

UNESCO, A CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE?*

by Johan Galtung

Center of International Studies
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

October 1986

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Today, United Nations day 24 October, we are also celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO. I shall proceed in the traditional way when two concepts are about to be compared: first, a discussion of peace; then a discussion of UNESCO and then several efforts to hold one up against the other.

As a suitable point of departure for a discussion of peace let me take "peace research" as conceived of by peace researchers. I think there is some need for some demystification here. There is nothing mysterious about the definition: what concerns us is the exploration of the conditions under which peace can be obtained with peaceful means. In other words, not peace obtained by war to end all wars, and not peace obtained by balance of power or balance of terror. We know perfectly well that under some conditions peace in the sense of absence of war maybe obtainable by threatening with a war if that kind of peace is broken. We are not necessarily saying that that is bad or good; we would probably say it is better than peace obtained through a war. But we would also say that it is inferior to peace obtained without using other countries as hostages, without threats of war. In a sense we are doing our research under a double value commitment: not only to peace, but also to peaceful means; somewhat like a cancer researcher who wants to obtain a cure for cancer but with what to him seems to be acceptable means. He might eliminate surgery and chemotherapy as being too violent to the body, and prefer to proceed in other directions, with nutrition, cell therapy, psycho-somatic methods. This may be a minority position before the approach is generally accepted.

*Concluding speech, Fortieth Anniversary of the Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO, 24 October 1986, Oslo, Norway. The author is at present Senior Special Fellow of UNITAR, but is, of course, alone responsible for the views expressed.

But, the parallel is not a quite apt one. What peace researchers are not interested in is to explore how peace can be obtained through what seems to be the negation of peace, like cancer researchers trying to cure cancer with more cancer. Security studies are often seen in this light by peace researchers: as effort to obtain peace with even highly belligerent means. We would tend to think that this should not be referred to as peace studies since the basic concern seems to be to secure the interest of one's own group, country or group of countries. In other words: "security studies" as it is also referred to, a perfectly honest term.

Then there is another difference between security studies and peace studies, and even a very important one. Peace studies would always abide by one basic rule of scientific discourse: to be open, to be publicly accessible and challengable. To the extent that security studies are not publicly available but published secretly (confidentially) even undertaken secretly it does not constitute scientific research at all, but something else, for instance exercises in power enhancement. An absolute requirement for anything to be referred to as scientific, research, in any useful sense of that word is its public availability.

So let me now start by making publicly available a very simple answer to the question: where do I stand, not trying to hide myself behind "peace researchers in general", on the general issue of the conditions or causes of war and peace? I do not

think the roots of war and peace are found in the minds of men (and women) although the roots very often pass through those minds. I do not think they are found in human beings at all: rather, it looks as if we humans are perfectly capable both of war and peace, meaning that we are simply ambiguous, ambivalent.

I think the roots of war and peace are found in two places: in structures and in cultures. More particularly, there are structures, meaning social arrangements of people and of countries, made in such a way that those at the bottom are deprived of their livelihood and live in utter misery having their live spans seriously curtailed, so that those at the bottom live in a constant state of repression, having their space for action, even for speech and thought, seriously curtailed; and so that those at the bottom are deprived if not of livelihood and freedom of meaning of freedom, in a state of spiritual misery also known as alienation. What we know about such structures is that people at the bottom tend either to become rebellious and revolt, often with violence, or apathetic and wither away, eroded spiritually, mentally, somatically. In more colorful language: the structures tend to boil or tend to freeze. In the former case we may get open, direct violence, in the second the quietness of a churchyard. In neither case would peace researchers talk about peace, Nor do we call "peaceful" structures with such consequences built into them-- misery, repression, alienation--evey if they serve those at the top well.

Then there is the cultural aspect. There are cultures and cultures, and I am here thinking of symbolic arrangements, not only of words but also of other types of symbols, that may or may not legitimize the types of structural violence referred to above. Cultures may even legitimize direct violence. One particular and very problematic way in which this is done is through cultures that combine three characteristics: being singularist meaning that they conceive of themselves as the only true culture in the world; being universalist in the sense that they conceive of themselves as being valid for the whole world; and in giving to the people who hold that culture to be true a sense of being a Chosen People, perhaps even with a Promised Land. A Chosen People conceives of itself as not only having the right but also the duty of proselytization, of implementing that single, universal faith of theirs. In so doing they become problems to their neighbors. If two Chosen Peoples border on each other they become problems to each other and we see the history of the Eastern Mediterranean region; to some extent also Europe as a whole.

