THE UTOPIA OF LIFELONG LEARNING: AN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF

UNESCO'S HUMANISTIC APPROACH TO EDUCATION, 1945−2015

by

Maren Elfert

M.A., Freie Universität Berlin, 1992

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

Doctor of Philosophy

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

(Educational Studies)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

March 2016

Abstract

The scholarly literature has emphasized the strong humanistic tradition that characterizes the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). This study, which draws on archival research and interviews, traces the origins, features and shifts of UNESCO's educational humanism from the creation of the organization in 1945 to the present day, with a particular focus on the concept of lifelong learning. I argue that the tensions between the humanistic worldview and the pressures placed on the organization by multifaceted changes in the political economy and the landscape of global governance in education have forced UNESCO to depart from its comprehensive lifelong learning approach, while still maintaining a claim of continuity.

Employing Gadamer's (1975) concept of tradition and Bevir's (1999; 2003) concepts of tradition and dilemma and neo-institutional theories that emphasize the role of ideology and social meanings in explaining changes in organizations, the study examines the shifts that UNESCO's educational concepts and programs have undergone as changing actors continually renegotiated and reclaimed its humanistic tradition as a reaction to the dilemmas they faced. I argue that UNESCO's humanistic tradition has been challenged by competing ideas, in particular the concept of human capital, which presented a dilemma for the organization, contributing to internal and external tensions. Each of the symbolic documents that are at the centre of this study – UNESCO's constitution, *Learning to be* (aka the *Faure report*, 1972) and *Learning: The treasure within* (aka the *Delors report*, 1996) – are windows into the ideological struggles carried out at their time. They tell us a great deal not only about the beliefs and ideologies of the actors involved, but also about the "competing" ideologies with which they interacted. They further shed light on the shifting position of UNESCO in the system of international organizations and multilateral development.

At a time when the humanistic perspective of education has been crowded out by the increasing marketization of education and UNESCO faces a severe existential crisis, this study contributes to the understanding not only of the intellectual history of lifelong learning, but more broadly of the changes in educational multilateralism over the past 70 years.

Preface

This dissertation is an original intellectual product of the author, M. Elfert. The study received the UBC Research Ethics Board's Certificate of Approval H14-00391.

Preliminary findings from this dissertation have been published in the following papers:

Elfert, M. (2015, July). *Learning to live together: Revisiting the humanism of the Delors Report.* Paris, UNESCO Education Research and Foresight (ERF Working Papers Series, No. 12; also available in French and Spanish).

Elfert, M. (2015). UNESCO, the *Faure report*, the *Delors report*, and the political utopia of lifelong learning. *European Journal of Education, 50*(1), 88-100. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12104

Elfert, M. (2015, December 23). *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?* UNESCO's New "Humanistic Manifesto." *NORRAG NewsBite*.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

ADG	Assistant Director-General
AUREFA	Associations universitaires régionales d'éducation et de formation des adultes
CAME	Conference of Allied Ministers of Education
CERI	Centre for Educational Research and Innovation
CONFINTEA	International Conference on Adult Education (Conférence international sur l'éducation des adultes)
CUCES	Centre universitaire de coopération économique et sociale
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DG	Director-General
EC	European Commission
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council (of the United Nations)
EFA	Education for All
EFD	Educational Financing Division
ERI	European Roundtable of Industrialists
EU	European Union
EWLP	Experimental World Literacy Programme
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FTI	Fast-Track-Initiative (World Bank)
IBE	International Bureau of Education
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
IIIC	International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INFA	Institut national pour la formation des adultes
IR	International relations
IWGE	International Working Group on Education
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIEO	New International Economic Order
NWICO	New World Information and Communication Order
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal

UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UIE	UNESCO Institute for Education
UIL	UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
U.S.	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WCEFA	World Conference on Education for All
WHO	World Health Organization

Acknowledgements

Finally the time has come to write the acknowledgements for my dissertation, the project that has bundled much of my energy over the past four years. First of all, I want to thank my husband Yvon Laberge, who has continually supported me in every possible way and has been my refuge and bastion in the loneliness of PhD studies. If it had not been for him, I would have never come to Canada to study at UBC in the first place.

