

December 13, 1982

UNESCO, WHERE CULTURE BECOMES PROPAGANDA

INTRODUCTION

It was supposed to be a conference dealing with cultural issues. But the United Nations gathering in Mexico City last July turned into the kind of three-ring political circus that is now the modus operandi of the United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO.

At the conference, called Mondiacult '82, French Cultural Minister Jack Lang, though not mentioning the United States by name, blasted the U.S. with charges of "financial and intellectual imperialism" in the export of American cultural products ranging from films to fashions. The Arab nations attacked Israel for invading Lebanon. Argentina attacked Britain for invading the Falkland Islands. Mexico took a political potshot at the U.S. by introducing a resolution to guarantee welfare rights for all migrant workers, legal or illegal. In sum, as in the case of the Education and Social Science components of UNESCO activities, the Mexico City conference served mainly as an arena for communist and Third World political machinations. There were no limits on the speeches in the plenary sessions. Resolutions were delivered to delegations only hours before the vote--without translations. American Ambassador to UNESCO, Jean Gerard, described the whole conference as "procedural chaos." A Dutch delegate was heard to remark that UNESCO meant "U never eat, sleep, or cogitate."

In the midst of the political pandemonium at Mondiacult, Soviet bloc and Third World delegates predictably managed to attack the United States, the Western nations, and multinational corporations for "cultural imperialism" and "neocolonialism." Cuba submitted a classic Moscow-brand resolution called "Culture and the Control of Information." Co-sponsored by Madagascar, Angola, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Grenada, and Sao Tomé and Príncipe, the original version of this resolution blamed cultural problems worldwide on Western capitalism. It asserted that:

...transnational corporations...largely control the cultural industries, distort the identity process of the developing nations and affect the cultural and educational context through their policy of indiscriminate consumption,
 ...ignore the cultural values of the so-called Third World countries, and promote behavior patterns alien to their legitimate traditions,
 ...derive more than 50 percent of their income from foreign sales and...are basically concerned with profit and not with the cultural and socio-economic advancement of the developing countries....

Attacks on U.S. and Western culture and the delivery of that culture through modern telecommunications technology are nothing new at UNESCO. Mexico City marked the second World Conference on Cultural Policies. The first was in Venice in 1970 and the tone was anti-capitalist and pro-socialist even at that time.

In Mexico City, Director General of UNESCO, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow of Senegal, opened the conference by leading the charge against Western media and cultural products. He said there was great cultural potential in modern media technology, including cable-TV, video-discs, and video-cassettes. But, he added, the "general trend" in films, records, radio, and television

...continues to be towards mass production and consumption and increasingly uniform products.

Within UNESCO, M'Bow's seemingly vague keynote statement has precise meaning. It mirrors the mounting spiral of anti-capitalist, anti-free market resolutions and rhetoric at UNESCO culture conferences and in UNESCO publications dating back to at least 1970. Opposed to the free market, free enterprise, and the proved concepts of supply and demand, UNESCO and the M'Bow Secretariat are committed to a centrally planned socialist economic model, not only for individual nations but for the entire world. In fact, since the mid-1970s, a crescendo of demands has been building for the so-called New World Cultural Order (NWCO).

The NWCO is yet another political strategy growing out of the "New International Economic Order," a resolution passed by the U.N. General Assembly in 1974. The NIEO, is one of the most ambitious versions to date of Fabian socialist theories. This utopian scheme extends to poor nations the false hope that wealth can be taken from developed industrial nations, like the U.S., West Germany, and Japan, and somehow redistributed to the advantage of the "have-nots" of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The well-documented fact that the developed nations achieved their high living standard through the free enterprise system is completely ignored. Nor does the NIEO address the reality of the rapid economic progress of those developing countries of the so-called Third World who have adopted a free market economy--Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Kenya, Brazil, Ivory Coast, and Singapore.

UNESCO's biased socialist cultural policy has evolved steadily over the past twelve years largely because of the efforts of the Soviet aligned nations and the Group of 77 (so-called because of its origin as a voting group of 77 socialist dominated developing nations but now numbering over 120). Because of the one-nation, one-vote procedure at UNESCO conferences, they have been able to institute their socialist "New World Cultural Order" as the official UNESCO cultural policy. This of course was particularly evident at Mondiacult '82 in Mexico City, where the "key players" in the game of "cultural imperialism" were unmistakably identifiable once and for all. Cultural imperialism is the main component in these players' NWCO attack on Western culture and cultural industries. Their ideology argues that Western culture lays waste to any other native culture it contacts. Their thesis appears under the cover of such UNESCO-speak slogans as "democratization of culture" or "participation in culture."

As a part of the larger NIEO propaganda war at UNESCO, such activities clearly do not fulfill UNESCO's stated mission: "to collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual understanding and knowledge of all peoples."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNESCO'S CHIEF CULTURAL PROJECTS

"Culture", of course, is part of the acronym, UNESCO--the United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization. UNESCO's wide ranging cultural mission for the 1980s boasts a 1981-1983 budget of nearly \$59 million out of a total UNESCO budget of over \$1 billion. In 1949, UNESCO's cultural budget was only \$653,823 and the total UNESCO budget just \$8.5 million.