Unfortunately, these two conditions, structural and cultural unpeace, often come together. Unjust structures, replete with misery, repression and alienation are legitimized by means of a culture of the type mentioned. As a consequence the structure is not given up by those who believe in it even when given all the arguments and good reasons, and faced with the suffering of those

at the bottom. It is not only their right but also their duty to maintain, even extend the structure. Occidental colonialism/imperialism can be seen in this light whether exercised by those who believe in the religions of judaism, christianity or Islam; and, under the heading "christianity" whether exercised by Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, Belgian, German, French, British (to mention most of the members of the European Community!) or Russian or American world actors. Particularly important today would be the big structures commanded by the super powers, by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, both countries with a universalizing, singularist christian background, and the smaller structures operated by the Israelies over the Palestinians and the Boers over the Africans. That all four possess weapons of mass destruction, even atomic weapons, does not make the situation easier.

So, peace is to the peace researchers of course peace with justice (not misery), peace with freedom (not repression) and peace with meaning (but not the type of meaning that derives from denying peace to others). I think to most of us these three are already built into the concept of peace, but I agree with those who say that they stand being repeated. Thus, it is totally unacceptable when a country like the Soviet Union thinks it has special rights and duties because it conceives of itself as being a Chosen People, picked by History as the first country to enter the phase of human history referred to as socialism--her sacred duty being to guide other countries into those lands, even against their own will since they may not be the best judges of their own affairs.

Admittedly, all of this is very general. We need more detail, so let me at this point take up some of the factors that have been mentioned by the Chairperson of the National UNESCO Commission as interesting problems.

First, is inner democracy in a country conducive to peace? Not necessarily. It is probably one of the better structures to counteract internal misery and repression, the structure of democracy itself giving many people meaning to their lives, thereby itself reducing structural violence. But in this there is no guarantee that internal democracy works peacefully between nations. Imagine that a democratic country at the same time is equipped with a culture of the type mentioned: a Chosen People equipped with, a singularist and universalist ideology. They could very well with clear unanimity, in a perfectly democratic fashion, arrive at the decision that something has to be done about other countries, for instance bombing them, invading them, or at least intervening in some way or another. A democratic Nazi Germany might very well have supported nazism like colonial policies in Britain and France were supported by the majority of the population. And yet what these three regimes stood for cannot by any stretch of the imagination be referred to as peace.

Second, can it be said that support of the United Nations, multilateralism in general promotes peace? Yes, I would tend in general to think so. But the condition is that this is an open multilateralism that makes it possible for many groups, many

countries and many groups of countries to articulate internationally their concerns and grievances before they erupt in open violence. Multilateralism should in principle make us more aware of our common destiny, and set universal standards for our behavior as countries, in other words raise countries to the level of becoming good world citizens. Later on we may even get a world democracy among nations, not only between them.

Third, is what we usually refer to as "international understanding" an important road to peace? I would think so, but then it should also be emphasized that what to one person is understanding to the other person may sound highly subversive. And vice versa: what to one person is understanding might to the other person sound like direct, undiluted repression. To clarify such matters we need dialogue, open, nondirected, non-programmed discussion so as to compare concepts and images. In other words, I would tend to see international understanding as a process rather than as a final result; and as an ever on-going process. When that dialogue is repressed because it becomes too disagreeable for somebody revolt may easily be the next step. And he who suppressed the dialogue in the name of peaceful relations may reap exactly the opposite.

Fourth, is UNESCO a useful intellectual forum? Often fascinating, often deadly boring. It depends, perhaps, not so much on the theme as on the participants. Personally I have two sources of frustration after countless UNESCO meetings: Soviet delegates

and French discussion cultures. Soviet delegates tend to be multi-purpose delegates with no particular professional background, rotated from one conference to the next. I have once experienced that a Soviet meteorologist was steered into a meeting on peace research, the idea being that in either case it had something to do with "climate". Peace research is certainly transdisciplinary, but this may be to stretch the concept a little too far! And where the French intellectual style is concerned: I very often find it empty, rhetorical. This becomes painfully clear when French verbal extravagances replete with the subjunctive mood is translated into a lesser tongue: there is very little content left. Neither the Soviet nor the usual type of French contribution is conducive to the open, free dialogue we need so badly in order for UNESCO to contribute better to peace.