I tremendously enjoyed every day that I spent in the PhD program at UBC. I marveled at the beautiful ocean-view campus and at the luck I had to work with a group of extraordinary people. I have had the most wonderful supervisors, André Elias Mazawi and Kjell Rubenson, who both went far beyond the call of duty in their unfailing support of me. I cannot thank them enough for all the advice they gave me, the tireless reading of and commenting on my papers and the various drafts of my dissertation and the many letters of reference they had to write for me. I am indebted to them for the enormous amount I learnt from them and I hope I can continue to do so after this dissertation is complete. I am also very grateful to Jessica Wang, the historian on my supervisory committee who gave me some excellent pieces of advice. I learnt a lot from the very thorough feedback she gave me on my second and third drafts, which greatly helped me improve the dissertation.

I owe gratitude to my interviewees Nicholas Burnett, Roberto Carneiro, Arthur Cropley, Sir John Daniel, Ravindra Dave, Jacques Hallak, Henri Lopes, Adama Ouane, Ulrika Peppler Barry, Colin Power, Stamenka Uvalić–Trumpić and Peter Williams. All of them took time out of their busy schedules to respond to my questions and e-mails and graciously offer me advice. I am particularly grateful to two of my interviewees, Alexandra Draxler and Klaus Hüfner, who have made time for me on several occasions. The memories of my interviews with all of these outstanding individuals will always stay with me. I owe thanks to Georges Kutukdjian who established the contact with Henri Lopes, on Alexandra's initiative. Others have kindly met or corresponded with me to help me grapple with certain questions, such as Joachim Knoll, Warren Mellor and Clinton Robinson.

Last but not least, I thank Adelheid Ude, my history high school teacher, and the late Manfred Göske, my English high school teacher at the Gymnasium Johanneum in Lüneburg. They always made me feel special and instilled in me the love of knowledge. I had to think of them a lot in the past years.

Prologue

"UNESCO is an organization concerned with man and his destiny."

(René Maheu, 1965)[1]

---

[1] cited by Berrêdo Carneiro, 1976.

Chapter One

UNESCO's Humanism: The Challenge of "Unity in Diversity"

Introduction

When I came to the University of British Columbia (UBC) as a PhD student in 2011 after having worked for many years for the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL),[2] I thought I knew a lot about lifelong learning. In my first term at UBC I took a course on the "Foundations of Adult Education." One of the first papers I read for this course was Shahrzad Mojab's (2006) chapter "Adult education without borders," which contained the sentence "Lifelong learning is the educational response to the new market order" (p. 353). I was very confused about this statement as it did not correspond in any way to the idea of "lifelong learning" I had developed during my time at UNESCO.

In the course of my studies I quickly came to understand what Mojab meant. I learnt about neoliberalism and the influence of the market order on education. When I carried out research on Canadian adult education policies, I encountered and internalized the neoliberal discourse of "lifelong learning" as driven primarily by economic rationales (Elfert & Rubenson, 2013). But in the context of my research for this study I went back to the UNESCO perspective. I studied how the predecessor of lifelong learning, *éducation permanente*, emerged in the context of UNESCO around the mid-1960s (UNESCO, 1966a). *Éducation permanente* was very much infused with the organization's humanistic approach to education, which is anchored in its constitution and underpinned by its view of education as a human right. I examined many of the key documents coming out of UNESCO, such as the reports *Learning to be*, otherwise known as the *Faure report*, published in 1972 (Faure et al., 1972), and *Learning: The treasure within*, otherwise known as the *Delors report*, published in 1996 (Delors et al., 1996). For Paul Lengrand, the earliest theorist of *éducation permanente* in UNESCO, the concept marked the "first time [when] an element of freedom has been introduced into the educational universe" (1986, p. 9). He referred to the adult as a new kind of learner,

---

[2] Until 2007, the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE).

"unique in his personality" and "rich in experience" (p. 9) and free to steer her or his own learning and "pursue their education beyond the limits of school or university" (p. 8), without "compulsion" (p. 9). I realized that the concept of lifelong learning as put forward by UNESCO had very little to do with the neoliberal interpretation of lifelong learning. Today, Mojab is one among many scholars for whom lifelong learning denotes the responsibility of individuals to obtain the skills that make them fit for the labour market. In his study of the competing views of lifelong learning between UNESCO and OECD, Rubenson (2006) invoked the image of the Janus face, showing us its economistic side more often than its humanistic side. Bagnall (2000), in his analysis of the contemporary lifelong learning discourse, came to the conclusion that it was predominantly driven by economic determinism.

