATUS IN SUCH FORUMS AS THE 1985 UN WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN, THE UN COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, AND THE UN VOLUNTARY FUND FOR WOMEN, TO WHICH WE COULD DIRECT ADDITIONAL FUNDS. AS ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE TO UNESCO, THE U.S. COULD INCREASE ITS BILATERAL ASSISTANCE FOR PROGRAMS THAT EXPLICITLY INCLUDE WOMEN IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS.

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UNESCO'S WORK IN THE FIELD IS PRIMARILY DEVELOPMENTAL. UNDER THE HEADINGS OF EDUCATION, CULTURE, COMMUNICATIONS, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, UNESCO EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS RANGE FROM TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION TO MORE SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES SUCH AS REVISION OF SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CURRICULA AND REORGANIZATION OF RELATED GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS. A TOP UNESCO PRIORITY IS SCHOOL ENROLLMENT WORLDWIDE BY 1990. AID EDUCATIONAL SPECIALISTS CONSIDER UNESCO AN AUTHORITATIVE SOURCE OF EDUCATIONAL DATA AS WELL AS A SOURCE OF MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE COMPLEMENTARY TO AID BILATERAL PROGRAMMING IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR. UNESCO CULTURAL PROJECTS RANGE FROM RESTORATION OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS TO REORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MODERN DATA RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS. ACTIVITIES UNDER THE COMMUNICATIONS HEADLINE INCLUDE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEWSPAPER PRINTING PRESSES IN OUTLING RURAL AREAS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF BROADCASTING STATIONS. MAJOR ACTIVITIES IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RANGE FROM EQUIPPING HIGH SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY LABORATORIES TO RESEARCH INTO SOLAR ENERGY AND INTO ARID ZONE FARMING.

UNESCO-EXECUTED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ARE FUNDED MAINLY BY THE WORLD BANK AND OTHER MULTILATERAL BANKS, THE UN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (UNDP), AND A SMALL NUMBER OF BILATERAL TRUST-FUND CONTRIBUTORS. ACCORDING TO A RECENT FIRST-TIME ASSESSMENT BY 78 U.S. EMBASSIES AND

AID MISSIONS (OUT OF 83 CONTACTED), UNESCO PROJECTS ARE GENERALLY RELEVANT TO DEVELOPING COUNTRY NEEDS, INNOVATIVE, AND, IN MANY CASES, HIGHLY EFFECTIVE. BUT UNESCO HEADQUARTERS AND REGIONAL OFFICES MONITOR PROJECTS POORLY, AND, IN SOME CASES, COORDINATE POORLY WITH UNDP. UNESCO PROJECTS FINANCED BY UNDP ARE SUBJECT TO SYSTEMATIC UNDP COUNTELS AND TEND TO BE BETTER MANAGED THAN THOSE FINANCED SOLELY BY UNESCO.

A U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM UNESCO COULD MEAN DECREASED U.S. SUPPORT FOR FIELD PROGRAMS THAT GENERALLY SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN POLICY GOALS. UNESCO PROJECT MANAGERS MIGHT CONTINUE TO EMPLOY AMERICANS AS CONSULTANTS, AND TO SPECIFY AMERICAN EQUIPMENT IN REFERENCE TO ON-GOING PROJECT REQUIREMENTS AND THE WISHES OF PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES, BUT THIS CANNOT BE ASSURED. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT UNESCO WOULD SEND FEWER THIRD WORLD NATIONALS HERE FOR ON-THE-SPOT TRAINING.

IF THE U.S. WITHDREW FROM UNESCO, OTHER MULTILATERAL CHANNELS SUCH AS UNDP AND THE WORLD BANK WOULD STILL EXIST FOR ASSIGNING DEVELOPMENT. ACTIVITY IN THESE CHANNELS COULD BE EXPANDED, AS COULD SUPPORT FOR PRIVATE SECTOR EFFORTS.