More than 40 percent of the current UNESCO culture budget goes for the highly publicized star projects of the "Preservation and Presentation of the Cultural and Natural Heritage" that range from the restoration of famous monuments, such as Borobudur, the great Buddhist "temple mountain" of Java or Angkor Wat in Cambodia to constructing museums in Egypt, studies and research on cultural heritage, and the training of specialists in monument preservation techniques.

Also written into the 1981-1983 UNESCO mandate for culture and communication, however, are endorsements of the NIEO and its socialist offspring, "the New World Information and Communication Order," better known as simply the New World Information Order or NWIO. And in fact, the \$22 million segment of the culture budget designated for communications helps to fund attempts by the UNESCO Secretariat and radical members of UNESCO to promote NWIO proposals to license journalists and censor Western owned international news and information services. These come under the guise of such studies as one on the "right to communicate," which translates from UNESCO-speak as the right to control Western news correspondents, especially those working within developing nations.

Another UNESCO culture program, budgeted at nearly \$13 million for the 1981-1983 triennium, is called "Appreciation and Respect for Cultural Identity." Underlying the studies of this program is the bias of UNESCO, which regards the West, and particularly the U.S., as a colonial aggressor. For the UNESCO Secretariat under M'Bow claims that colonialism and exploitation today take the form of U.S. and Western domination of the international wire services, television, radio, and the motion picture industry. Export of these and other Western cultural products is portrayed as cultural imperialism in UNESCO publications and at UNESCO's international conferences and meetings of experts.

Under M'Bow, UNESCO is pushing "cultural development" in a way that advocates a world welfare state supported by Western industrialized countries. Projects like the \$14 million "Participation in Cultural Life" illustrate the irony of this so-called cultural development agenda. At least 65 percent of the funding is provided by the U.S. and the Western nations, yet the study focuses on topics like "Cultural Foundations of the New International Economic Order." Not only are the U.S. and the West underwriting projects designed to undermine the West, but these projects also exclude Western culture from the "legitimate" development process. Any contact with Western culture and ideas somehow has been deemed contaminating to developing nations. This is the NIEO cultural philosophy of UNESCO.

The motive here is political. UNESCO's Secretariat and the UNESCO voting majority do not want Western cultural influences to make contact with the people of the developing nations. Perhaps M'Bow and his staff fear that, if the free market influences were to touch the Third World, the idea of individual economic initiative inherent in Western society and the accompanying ideas of free speech, free press, the right to religion, and free assembly would also eventually take hold. The irony here is that the ubiquitous NIEO is rooted in the same state planned centralized theories of government that have failed so miserably among its chief advocates, such as the USSR and the Eastern bloc. Algeria, which originally proposed the NIEO, is now bailing out its troubled socialist economy with free enterprise reforms.

Cultural Jargon at UNESCO

UNESCO's many documents, publications, and conferences on culture have a common vocabulary that muddies the real meaning of the UNESCO cultural debate for the uninitiated. Essential UNESCO-speak on the subject of culture includes such terms as: "democratization of culture"; "access to culture"; "participation (of all) in culture"; the "right to culture"; and "cultural democracy." Through use of these terms, all roughly equivalent in meaning and purpose, the NIEO socialist doctrine is subtly blended into the fabric of all UNESCO discussions on culture. For instance, the term "democratization of culture" is used to convey the idea that culture, like the wealth of the Western industrialized nations, must be redistributed to the masses. This redistribution concept is the central force of the NIEO doctrine.

Why does culture have to be redistributed? Because it is hoarded by the "elites," according to UNESCO's cultural theorists. Who are the elites? They are especially the educated classes of the developing countries, who, because of their Western education, enjoy the plays, novels, operas, and other cultural products that derive from the Western tradition. According to UNESCO's official documents, this must be stopped.¹ Similarly the "fragile" native cultures of the developing countries are considered to be in grave danger because of the influence of Western culture and entertainment. Especially threatening, says UNESCO, are such popular Western forms of entertainment as movies and music delivered by the mass communications media of radio, television, and satellite technology.

What is UNESCO's solution to this supposed threat of "cultural elitism" and Western culture? According to numerous UNESCO publications and conference resolutions, the solution is a highly centralized matrix for state controlled cultural planning. In other words, the way to "protect" the masses from "contamination" by Western culture is for the state to determine in advance the kind of culture to be allowed in a developing nation. What M'Bow apparently seeks is creation of an elite of cultural commissars, dictating to their fellow countrymen what can and cannot be read or viewed. Surely such cultural authoritarianism was not the intent of the U.N.'s founders.

The New World Cultural Order and Its Birth in Venice

UNESCO's utopian theory of a "New World Cultural Order" (NWCO) is the cultural corollary of the New International Economic Order and one of a series of "new orders" popularized at UNESCO, particularly since Director-General M'Bow came to office in 1974. M'Bow has wholeheartedly embraced the NIEO as his theory of "development" for UNESCO. He has even set the goal of realizing the New International Economic Order by the year 2000.