Fifth, is governmental steering, today so frequently found in the UNESCO, a factor conducive to peace? Using my wife's studies I would say: it looks as if UNESCO has had three phases in its history. The first phase was that of the brilliant individuals. In the second phase national quotas were introduced, sometimes making for statistics rather than brilliance. In the third phase these national quotas became governmental quotas, giving priorities to governmental functionaries from the member states, in some cases also to politicians whose career pattern at home for one reason or the other had been aborted. I think that for UNESCO to become a good instrument for peace neither the first, nor the second,

and certainly not the third of these structures is the key to peaceful development. The best is probably to gamble on a rich combination: letting in the brilliant individuals capable of honest articulation, keeping the national quotas, ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{at} ~~at~~ the same time there must be contact with the governments, but not with the governments on top of all organizations and commissions as today seems to be the case. Today UNESCO is very governmental.

Let us now explore the connection by contrasting what has been said about peace and peace research above with the official Norwegian UNESCO attitude, as presented by the Norwegian Foreign Minister to this particular conference. But let it first be pointed out that peace research is not only about how peace can be obtained with peaceful means; there are also some assumptions about the methodology. And these assumptions fall under two headings: the approach should be transnational and transdisciplinary, or with more serious sounding words, global and holistic. In other words, peace research is not necessarily promoting the interests of the class, the country or group of countries in which the research is carried out. If open stands are taken it would be to change structures so that misery, repression and alienation are no longer built-in features of the structures. This is not necessarily the same as siding with the exploited, repressed and alienated. They may have approaches to the issue that do not fall under the peace research program of "peace with peaceful means", which is more or less the same as the andhian formula "there is no road to peace, peace is the road". Violence from the bottom is not what peace research would advocate. Violence can be understood, not advocated; that would be to capitulate in our research task.

Maybe it should also be pointed out that today it is very well known why the United States withdrew from UNESCO: the country does not like that UNESCO publishes information that may make young people in the US have doubts about their own country-- according to what I was told from a closed meeting where another ambassador has asked the US ambassador what was the real reason. A clear message. But it is almost impossible to do any research about the machineries for direct violence and about the structures with built-in violence of the three types mentioned in the world without mentioning the super powers in general and the United States of America in particular.

Back to the Norwegian position: it is very similar to the US position. In fact, it even has a touch of His Master's Voice, so it is almost incredible how much Washington must have learned from Oslo about these matters---

First, there is the idea that there is too much theory, too many long-winded theoretical explorations, not enough practical work.

That there are many theoretical documents is certainly true. But I think that has to be tolerated, and many, most, perhaps all of the documents should even be read. In my experience most of them are efforts to come to grips with extremely complicated questions; with problems rooted in structures and cultures. The authors themselves

may not see the problems very clearly, and what is more important: some others may not want to see the problems very clearly. After all structures do separate, to some extent, those on top from those on the bottom and those on top in general will not appreciate perspectives emanating from the bottom or from people identified with them. They prefer that everybody in the structure arrives at the same conclusions, the conclusions already arrived at higher up, thus providing a consensus, harmony, peace in the organization. Everything all right in the best of all possible worlds, only that the bottom has to develop which is their problem, not also the problems of a certain structure protected by a certain culture.

I think this view is entirely unrealistic. I think it is based on a wrong construction of the world, that the Norwegian government just like the US government simply have to tolerate that there are other views, try to understand them and draw other conclusions than exiting from an organization because it articulates problems in a new way. Maybe we simply are in one of those periods where the problem is to understand the problem, not to throw at our definition of the problem solutions that may be either irrelevant or make bad things worse. Many words might be needed to say these things. I am rather impressed that so much has happened during these last twenty years, that our ways of looking at world problems have changed if not necessarily in Washington. D.C. But there is still a long way to go.

Second, the administration of UNESCO is heavy, inefficient. This is certainly true and has been exacerbated by the Director General for the last two periods, Mr. M'Bow (or maybe one should

say "doctor" since he has 45 honorary degrees, three gold medals and 41 decorations; or "professor" since he has four honorary professorships and figures as the author of seven books--all of this more than sufficient to explain that he had to be away as much as 209 days during one single year).