MANAGEMENT

UNESCO SUFFERS FROM SERIOUS MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS AT EVERY LEVEL AND IN ALMOST EVERY ASPECT OF ITS WORK. ORGANIZATION-WIDE PROBLEMS INCLUDE A DISPROPORTIONATELY LARGE PARIS-BASED BUREAUCRACY THAT ABSORBS SOME 80 OF ALL UNESCO FUNDS; A RELUCTANCE TO DELEGATE REAL AUTHORITY, ESPECIALLY AT THE TOP; LACK OF RIGOROUS CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM FORMULATION AND EVALUATION; SELECTIVITY, IF NOT ARBITRARY, DECISION-MAKING ON PROGRAM AND PERSONNEL ISSUES, INCLUDING IRRESPONSIBLE DELAYS IN THE FILLING OF STAFF VACANCIES; POOR STAFF UTILIZATION; AND INEFFECTIVE INTERSECTORAL COORDINATION.

ONE AREA OF MANAGEMENT WHICH TOUCHES THE U.S. DIRECTLY IS UNESCO'S HIRING OF AMERICANS. BOTH OUR GEOGRAPHIC QUOTA AND OUR SUCCESS IN GETTING OUR QUOTA FILLED HAVE SUFFERED SINCE THE MID 1970S -- PARTLY BECAUSE OF A DESIRE TO GIVE MORE POSITIONS TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BUT ALSO BECAUSE OF ARBITRARY SELECTION PROCEDURES.

UNESCO'S STYLE OF OPERATION IS ONE OF EXTREME OVER-CENTRALIZATION -- WITH EXCESSIVE INFLUENCE VESTED IN A SECRETARIAT WHICH EXHIBITS A GENERAL SPIRIT OF INSENSITIVENESS VIS-A-VIS MEMBER STATES, ESPECIALLY THE LARGER DONORS. INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE IS A CASUALTY OF THIS APPROACH, AT ALL LEVELS.

INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS

EACH OF THESE PROBLEMS -- POLITICAL MISDEEDS OF THE ORGANIZATION, MISDAIN FOR THE MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS IN THE BUDGET PROCESS, AND POOR MANAGEMENT -- PERMITS THE REAL-WORLD SIGNIFICANCE OF UNESCO'S PRESENT OPERATIONS, CLUES ITS FUTURE PROSPECTS, AND LESSENS ITS IMPORTANCE TO U.S. INTERESTS. EACH OF THESE PROBLEMS MIGHT APPEAR TO BE SOLUBLE, WITH THE APPLICATION OF SUFFICIENT EFFORT AND DIRECTION. THAT APPEARANCE IS MISLEADING. THE PROBLEMS ARE INTRACTABLE, AND QUITE POSSIBLY INSOLUBLE, BECAUSE THE GOVERNING BODIES OF UNESCO CHARGED BY ITS CONSTITUTION WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR SETTING ITS POLICIES AND OVERSEEING ITS MANAGEMENT, HAVE SHOWN THEMSELVES TO BE INDIFFERENT, SUBMISSIVE, AND INCAPABLE OF INSTITUTIONAL REFORM.