At the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies in Mexico City, several speakers emphasized that the "democratization of culture" had to be based on the "democratization of society as a whole, which might require far-reaching changes in economic and social relations."² In other words, the NIEO must first be established before the new cultural order could be born.

Even before the NIEO and the present spate of "new world orders" were formally instituted at UNESCO under M'Bow in 1974, a

¹ See Final Report, UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Europe, Helsinki, June 19-28, 1972, p. 57; Thinking Ahead: UNESCO and the Challenges of Today and Tomorrow, (Paris: UNESCO 1977), p. 129; "Problems and Prospects," World Conference on Cultural Policies, Mexico City, July 26-August 6, 1982 (UNESCO, June 21, 1982), p. 13.

² Op. cit., Commission II report, p. 9.

strong socialist bias was present in UNESCO cultural policy. At UNESCO's first World Conference of Cultural Policies held in Venice in 1970, the basic, socialist New World Cultural Order agenda surfaced to become the model for future conference resolutions. The Director-General of that time, René Maheu of France, affirmed "the right to culture" in his address.³ This "right," derived from the 1948 U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, guarantees a state funded and directed cultural program for all. The 1948 Declaration further guarantees the social welfare state economy to the entire citizenry of a nation. The U.N. treaty, based on the Declaration, long has been opposed by the U.S. and has not been ratified by the Senate. The NIEO of 1974 also embodies the state welfare society concept from the 1948 Declaration. These notions are reinforced by the concept of "lifelong education," also endorsed at the 1970 Venice conference. Lifelong education is meant to serve, as it does in the socialist countries today, as a state controlled institution for continuing political reeducation of the populace to accept the NIEO and the other aims of an international, centrally planned economy.⁴

The all-important recommendations for centralized, government controlled cultural policy planning were made in the Venice Conference Resolutions #12-17. This policy has been tied to international funding through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and other international aid agencies. There was as well a call for a UNESCO Cultural Development Bank to be run like the international banks.⁵ By tying UNESCO to international lending facilities, this resolution was intended to give UNESCO an uncontrolled source of funding outside the U.N. budget.

The Regional Cultural Policy Conferences: 1972-1981

Between the Venice and Mexico City conferences on cultural policy, a series of "regional" cultural conferences has been held. The European regional meeting took place in Helsinki in 1972. There the ground for the NIEO was broken by reaffirming the ideas of "the right to culture" and "cultural democracy," the latter to be implemented through lifelong education.⁶ At the same time, cultural "elitism" was condemned.⁷

The scene shifted to Asia for the regional conference of 1973 at Jakarta, Indonesia. Lifelong education was again affirmed

³ Final Report, UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Institutional, Administrative and Financial Aspects of Cultural Policies, Venice, August 24 (Paris: UNESCO, September 2, 1970), Appendix II, p. 43.

⁴ Thomas G. Gulick, "For UNESCO, A Failing Grade In Education," Heritage Foundation Background No. 221, October 12, 1982, p. 10-11.

⁵ Ibid., p. 23.

⁶ Final Report, UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Europe, Helsinki, June 19-28, 1972 (Paris: UNESCO 1972), pp. 22 and 28.

⁷ Ibid., p. 57.

and recommended as the preferred way to "restructure" national educational systems. The issue of Westernized "cultural imperialism" conveyed through the mass media was raised, and there was a recommendation to protect national cultures against "vulgar mass-produced culture."⁸ Once again, the only solution offered for cultural development was a centrally controlled, state cultural policy for each nation. In fact, Recommendation #1 at this conference called for legislating a legal "right to culture." (Culture then would be defined and administered by the state for the masses.)

The next UNESCO regional cultural conference was held in Accra, Ghana, in 1975. The African delegates emphasized "cultural identity" as "an act of liberation." The conference debated at some length the evils of Western cultural imperialism, especially mass media "imperialism," and recommended a high degree of government involvement in formulating cultural policy, including a state cultural policy for radio and television. One recommendation warned against subversion of African national culture by Western direct broadcast, satellite (DBS) programming.⁹ But for all the anti-Western rhetoric there were substantial requests for cultural funding from the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program, both largely supported by Western industrialized countries.

At UNESCO's Latin American regional conference on cultural policies in Bogota, Colombia, in 1978, most of the anti-Western talk was aimed at the media. Recommendation #2 lashed out at cultural "adulteration." "Incorporating cultural policy into state "central planning systems" was emphasized.¹⁰ And there was a strong recommendation to create government controlled mass media institutions to "balance" private sector communications.¹¹ "Balancing" here refers to counteracting the alleged threat from U.S. and Western European TV, movies, and other cultural products. Again, the delegates asked for large amounts of funding from the World Bank, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and several Latin American development banks, all of which depend heavily on the U.S. and its Western allies for their loan capital. M'Bow set the tone for this conference with his own reference to "cultural alienation," which he said was induced by Western mass media.¹²

⁸ Final Report, UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Asia, Jakarta, December 10-19, 1973, Recommendation #2, Paragraph I, Item #1.