However, this does not only apply to UNESCO. It applies to almost all of the United Nations. One problem in this connection is the tremendous power vested in the head of the organization, in this case the Director General, who is running the organization more or less like a feudal fief even having most things that happen take place in his name. The pattern is actually pre-napoleonic, the model is Louis XIV rather than Napoleon. L'UNESCO, c'est moi. In the concrete case of Mr. M'Bow UNESCO found a person with special talent to exercise that role given that his background was partly as a French Colonial Officer, partly as a Chief in Senegal. The three roles are too similar, giving the person ample chance to act out certain personal tendencies. The blame, hence, should not be placed squarely on him but rather on those who frame the UNESCO Constitution this particular way.

That Constitution should be changed. Some process of decentralization, even democratization of the agency should be started also making the staff much less alienated, less scared and easily demoralized than is the case today. But any such initiative should apply to the UN system in general, not only to UNESCO. As a structure UNESCO is today itself repressive and alienating, and these are the features that should be fought in making UNESCO a model, not only a carrier of peace.

Third, it has been pointed out that UNESCO has a tendency to disperse its activities over too many topics, trying to do more than can possibly be done well, with a certain depth. Again, I disagree. In so doing UNESCO has been able to involve in its work a tremendous number of people from all over, in fact as many as 20,000 participants in one single year, in 500 meetings. Think of what this means in terms of giving people all over the world, in all member countries, a sense of world citizenship. They start looking at the world as the common habitat of humankind, and see politics to a large extent as "world domestic politics", not only as "international relations". A condition for getting all of these people involved is to spread the travel budget and the per diems over many people. But many people may require many topics since they have different levels of knowledge and different ways of seeing things. Concentration would play up to professionals, dear to the mind of the countries that see themselves as more developed. But I am not at all sure that this will necessarily be more conducive to peace. Peace should be participatory, involving many.

Fourth, there is the very contentious issue of how UNESCO can contribute to peace and international understand in a more direct way. The Norwegian position, again identical with the position of the US, seems to be that these issues should essentially be dealt with as political issues in the political organs of the United Nations, meaning the General Assembly in general and the Security Council in particular. Where research is concerned there is the United Nations Institute of Disarmament Research in Geneva and also

the disarmament section in the United Nations. By taking up these issues in the places just mentioned one would not only avoid duplication, but also make sure that the necessary competency for these very complex problems would be available.

I entirely disagree from beginning to end. After all, the issues are not the same. When UNESCO talks about peace it is usually from the vantage point of the social sciences and the humanities, perhaps also natural sciences and education, rather than out of political/military immediate concerns. To the extent UNESCO is probing into structure and culture there is no danger of duplication.

But then, what is wrong with duplication? "Duplication" is one of these words that bureaucrats bring up very quickly; it usually means that they are afraid of something. Is the United States, for instance, afraid that the problem should be raised in a setting where they do not have a veto, like in the Security Council? And is that the reason why instead of a political veto they try to exercise an economic veto, withdrawing with 25% of the budget, thereby almost forcing the organization to acquiesce, not necessarily because the Secretariat so desires as because of all the threats coming from some Member States? When the British delegate William Dodd says that UNESCO should "eliminate more politically controversial activities from UNESCOs 1986-87 work program, especially in the disarmament and human rights fields"

this sounds very much like an effort to exercise a veto. What is controversial to Britain might be a triviality to others. For that reason it is good to remember the words by a former conservative British Prime Minister, Mr. Edward Heath, when the present British administration left UNESCO, warning against "the growth of a hasty, narrow-minded nationalism".

Are problems of peace not so important that they should be dealt with as many places as possible? Should one not rather promote duplication with the hope that at some place some good solutions might come up rather than trying to limit, to narrow down the range of discussion to that which can be articulated in the United Nations proper, in New York? What one senses is that somebody is afraid that something might come up and that somebody else, in this case Norway, tries to come to the rescue of the master country. But this policy will never work: it is short-sighted, narrow-minded and will probably lead to exactly the opposite of what is intended.