NEITHER THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OR THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE ORGANIZATION IS CAPABLE OF ACTION INDEPENDENT OF THE PROPOSALS AND AGREEMENTS FORMULATED AND STATED BY THE SECRETARIAT. TO SAY THIS IS NOT NECESSARILY TO CRITICIZE THE SECRETARIAT, IT IS SIMPLY THAT AN IMPARTIAL EXAMINATION OF HOW THESE INSTITUTIONS ACHIEVED THEIR PRESENT IMPEDENCE (A STUDY WHICH THIS REVIEW DOES NOT ATTEMPT) WOULD CONCLUDE THAT THE PROBLEM WAS AS MUCH ONE OF ADEQUATION AS OF USURPATION. NONETHELESS, THE FACT IS THAT UNESCO TODAY HAS SERIOUS, AND GROWING, PROBLEMS WHICH SEEM BEYOND THE PRESENT REICH OF ITS GOVERNING BODIES TO SOLVE. THIS SITUATION IS EXAGGERATED BY THE LACK OF INFORMATION ESSENTIAL TO THE GOVERNING BODIES, TASKS, AND MORE SERIOUSLY, BY AN ABSENCE OF MEANS THROUGH WHICH THEY COULD ACQUIRE SUCH INFORMATION. THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AND THE BOARD ARE TOTALLY DEPENDENT ON THE SECRETARIAT FOR SUCH KEY MANAGEMENT INFORMATION AS BUDGET DATA; PROGRAM EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK; CURRENT AND PROJECTED SPENDING ESTIMATES; PERSONNEL PLANNING AND DECISIONS; AND FORMALIZED STAGE PROGRAM PLANNING. NO EFFECTIVE PROVISION FOR OBTAINING THE INFORMATION GIVEN BY THE SECRETARIAT IS AVAILABLE. NO MEANS ARE PROVIDED THROUGH WHICH FURTHER INQUIRIES COULD BE ADDRESSED TO KEY SENIOR PERSONNEL REGARDING THE NATURE OR BACKGROUND OF THEIR PLANS AND DECISIONS. THUS, ANY STRATEGY OF REFORM FROM WITHIN MUST TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE ORGANIZATION AS IT IS PRESENTLY CONSTITUTED AND AS IT PRESENTLY GOVERNS ITSELF.

BUDGET

OTHER MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS HAVE RESPONDED TO WESTERN CRITICISMS THAT EXCESSIVE BUDGET GROWTH BE CURTAILED, BUT UNESCO HAS NOT. THE BUDGET INCREASES FOR OTHER MAJOR UN ORGANS WERE: 0.5 FOR THE FAO, 0.3 FOR THE UN ITSELF, 1.9 FOR THE ILO, AND MINDS 0.3 FOR THE WHO. AT THE MOST RECENT GENERAL CONFERENCE, UNESCO PROPOSED A REAL PROGRAM GROWTH BUDGET OF 9.7, FAR OUT OF LINE BOTH WITH THE U.S. POLICY OF ZERO NET PROGRAM GROWTH IN MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS AND WITH THE BUDGETS OF OTHER MAJOR ORGANIZATIONS. EVEN THOUGH HARD NEGOTIATIONS FINALLY RESULTED IN A REAL PROGRAM GROWTH BUDGET OF 5.5 OR 5.744 MILLION, THIS GROWTH RATE WAS STILL UNACCEPTABLE, AND WE VOTED AGAINST THE BUDGET. AT THE LAST TWO EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS, NEARLY ALL OF THE MAJOR DONORS, WHO CONTRIBUTED OVER TWO-THIRDS OF THE BUDGET, EITHER ABSTAINED OR VOTED AGAINST THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S PROPOSED BUDGET.

WE ARE ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNESCO BUDGET -- WHICH IS SO CONFUSING THAT EVEN REPORTS FIND IT OPAQUE. SOME BUDGET ITEMS ARE HIDDEN, WHILE OTHERS ARE PRESENTED IN A MISLEADING WAY, MAKING THE BUDGET SUBJECT TO MANIPULATION BY THE SECRETARIAT. ALTHOUGH EXTERNAL AUDITING IS TECHNICALLY ADEQUATE, NEEDED CHANGES DO NOT OCCUR. MOREOVER, THE INTERNAL AUDITORS ARE ONLY RESPONSIVE TO THE MOST GENERAL SORT OF GUIDANCE, CONTAINED IN RESOLUTIONS; SECRETARIAT-DRAFTED GENERAL CONFERENCE POLICIES; AND DO NOT RESPOND TO MEMBER STATE OR EXECUTIVE BOARD INQUIRIES OR REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION. GIVEN THIS CONFUSION AND OBFUSCATION, UNESCO MEMBER STATES HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO IMPOSE EFFICIENT CONTROLS.