⁹ Ibid., Recommendation #14.

¹⁰ Final Report, UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies, in Latin America and the Caribbean, Bogota, January 10-20, 1978 (Paris: UNESCO, 1978), Recommendation #15, p. 35.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 43.

¹² Ibid., p. 72.

Arab cultural ministers met in Baghdad for a 1981 regional cultural conference organized by ALESCO, the Arab nations' counterpart of UNESCO. The Arabs also endorsed the "right to culture" and its implementation via highly centralized cultural policy planning.

From the results and the rhetoric of the UNESCO cultural conferences held since Venice in 1970, a definite political strategy has emerged among the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. All attack alleged Western cultural imperialism, and yet all ask for substantial Western aid money to build their own cultural and communications infrastructures. A certain bargaining logic can be seen here. First the "hard line" and the tough talk is directed at the Western industrialized states, such as the recent threats to censor or cut off the access of international news services to developing nations. Then the soft approach is used. For example, in the UNESCO debate over a "New World Information Order," the "compromise" reached between the Western powers and the developing nations was the creation of the International Program for the Development of Communications (IPDC), a UNESCO bureau to funnel money and communications technology and know-how to the developing countries. Though the IPDC has only about \$900,000 in development funds so far, the organization has been created as a bargaining chip in the larger NIEO ideological war. The anti-Western forces at UNESCO can be expected to "raise the ante" of threats against Western news/communications media and Western "cultural industries." The purpose: to shake loose more Western capital for IPDC and for other agencies they may try to create at UNESCO and elsewhere in the U.N. arena. Indeed, the voting majority at UNESCO seems bent on NIEO wealth redistribution schemes while ignoring free market approaches to development.

HOW THE "CULTURAL IMPERIALISM" GAME WAS PLAYED AT MEXICO CITY

Because of the time spent on noncultural issues at the Mexico City Cultural Policy Conference--such as the debates over Israel's invasion of Lebanon, the Falkland Islands crisis, and the rights of migratory workers--cultural imperialism never took center stage in Mexico City. Key anti-Western players at the Conference nonetheless passed several resolutions meant to be the seeds for future cultural imperialism battles. Even after "sanitizing" amendments forced by an uncharacteristically tough U.S. delegation, a resolution drafted by Cuba still was able to convey the message that Western mass media endanger native cultures.¹³ The Cuban resolution provides for studies on the "impact" of Western cultural products delivered by telecommunications, including satellite, into developing nations. Both Cuba and the Soviets called for more funding of IPDC, the symbol of the New World Information Order war against the West.

¹³ Allen Weinstein, Vice Chairman of U.S. Delegation to UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies, Mexico City, 1982, draft of article on Mexico Conference for World Press Freedom Committee (Reston, Va.: WPEC), p. 5.

Algeria, backed by France, Zimbabwe, Nicaragua, and several African nations including Zaire, Zambia, and Guinea, submitted a resolution on "cultural industries." It endorsed NWIO and the "democratization of culture" (the UNESCO-speak attack on Western "cultural elitism"), called for a UNESCO study on the "impact of cultural industries on developing countries," and suggested that the IPDC set up "subregional" and national cultural industries in developing nations. Using the IPDC as a "middleman" at UNESCO, is yet another example of the socialist governments' strategy of funneling money and technology to developing countries and to themselves without ever exposing their populations to direct business or cultural relations with the Western capitalist nations.

The Soviets submitted a resolution called "The Role of the Mass Media in the Development of Contemporary Culture." It too paid homage to the IPDC and endorsed the NWIO--two important propaganda points for the socialists. In addition, it called for a wide range of studies covering satellite broadcasting and its effect on native cultures, a study on the NWIO in general, and a study on the influence of mass media on culture. Studies on these questions may seem harmless, but are hardly so in view of the NIEO bias of the UNESCO Secretariat and of the mainly leftist scholars that the UNESCO cultural hierarchy usually assigns to them.

Examples of this leftist bias abound in UNESCO literature. Before the Mexico City Mondiacult '82, for instance, UNESCO's monthly magazine, Courier, ran a special issue on "Peoples and Cultures." Seven of its eight articles are unmistakably biased in favor of NIEO socialism's centrally planned, state controlled media and culture. Of these seven, three are openly Marxist in ideology; one is pro-Maoist. That adds up to a UNESCO magazine, distributed in 158 member countries with the official UNESCO seal, 65 percent financed with Western money, and yet nearly 90 percent socialist, Marxist, and Maoist in political content. The lead article by Director-General M'Bow contains passages similar to the anti-American speech given by French cultural minister Jack Lang later that month in Mexico City.