Lifelong learning undoubtedly became a global educational paradigm. There are hardly any educational policies and strategies, be it at the global, country, regional or local level that do not refer in one way or the other to the principle of lifelong learning (see Commission of the European Communities, 2000, for an example of a regional strategy; Lee, 2010, for the country level; City of Vancouver, 2008, for the local level; Jakobi, 2009, for a global overview). But what does the concept stand for? Why has the meaning of lifelong learning changed so radically over the past decades, from being "an element of freedom" to "the educational response to the new market order"? This study will contribute to answering these questions by tracing the history of lifelong learning in the United Nations Scientific, Educational and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It is fair to say that UNESCO represents the international organization that, since its inception in 1945, has made the most important philosophical and theoretical contributions to the concept. But it is important to note that in parallel to UNESCO's intense engagement with lifelong learning, especially during the 1970s and the 1990s, the idea was much discussed in educational circles more broadly, and other international organizations played an important part in bringing it to prominence under different names, such as the OECD's *recurrent education* (Kallen, 1979). This study will focus on UNESCO's view of lifelong learning, which shone a spotlight on the humanistic side of its Janus face. I argue that lifelong learning represents an expression of the humanistic ontology that UNESCO has constructed through the involvement of individuals who – while coming

from different backgrounds and cultures – shared a certain humanistic ethos, which I will further define later in this chapter. The humanistic worldview provides a sense of continuity and identity to the organization in a constantly changing environment. Focusing on the concept of lifelong learning as a case in point, I will show how this idea has emerged, and how it has been kept alive while being impacted by internal, external, local and international influences in the context of global politics. In particular in the last 25 years the pressure placed on UNESCO's tradition by competing educational concepts has increased. As a consequence, UNESCO became implicated in developments which entailed a quite radical departure of its humanistic interpretation of lifelong learning, while still maintaining a claim of continuity.

My Motivation for This Study

During the years I worked for UIL, I was increasingly troubled by the gap between UNESCO's humanistic discourse and the reality of "results-based management." I had the privilege of being involved in the conceptualization and development of a family literacy pilot project in Hamburg, in which UIL collaborated with Hamburg's teacher training institute, which is a part of Hamburg's education authorities.[3] My counterpart in the teacher training institute, Dr. Gabriele Rabkin, was a student of the late Gottfried Hausmann, the first Professor of Comparative Education at the University of Hamburg. After his retirement in 1974, he continued to be a close friend and adviser of the UIL, where a room in the premises of the institute is named after him, the "Hausmann room," which is equipped with a number of desks for interns and international fellows.[4] Especially in the first years, Gabriele and I struggled to secure funding for the family literacy project, and we had many discussions about the difficulty to convince funders to invest in a project that showed no immediate results or the results of which were difficult to measure and to pin down. Gabriele told me that Hausmann very much opposed this kind of instrumental approach in education and that he believed in a hermeneutic approach that left room for open processes and followed the development of a project the

---

[3] This project, called "FLY" has later been successfully expanded and mainstreamed by the Hamburg education authorities and celebrated its 10th anniversary in 2014. For more information, see http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002295/229506M.pdf

[4] For more information about Gottfried Hausmann, see Elfert (2002), p. 29. http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/pdf/50yearseng.pdf

way it unfolded. This is very much what we tried to do with the family literacy project. I realized that a project that involved so many people – parents, children, teachers, administrators – and institutions (schools, the two coordinating institutes, the authorities etc.) was like a living organism. It had a character and a certain dynamic. It could be given direction and framing, but it may unfold differently than originally planned. I have observed these processes also in a two-year European family literacy project which I coordinated. One of the partners was a Turkish organization running various literacy and family literacy programs.[5] Over the years that I followed their work, I noticed that one of their key programs that had started off as a program to enhance the reading and writing of children, was later identified as an empowerment program for women as they had come to realize that the program had its strongest effect on the children's mothers. The funding schemes prescribed by the donor agencies with which UNESCO works, such as the World Bank, don't allow for this kind of openness. Most funding agencies want to see immediate and measurable results for projects that have very specific goals, such as the increase in literacy levels, possibly already after the first year. Results-based educational planning treats human beings as means rather than ends in the teaching and learning process. I always felt that this approach contradicted UNESCO's humanism and the concept of education as a human right, but it took me a long time to figure out why, and this study reflects my ongoing struggle with this question.