Fifth, UNESCO might study human rights but not start producing any norms in this field, that should be left to the political organs in general and the human rights commission in particular. I am not so sure of this. UNESCO possesses a broad range of competence in its areas of discourse. UNESCO has a lot of experience in many fields of science, culture and education. Should that organization not produce norms being more knowledgeable than anybody else

in the world about the concrete problems in this connection? Or, is it rather that one is afraid of the types of norms that might be produced by UNESCO? Is this the reason why one would like to have norm production more under control so as to avoid the famous "politization"? But then, what could be more political than a world press dominated by western standards and rules, western ways of thinking and writing? And, above all by western political discourse, meaning by that term the way in which problems are discussed, not prescribing the exact position, but prescribing the dimension along which possible positions can be organized? Or, should one start discussing the problems of a world press when as many as 160 papers in the Third World are influenced by money from the CIA?--a considerably higher number I would assume than the Soviet Union is able to influence through its rather poor network around the world? Is the general attitude that things are apolitical as long as they are the way the western powers want and that "politization" starts the moment these ways are challenged? In that case we are dealing with a position, even at the governmental level, which is unreflected and will not hold up against scrutiny. Such positions are held only by a small minority of states; like the tendency to ban research abroad of Israel and research on collective rights.

Sixth, the position seems to be that when UNESCO engages in education it should be less controversial. I disagree, but I also agree up to a certain point. It is not the task of UNESCO to indoctrinate. When something is controversial the task of UNESCO, as

of a ministry of education in general and schools in particular, is to proceed as one does with a controversial issue in a democracy: dialogue. Something which is noncontroversial can be written up in a textbook, in a handbook, in a set of tables and be distributed all over the world. That which is controversial can best be handled by having different views presented (very often there are more than two views!), and then start dialogues all over the world. If the problem is controversial this should only make us devote more time to the problem, not less, since a controversy very often is indicative of only one thing: the problem is important. No good purpose is served by brushing the problem under the carpet, pretending that the problem does not exist.

So far I have been discussing positions and problems made by others. Permit me now to put forward some of my own wishes for UNESCO, not necessarily formulated along the dimensions used in the debate I have referred to above. These views are based not only on considerable experience with UNESCO over the last 25 years, but with a total of ten UN organizations where I have served as a consultant, or in some other capacity.

In my experience these organizations can be divided into four groups, using two dimensions. On the one hand there is the distinction between organizations that are at least mildly progressive in the sense of working in favor of those who are exploited, re-

pressed or alienated-whether this is done from a food or health angle, from a human rights angle, or from a cultural angle--as against those who are rather status quo oriented. On the other hand there is the distinction between organizations that are intellectually rigid and intellectually flexible. By "rigid", then, I mean organizations where the basic paradigm for analyzing phenonema has already been set. The organization is usually in the hand of one highly professionalized discipline, jealously watching that nobody else should have a say in the way they are shaping the world of their concern. By "flexible" I am actually referring to two different phenonema: on the one hand the mutli-disciplinary approach where several disciplines are brought into the picture, and on the other hand the non-disciplinary approach with no discipline at all in both senses of that word, combining dilettantism with populist enthusiasm or whatever other sentiment might be available. This is actually the combination I think is best: I am afraid of excessive professionalism since I think it serves as a way of giving the past too much of a voice. In a profession the thinking of the past has been crystallized. Not only the answers, also the questions that can be formulated are already given, defined forever. For politics this is insufficient--and peace is to a large extent a question of politics.

It goes without saying that UNESCO has some element of progressiveness, not very much and certainly is intellectually flexible both in the sense of drawing on many disciplines and in the sense of dilettantism. I find that combination good, conducive

to the purposes of UNESCO. It is possible to bring up new ideas. It is possible, for instance, for women to articulate totally new ideas, ideas that would have been suppressed at a very early stage had they been put forward in an intellectually rigid, status quo organization like the International Telecommunications Union, ITU, in Geneva. Let it only be added to this that the other two combinations are also possible: UNCTAD is both progressive and intellectually rigid, being run by economists and for that reason easily converted into a rather pliable organization. FAO is certainly multidisciplinary but also by and large status quo oriented.