UNESCO hired French culture consultant Claude Fabrizio to write a preparatory paper for the Mexico City conference, which was later incorporated into the official UNESCO pre-conference brochure, "Problems and Prospects."¹⁴ The report backs the NIEO plan for Third World development to the hilt. It never considers the free market system as a viable alternative and fully endorses centralized, state controlled cultural planning and traces this kind of planning to its origins in the socialist nations. It

¹⁴ Claude Fabrizio, "Attempt to Analyze the World Cultural Problems and Outline the Prospect for World Cultural Development," Preparatory Paper for Mondiacult '82, Mexico City; UNESCO document #CC-81/615/Ref.

does not mention that these nations suppress the works of their own artists, who dare to criticize the socialist economy or communist society. Fabrizio also is featured in a recent UNESCO book called Cultural Development: Some Regional Experiences.¹⁵ In this volume, Fabrizio and four other authors all describe some phase of the NIEO as indispensable for cultural development.

UNESCO publishes a series of paperbacks entitled: Cultures. In the volume called "Cultural Values: The Cultural Dimension of Development," only three out of eleven articles are not radically socialist and based on the NIEO. The three nonpoliticized articles deal with academic or technical aspects of art and sociology. Likewise, in the Cultures volume entitled "Culture and Communication," five out of nine articles endorse the Fabian socialist NIEO. Two of these five are clearly Marxist and quote Marxist authors in support of their theses. The other four articles are not political. In neither of these volumes on controversial aspects of cultural policy and the development of the poor nations is the alternative Western approach to culture and communications represented.

Even further back in UNESCO publication history is a 1974 study called: "Television Traffic--A One Way Street?" It presented the argument that Western TV exported more shows than it imported. This study subsequently became a major reference work for the future New World Information Order theorists at UNESCO. It completely neglects to mention that Western television programs are generally higher quality products than those produced in the socialist countries or the Third World. Nor does it mention the factor of state censorship and the denial of free speech and free press as key elements in the low quality TV entertainment in many of these non-Western countries. Finally, one of the two authors of the study, Kaarle Nordenstreng, is the President of the International Organization of Journalists, an organization closely aligned with the editorial policies of Moscow. And so it goes. There is no attempt whatsoever to accommodate pro-Western writers or nonsocialist views in UNESCO publications. To what avail is it for the free nations of the West to finance 65 percent of UNESCO's worldwide publicity operation, when that operation mainly serves socialism and consistently attacks free enterprise. The Soviets also revealed part of their future agenda for culture and communications at UNESCO by calling for "careful preparations" for a scheduled 1983 UNESCO meeting--possibly in Moscow--on implementing the NWIO. Allen Weinstein, Vice-Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Mexico City Conference, noted that the G-77 voting bloc at UNESCO, was forced at the Mexico City conference to "defer until later [UNESCO] conferences a full-fledged assault upon the free media."¹⁶

¹⁵ Cultural Development: Some Regional Experiences, (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1981).

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 8.

Among the likely opportunities for such an assault next year may be a meeting scheduled for June 1983 in Grenada, Spain, sponsored by UNESCO and some of its nongovernmental organizations. Entitled "Communications for Democracy," it features agenda items like "advertising and democratization." This could well develop into a Group of 77 strategy to control Western--especially U.S.--media advertising in developing nations or even to take a share of Western profits earned through advertising exported to poor countries.

Also scheduled for 1983 is a world conference on allocating the earth's orbital slots for communications satellites. This meeting, called the World Administrative Radio Conference '83, will be held in Geneva and sponsored by the U.N.'s International Telecommunications Union (ITU). It is the satellite phase of the NIEO battle. Developing nations--especially the radical G-77 countries--are expected to demand many satellite slots even though they lack satellite technology. This debate is closely tied to the UNESCO debate over the proposed regulation of program content in transborder satellite communications.

There were also Mexico City resolutions, in the tradition of previous conferences, calling for more centralization of government cultural policy-making bodies and more World Bank and international lending agency funding for cultural programs and industries in the developing world. Translated, this means increased U.S. and Western funding for UNESCO's anti-Western activities.

How did the U.S. fare at the Mexico City Conference? By comparison to the socialists and communists, very poorly. One important American sponsored resolution on the freedom of religion as a cultural right was passed. But an American resolution declaring "freedom of media as a basic cultural right" was defeated; in fact, it failed to attract even a single co-sponsor, a typical illustration of the West European habit of bowing to Third World pressures at the U.N.

A particularly disturbing development in Mexico City was the increasingly radical and anti-U.S. stance being taken by French cultural minister Jack Lang, a long-time socialist and supporter of Castro's Cuba. This has serious implications for UNESCO, which is headquartered in Paris and where the French left wing has had a tremendous political influence, especially during UNESCO's early years in the 1950s.¹⁷

According to Judson Gooding, the U.S. cultural attaché at the U.S. Mission to UNESCO in Paris, Cuba may well play a key role in a world cultural conference, the États Généraux de la Culture Mondiale, planned by France for 1983. Considering the attacks against the U.S., Great Britain, Israel, Western culture, business, and media at the Mexico City UNESCO conference, a

¹⁷ Gulick, op. cit., p. 4.