Many times – in the interviews I conducted for this study, at conferences and in discussions – I heard the argument that the dichotomy between the instrumental perspective of education and the human rights perspective is pointless or even detrimental to debates on education. One of my supervisors, Kjell Rubenson, and some of my interviewees pointed out that initially, the human rights approach and the "human capital" approach to education, which became influential in the early 1960s, complemented each other. I acknowledge that there are many reasons for governments to provide education and for individuals to pursue it, and most people, from literacy learners to PhD students, regard education as an investment. But there is a fundamental difference between the instrumental perspective and the humanistic approach taken by UNESCO. For the founders of UNESCO, such as the Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain, and for

---

[5] AÇEV (The Mother Child Education Foundation), http://www.acev.org/

others who occupy a central role in this study, such as Jacques Delors, the purpose of education consisted in the development of the human person – "making man truly human" (Maritain, 1943, p. 113). In the instrumental perspective, the purpose of education is to convey skills that are "useful" for some other purpose, changing "the means into ends" (p. 114). These two perspectives are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but they represent divergent ontologies, which will be examined in this study. On my journey through my PhD program, I experienced several key moments that advanced my understanding of this – one of those moments was when my other supervisor, André Mazawi, talked about the "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" value of education. Another important discovery was the work of Zeev Sternhell. His staunch partisanship for the values of the Enlightenment had a powerful effect on me. In marked contrast to critiques of the Enlightenment, such as Horkheimer and Adorno's (1973) *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Sternhell (1996) fervently argues that turning away from the Enlightenment's emphasis on the value of the individual and the key idea of modernity that "men are able, in a rational manner, to create a better future" (p. 13) leads to antidemocratic, fascist and totalitarian tendencies. Sternhell's research on the origins of fascism comes to the conclusion that we must emphasize what unites human beings, and not what differentiates them, such as religion, nationalism, language, ethnicity, and cultural identity. Sternhell seems to be speaking out of Maritain's statement that "the preface to fascism and Nazism is a thorough disregard of the spiritual dignity of man" (1943, p. 114). I argue that the Enlightenment concept of dignity constitutes one of the pillars of UNESCO's humanism, which remains consistent even under the influence of the anti-humanist stance of the French 1968 "revolution." Sternhell has been criticized for simplifying things, because he presents the story of modernity as basically an ideological struggle between two different camps – the proponents of the "Franco-Kantian Enlightenment" on the one hand, and the "communitarians," the representatives of identity politics, on the other. I do not always agree with some of his conclusions, but his work greatly advanced my understanding of the influence of the Enlightenment on UNESCO's humanism, which is underpinned by the belief in the possibility of peace and progress under the condition that human beings follow their capacity for rational agency.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The UNESCO ontology is reflected in the emblem of the organization, the Parthenon temple, a nod to the Greek credentials of humanism (Singh, 2011, p. 36; UNESCO, n.d.a, p. 2), which symbolizes an attachment to a Western worldview. I refer to this humanism as a "tradition" in UNESCO. The humanistic ontology is a continuity in UNESCO, but at the same time UNESCO's educational concepts and programs have undergone shifts as that tradition was continually renegotiated and reclaimed in the changing context of global politics and the political economy in which the organization operated. Each chapter of this study will focus on a specific period that held significance in terms of the (re-)emergence of UNESCO's key educational concepts, from the foundational years to the present time. Each period is characterized by a different political, social and economic context, in which the tradition of UNESCO's humanism has been (re)formulated by a variety of actors who were driven by motivations related to their situatedness, their biographies, beliefs and experiences. The research questions guiding this study are: How has the concept of lifelong learning grown out of UNESCO's humanistic approach to education and how has the concept developed, between 1945 and the present time? How has lifelong learning been shaped by multiple actors situated in a plurality of contexts who entered into dialectical relationships with UNESCO to contribute to its articulation in the tension between UNESCO's humanistic tradition and the wider social, intellectual and political developments?

Three years before the right to education was proclaimed in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) of 1948, it was enshrined in UNESCO's constitution in the formulation "education for all." UNESCO's first flagship program, "fundamental education," was followed by *éducation permanente* (lifelong education), which later developed into "lifelong learning," and which constitutes UNESCO's most successful educational paradigm. Since 1990 the *Education for All* (EFA) initiative has dominated UNESCO's work, leading to a narrowing of the lifelong learning approach. The intellectual history of lifelong learning in UNESCO reflects shifting social and economic discourses and ideological tensions that have shaped debates about education in all societies. One important ideological tension that will run like a thread through this study is the tension between the humanistic approach to education on the one hand and

the economic-utilitarian view of education on the other. This tension comes out strongly in contemporary debates about education, marked by concerns about an overly instrumental approach to education and its increasing marketization and privatization (Marginson, 1997).