The organization of our concern, UNESCO, is the best example of what to me is the best combination, and it is interesting to note that this was the major target of the US onslaught on the United Nations system. Why? Partly because UNESCO has to do with the press and the press deals with how problems are defined all over the world--a rather important function. And partly because UNESCO for that reason is unpopular with the western oriented press of the world so that the US ran no risk in the media by attacking UNESCO according to the "enemy of my enemy is my friend" principle. So my ^{first} conclusion is that UNESCO should retain these two characteristics, and they should be seen as virtues rather than as vices--but building on multi-disciplinary rather than dilettantism!

My second conclusion is that the way UNESCO is financed simply has to be changed. It is intolerable in the longer run that two countries alone should account for 30% of the budget: the US and the

UK, who have now left the organization. They should be profusely thanked for their contributions in the past and be informed that this cannot possibly be a pattern for the future.

Third, cut UNESCO salaries in order to attract better people! The idea that through high salaries one attracts good people is certainly not in general true. What probably is true is the much simpler proposition that through high salaries one attracts people interested in high salaries, the professional per diem counters sitting in their offices counting the relationship between mortgages and the emoluments accruing to them from UNESCO. Lower salaries would attract people with other types of motivation, presumably younger, more energetic, more idealistic and willing really to work. Actually, cutting their salaries by 30% would solve the problem alluded to in the preceding point, the US and the UK would of course be invited to join again at any time but then with a much lower contribution to the total budget. UNESCO would survive. It is very much to be regretted that the present Director General has not encouraged this line as an approach to the problem of the organization. Instead the Executive Board increased the Director General's salary!

Fourth, the structure of UNESCO has to be changed with much less focus on the position and the personality of the Director General. It is a symptom of a severe illness when his appointment attracts that much attention and his personality has that much of an influence on the organization. Delegation and decentralization and more encouragement of Secretariat initiative should be cardinal virtues of the system.

Fifth, as mentioned above, UNESCO should disperse itself even more: more countries, more people. Think of what UNESCO has been able to do not only for women but also with women-- catapulting into world limelight the problems of the women and the women who have significant things to say about these problems. I think UNESCO would be able to do this also with and for other groups, but not if there is too much professionalization.

Sixth, Unesco should continue its research on how structures operate around the world. Much has been done, for instance in studying militarization, armament and disarmament. Much more can be done. Objections by a minority group of western powers should not be taken too seriously: rather, they should be invited to participate in the studies

Seventh, UNESCO should have the courage to take up cultures. So far UNESCO has suffered from one basic assumption: all cultures are equal. This was a necessary assumption in a period when occidental cultures were considered better than others. But that period is no longer necessarily with us: the time has come to investigate cultures in terms of their peace building or war-building potentials. This will hurt, this will probably be much more problematic than what we have had so far. But it has to be done unless we prefer that the problems come out as open or covert violence rather than in adversarial dialogues from which both sides may learn.

Eighth, UNESCO should use research to broaden our range of options. Thus, there are those who say that collective human rights and individual human rights are on a collision course. UNESCO should enter this debate by exploring the conditions under which this is not the case, the conditions under which these two types, both of them important, are compatible. Such research requires imagination rather than empirical study although the latter is certainly not to be scoffed at. What matters most is to get out of the tyranny of the false dichotomies.

Ninth, and finally: UNESCO should train us in talking nicely about human beings, about us. We are great, potentially, we humans. Structures and cultures may make us less, or worse than what we otherwise would be. Much of the maligning is done in terms of biology: we humans are supposed to have an innate drive towards war, inherited from animals, programmed into our nature through selection for aggressive war, in a particularly violent brain, as an "instinct."

In a statement drafted in Sevilla, Spain, May 16, 1986, with the support of representatives of the Spanish UNESCO, five conclusions are drawn dealing precisely with this:

- (1) IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors.
- (2) IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war or any other violent behavior is genetically programmed into our human nature.
- (3) IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that in the course of human evolution there has been a selection for aggressive behavior more than for other kinds of behavior.
- (4) IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that humans have a "violent brain".
- (5) IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war is caused by "instinct" or any single motivation.

I agree. Yet there are many who cling to such ideas, partly to justify their own aggressiveness, structurally and culturally conditioned. UNESCO has a great task in exploding such myths.

We need UNESCO and UNESCO needs our support. The crisis will be overcome. And together we shall make progress, using UNESCO as one way of building peace — *as stated in the Constitution, Article*

The purpose of the Organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further 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.