French États Généraux on culture could become a political free-for-all. Likely targets of the leftist governments would be: NATO defense policy and the nuclear freeze issue as well as Western news and communications media including satellite communications. French President Francois Mitterand has asked for UNESCO's support of the États Généraux, a political gesture likely to be realized in view of the socialist kinship of the M'Bow Secretariat at UNESCO and the Mitterand government of France.

THE FAILURE OF THE U.S. TO FIGHT BACK AT UNESCO

Although the attack on U.S. culture at UNESCO is of long standing, the United States rarely has fought back against the barrage of socialist, Marxist, and NIEO assaults. Rather, as at Mexico City, the U.S. strategy has been "damage control," that is, limiting or minimizing the political damage inflicted on the U.S. by hostile resolutions such as that by Cuba on "Culture and the Control of Information." And in fact, the damage was limited in this and other resolutions when the U.S. delegation was able to excise the most offensive language from these documents.

But there was no response to Jack Lang's all-but-frontal attack on U.S. "financial and intellectual imperialism." American Ambassador to UNESCO Jean Gerard said in her address to the conference, in reference to the attacks of Lang and others, "I have no intention of responding to criticism at this time." But why not? The timing was perfect for a response and a defense of American freedoms and free society. Nor was there any real response at the U.S. press conference following Gerard's nonresponse. If U.S. and Western values are not strongly asserted at UNESCO, then socialism, the NIEO, and the tyranny of the closed society--as in the Soviet Union, mainland China, and Tanzania--win by default. The record shows that this has been happening during at least the last twelve years of debate on culture and communications in the UNESCO forum.

Time after time, the American representatives at UNESCO have caved in to the assault of the radical NIEO political strategy of the G-77. The New World Information Order debate, for instance, is a major tactic in the G-77 war on Western free enterprise. But it is also closely tied to the entire New World Cultural Order debate. NWIO supporters seek to control the Western media delivery systems and services--the wire services, their journalists, their telexes, telephone systems, etc. NWCO, on the other hand, aims at the content of modern mass media--movies and TV shows, Western music and entertainment on records, videotapes, video-cassettes. Even Western fashions have been attacked as cultural imperialism by NWCO advocates.

The great war on Western media and cultural products began in earnest at a 1975 UNESCO meeting in Paris on the mass media. The events subsequent to that meeting are a perfect example of the U.S. policy of "damage control" at UNESCO. During the 1975

Paris meeting, a preparatory session for the 1976 General Conference, all Western nations except Switzerland and Austria, walked out during an attack against Israel led by Algeria. After the walkout, the Soviets were able to force passage of a resolution calling for state control of mass media. The West consequently threw out this resolution at the 1976 UNESCO General Conference in Nairobi and turned the mass media issue back to UNESCO's Director-General M'Bow.

By the time of the 1980 UNESCO General Conference, held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, the MacBride Commission Report commissioned by UNESCO to study international communication problems was ready. Its recommendations included several measures designed to introduce state control over the content of news media reports; an international "code of ethics" for journalists; and an international regulatory agency to monitor the "protection" of journalists.

The U.S. delegation at Belgrade and its allies among the Western nations again resorted to "damage control" as these issues were raised. Most of the resolutions aimed at state control of the media and free press were not passed. However, many anti-Western culture and anti-free press recommendations were passed in the form of "studies." Typical of these was a UNESCO study to investigate "the impact of advertising, particularly on the content of messages and on the management of communication media." The response to these studies by the chairman of the U.S. delegation, Robin Chandler Duke, was characteristically weak. She did not reject the proposals for the studies, but merely labeled them "impractical, unnecessary and counterproductive." She stated that the study on advertising would "move UNESCO in a highly unhelpful direction."¹⁸ These and other resolutions antithetical to Western media goals were then passed by the UNESCO majority at Belgrade essentially without Western protest.

The very idea of proposing studies on subjects like the control of advertising content and the "protection" (read licensing) of journalists is an NIEO strategy of the Group of 77 and the Soviet bloc. Typically, the results of these biased studies are eventually released at future UNESCO meetings and again come up for a vote.

Indeed, mass communications and Western cultural industries were major topics at the UNESCO Extraordinary Session of the General Conference November 23 to December 3, 1982, in Paris. The Executive Council meeting of the International Program for the Development of Communication (IPDC), on December 13-20, 1982, also in Paris, is another likely place for renewed debate. Surprisingly, the U.S. State Department appointed no professional media experts from the private sector to the Extraordinary Session.

¹⁸ Proceedings, of the UNESCO General Conference, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, September 23 - October 28, 1980, Vol. III of Records of the General Conference, pp. 1353-1354.

The White House claimed to lack the staff and funding adequate to have an experienced, well-prepared team of experts in media, education, culture and science on hand.