POLITICIZATION

EVEN MORE REPRESENTABLE, FROM THE AMERICAN VIEWPOINT, IS UNESCO'S EXCESSIVE POLITICIZATION AND INSUFFICIENT CONSIDERATION OF MINORITY VIEWS. UNESCO SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME AND MONEY ON ACTIVITIES BASICALLY POLITICAL IN PURPOSE, INCLUDING AID THROUGH ARMED "LIBERATION" ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS THE PLO. IT PROMOTES IMBALANCED DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGNS AND A SELECTIVE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION APPROACH THAT FOCUSES ON DISCRIMINATION. IT ELABORATES NEW "COLLECTIVE RIGHTS" -- TO THE DETRIMENT, IN OUR VIEW, OF THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS. IT DEVELOPS A PLETHORA OF "NORMATIVE" INSTRUMENTS, SOMETIMES ANTI-LIBERARIAN IN CONCEPT. THESE ACTIVITIES ARE ENCOURAGED BY A COINCIDENCE OF VIEWS BETWEEN THE SECRETARIAT AND A MAJORITY OF THIRD WORLD REPRESENTATIVES, DESPITE OPPOSITION BY THE U.S. AND THE OTHER DEVELOPED COUNTRIES WHICH PAY A HUGE PROPORTION OF UNESCO'S BUDGET. IN GIVING MANY OF UNESCO'S PROGRAMS A POLITICAL DIRECTION, THE MAJORITY OF MEMBER STATES, WITH THE SUPPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT, OFTEN RIDE ROUGHSEED OVER MINORITY POINTS OF VIEW REPRESENTED BY DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES.

CONCLUSION

UNESCO PROGRAMS BENEFIT SELECTED GROUPS AND SECTORS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY, ESPECIALLY CERTAIN GROUPS OF SCHOLARS, SCIENTISTS, AND CULTURAL SPECIALISTS. MOST UNESCO PROGRAMS ARE AIMED ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY AT THE THIRD WORLD AND HAVE LITTLE OR NO DIRECT IMPACT ON U.S. INTERESTS, ALTHOUGH MANY OF THEM COMPLEMENT GENERAL HISTORIC U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES. MANY UNESCO FIELD PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND CULTURE ARE OF THIS NATURE. IT MUST BE CONCLUDED, HOWEVER, THAT UNESCO'S SEVERE MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS DIMINISH THE CONSTRUCTIVE RESULTS THAT THESE PROGRAMS COULD PRODUCE IF THE ORGANIZATION WERE EFFECTIVELY MANAGED.

A NUMBER OF OTHER PROGRAMS, PARTICULARLY IN COMMUNICATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, EDUCATION FOR "PEACE AND UNDERSTANDING," AND "PEACE AND DISARMAMENT," CLEARLY WORK AGAINST U.S. INTERESTS. STILL ANOTHER GROUP OF PROGRAMS INVOLVE SUPPORT FOR THEORETICAL STUDIES AND FOR UNNECESSARY, COSTLY AND DUPLICATIVE ACTIVITIES THAT DIVERT RESOURCES FROM REAL AND PRESSING NEEDS. THESE PROGRAMS ARE SUPPORTED BY WHAT HAS COME TO BE AN AUTOMATIC MAJORITY IN UNESCO — A MAJORITY THAT IS OPPOSED TO WESTERN IDEAS ON PERSONAL FREEDOM, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN ITS CITIZEN'S AFFAIRS; AND NEGATIVE TOWARD THE NEED FOR BUDGET RESTRAINT. GIVEN UNESCO'S GRAVE INSTITUTIONAL MALFUNCTIONS AND ITS OTHER PROBLEMS IN BOTH THE PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS, IT WOULD REQUIRE MAJOR, SIGNIFICANT REFORM TO BRING UNESCO INTO LINE WITH U.S. INTERESTS.