UNESCO: CULTURE AND CAPITALISM

The anti-Western, anti-free enterprise ideology of the "New International Economic Order" is so ingrained in UNESCO's cultural agenda that it may be irreversible. And what is true for the cultural sector of UNESCO applies as well to its education and social science programs.¹⁹

A kind of "preview of coming attractions" in the UNESCO cultural debate is readily available in the draft of the UNESCO Medium Term Plan for 1984-89. The final form of this plan and the funding for it were negotiated in Paris during the Extraordinary Session of the UNESCO General Conference, November 23 through December 3. The first part of the Medium Term Plan contains a section called "Uncertainties and the Renewal of Values." In this section all Western cultural products and industries are lumped together and accused of circulating cultural "stereotypes."²⁰ Indeed, "stereotypes" is only the latest in the dictionary of UNESCO cultural buzz words aimed at discrediting Western business and multinational corporations, which stem from the New International Economic Order doctrine, inspired by the socialist nations. Unsurprisingly, the most strictly regulated cultural codes--true "stereotypes"--which characterize the culture and art of the socialist nations, particularly the Eastern bloc, the Soviet Union, and Red China, are not so cited by UNESCO. Many Russian and Eastern European artists have defected to the West seeking the artistic freedom offered by the Western nations. Few Western artists have chosen to move to the USSR or Eastern Europe.

The first part of the UNESCO Medium Term Plan goes on to say: "The very logic of these [Western cultural] industries leads them to foster the expansion of an 'escapist culture,' which presents to sight and hearing acts that society does not allow."²¹ The passage continues by stating that Western cultural industries are polluting the countries of the "Third World" with "standards and values specific to certain industrialized societies" (i.e. the U.S. and Western Europe). These values include:

...a trend towards cutthroat competition and rivalry, and the frenzied pursuit of power or of individualized status as represented by income, regardless of the means by which such goals are reached. This trend is often reinforced by certain aspects of modern educational systems and by a number of economic, administrative and

¹⁹ Gulick, *op. cit.*

²⁰ Draft: Medium Term Plan (1984-1989), UNESCO, "First Part," 4 XC/4, p. 28.

²¹ *Ibid.*,

even political structures.²²

This passage from the Medium Term Plan makes plain how pervasive the attack on Western society is at UNESCO. All aspects of Western life are condemned from culture to education to commerce to government.

There are many other disturbing sections in the 1984-1989 Medium Term Plan: a suggestion that international satellite communication and its cultural programming be regulated;²³ a Marxist-oriented critique of the production cycle of cultural industries:

...since these industries subject art to the laws of industrial production--higher production and turnover rates, the needs for short-term amortization, cost factors and profit margins--they have profoundly modified the conditions under which creation takes place, undermining some of its forms and even in some instances bringing about a deterioration in the economic and social status of the artists.²⁴

But no critique at all of artistic repression in the socialist nations is to be found in the Medium Term Plan.

The Medium Term Plan also refers to the "flowering of genuine cultural democracy," suggesting a kind of majority rule in national culture to the exclusion of individual cultural freedom.²⁵ This notion is confirmed elsewhere by the Assistant Director-General for cultural affairs at UNESCO, Makaminan Makagiansar of Indonesia, who wrote in the UNESCO periodical Cultures:

If cultural values are recognized as an essential component of integrated development, if culture is not seen as the prerogative of the privileged classes but a common heritage whose democratization is bound up with economic growth and social justice, it seems necessary

to place cultural policy in the wider context of general national policy.²⁶

Here again, at the highest level of the UNESCO cultural sector hierarchy is the paternalistic, socialist bias that the faceless "masses" must be protected against the unnamed "elites," who, upon closer examination, turn out to be the educated middle

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., "Second Part," XI. Culture and the future, Paragraph 11030.

²⁴ Ibid., Paragraph 11034.

²⁵ Ibid., Paragraph 11025.

²⁶ Makaminan Makagiansar, "Preservation and Further Development of Cultural Values," Cultures, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1979, p. 13.

and upper middle class strata of Western and Third World society. And these masses must be protected, naturally, by a centralized state run cultural agency that is part of socialist, centralized, planned economy.

Another UNESCO author, Felipe Herrera, former Chilean Minister of Finance, former Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund and former President of the Inter-American Bank for Development, gives another slant on the utility of a centralized culture bureaucracy. His reasoning: culture must be state controlled and centralized because that is preferred by international, multinational lending institutions.²⁷ In any case, what is critical is that Herrera joined in the chorus calling for repressive centralization of culture.

Another highly placed UNESCO cultural official, Janusz Ziolkowski, Director of the Division of Cultural Development in the UNESCO cultural sector, argues that Western free market economics is too decadent to be the development model for the Third World--that the pace of industrialized life produces "certain forms of stress" sometimes leading to violence and a "breakdown of the sense of values."²⁸ This leads in turn, he says, to a "fascination with material wealth" which the corrupted desire to have without expending any effort."²⁹

In the classic UNESCO work on culture, Cultural Industries, the foreword, written by the M'Bow Secretariat staff states:

It is already ten years since UNESCO, moving away from the view of culture as something spontaneous and unconditioned, sought to give due recognition to the importance of analysis and critique of the nature, dimension and impact of mass culture, all issues which largely coincide with those raised by cultural industries.³⁰

From a Western or American point of view, it might well be said that this is where UNESCO went wrong in its cultural policy--when it moved away from culture "as something spontaneous and unconditioned." In so doing, UNESCO has obviously chosen to politicize culture, thus snuffing the spark of life so essential to genuine cultural creativity.

Cultural Industries is a caricature of UNESCO prejudice. Only four of its seventeen authors are even slightly pro-Western. The rest are decidedly leftist and NIEO-oriented. At the extreme left wing are French coauthors Armand Mattelart and Jeanne-Marie

²⁷ Cultural Development: Some Regional Experiences, p. 88.

²⁸ Janusz Ziolkowski, in Cultures, op. cit., p. 21.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Cultural Industries: A Challenge for the Future of Culture (Paris: UNESCO, 1982), p. 12.

Piemme, who speculate that the culture industries will merge with their respective state governments to usher in a kind of Marxist Armageddon in which the goal is a "multinationalization of economies," a withering away of the nation-state and a global culture.³¹

UNESCO studies, of course, are entitled to criticize and even attack Western culture. What is unacceptable in an international organization, however, is the obsessive double standard: denunciations of the West are okay, denunciations and critiques of the Soviet bloc and the developing states are not.

CONCLUSION

Given the deep and extensive penetration of UNESCO by the socialist cultural doctrine of the New International Economic Order, the time has come for the U.S. and its Western allies to fight back or get out of UNESCO. Like its education sector, UNESCO's cultural sector has worthwhile programs. But the few good programs serve as a convenient cover-up for what UNESCO really is: a very large amphitheatre for international political propaganda, as proved at the Mexico City World Cultural Conference. The ongoing drama in this theatre is controlled almost exclusively by the opponents of the U.S. and the West. They have written all the heroic lines for themselves as socialist champions of a "New International Economic Order." The U.S. and its allies consistently are assigned roles as capitalist villains.

What is needed is a new script. The U.S. and the West no longer can afford mere "damage control" at UNESCO. They need to discredit the dangerous myths of the NIEO. UNESCO players surely are well aware that these myths can become reality only if U.S. and the West acquiesce. But the West must play the political game or suffer enormous losses to its credibility as a world leader. This is particularly true of the United States.

The U.S. must provide a powerful free enterprise alternative to the NIEO--a kind of Freedom in Free Enterprise strategy for free market development in the developing world. Once devised, this plan should be raised by the U.S. at every available UNESCO forum, particularly the General Conference scheduled for Paris in 1983. Whether a free enterprise development plan would win majority backing at UNESCO is not the point. The battle itself would impress and educate a number of key developing states. Simultaneously, the U.S. must lobby UNESCO delegates one-on-one with vigor, as do its anti-American opponents. In this regard, the U.S. and Western missions to UNESCO in Paris should work closely with representatives of their respective private business and entrepreneurial firms.

But a Western free market plan for development is not enough. The U.S. and its allies also must fight the charges of "cultural

³¹ Ibid., p. 58.

imperialism" by stressing what is never mentioned at UNESCO, the total denial of cultural and artistic freedom in the USSR, Eastern Europe, Red China, and elsewhere in the socialist and communist world. Much should be made of the persecution of artists and political dissenters in these countries. The persecution of religious minorities in the communist world should be exposed as well.

Finally, with 65 percent of UNESCO's budget coming from Western funding sources--more than 25 percent of it from the United States alone--the West must begin to use its economic weapon to stop the NIEO plan. Funds should be cut to UNESCO programs advocating NIEO concepts, the New World Information Order, or the New World Culture Order. If these ideologies persist and the UNESCO effort to curtail Western cultural industries and mass communications businesses continues, all U.S. funds to UNESCO, assessed and unassessed funds as well as U.S. funding of UNESCO through United Nations Development Program, international lending institutions, and regional banks, should be discontinued.

UNESCO's mandate to "give a fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture" and to advance "the mutual understanding and knowledge of all peoples" is being completely subverted by the M'Bow administration at UNESCO. Under M'Bow, UNESCO has concentrated on attacking the West for its wealth, its economic and technological successes, and its social and cultural freedom. It has embraced in the NIEO a socialist economic development plan that has all but killed the once thriving cultures of Russia, Eastern Europe, and mainland China. This virulent anti-Western bias of UNESCO is, regrettably, becoming typical of the entire United Nations.

As in its education policy, UNESCO must excise the socialist, anti-Western propaganda from its cultural agenda or lose its chief supporters, the citizens of the United States. For their part, Americans and all free world citizens must refuse to let their elected representatives at home and their diplomats assigned to UNESCO continue the game of "damage control." They should insist that a firm Western voice be heard at UNESCO exposing the NIEO and the New World Cultural Order for what they are--an attack on the freedoms of the Western world. If this voice is not raised, then the U.S. and the Western nations should pull their logs out of the UNESCO fire and go home.

Thomas G. Gulick
Policy Analyst