"Unifying the World Mind:" The Origins of UNESCO's Humanism

Against the backdrop of the Second World War, the founding of UNESCO rested on the belief that relations between states should be based to a much greater extent than before on strong multilateral institutions that could act as guarantors of peace. UNESCO exemplifies the conviction held by many at the time that cooperation limited to the political and economic realm was not sufficient to secure peace in the world, but that states and people around the globe needed to collaborate in the fields of education, science and culture in order to achieve lasting peace. The ideology behind UNESCO can be traced back to inter-war movements of intellectual cooperation as embodied in the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation (IIIC) of the League of Nations and even further to the tradition of idealism and belief in progress, which derives from the Enlightenment (Sluga, 2007, pp. 57-58).

UNESCO emerged from the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education (CAME), which met between 1942 and 1945 in London to discuss issues relating to the reconstruction of education in Europe after the Second World War. Delegates from 44 countries attended UNESCO's founding conference, called by the British and French governments and held in November 1945 in London. Latin American countries constituted the largest group, followed by Western-European and Asian countries. Only two African countries were present, Liberia and South Africa. Three Eastern European states associated with the "Soviet bloc" attended the conference, namely Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia. Initially, UNESCO was very much a creation of the three Western powers that had won the war, Britain, France, and the United States. Those three countries claimed the symbolic insignia of the organization. A British national was appointed first Director-General; France obtained the site of the organization, and the

United States could claim the constitution.[6] At the beginning some countries feared that the organization would fall under American influence, a fear that was reinforced by the absence of the USSR. The latter had refused to join as it regarded collaboration in educational matters as intrusion in its internal affairs (Krill de Capello, 1970, p. 5) and because it rejected the ideational principles ("wars begin in the minds of men") on which the organization was founded, which were incompatible with its materialist-structuralist ideology (Morel, 2010, p. 111; Fourcade, 2007, p. 144). Especially France saw with suspicion that the United States was trying to make UNESCO an agency of "American cultural imperialism" (Asher, 1950, p. 19; Fourcade, 2007, p. 144). However, early on it became apparent that UNESCO was not very receptive to American influence.

In his report from the 1948 UNESCO General Conference held in Beirut to the French foreign ministry the head of the French delegation, Jacques Maritain, proudly pointed out that the French delegation had managed to gather a "Latin-European-Arab" group which had greater voting power than the "Anglo-American" group. He applauded that UNESCO was "probably the only international organization in which France could still play a front role" (Fourcade, 2007, p. 145; my translation from French).[7] He also described how in Mexico, where the General Conference had been held the year before, "our country, or rather our culture, crystallized oppositions which make themselves felt everywhere in the world with regard to the increasing spread of ideas and methods of thought and American vulgarization" (p. 145), while presenting France as the defender of the "vieilles civilisations" (p. 145; see also Morel, 2010, pp. 102-103). In a similar vein, the Canadian John Humphrey, the secretary of the UN Human Rights Commission, described a heated discussion at a dinner party attended by several high-ranking Frenchmen, including Henri Laugier, the Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations in charge of Social Affairs, his executive assistant Stéphane Hessel, and the French socialist leader Pierre Mendès-France. Discussing the role of France in the post-war world, some of the Frenchmen claimed a role for France as the "troisième colosse" that would unite the world against the two superpowers (Humphrey, 1984, pp. 58-59).

---

[6] The poet and Librarian of Congress Archibald MacLeish wrote the preamble to UNESCO's constitution.
[7] Throughout the study, when I put "my translation" after a quote, I refer to a translation from French, except for one instance where I translate from German, which I have specified.

Jacques Maritain, the French Catholic philosopher, served as head of the French delegation at the second and third sessions of the General Conference, taking over at the last minute for Léon Blum who was sick (Barré, 2005, p. 393). Blum, the French politician and former Prime Minister, who had been imprisoned in the Buchenwald concentration camp for his opposition to the Vichy régime, had represented France at UNESCO's founding conference held in London in 1945, and at the first session of the General Conference, held in 1946 in Paris. Maritain was French Ambassador to the Vatican at the time, a job he never wanted but felt unable to reject when offered by the then French President, General de Gaulle (Barré, 2005, p. 384). He had spent the war years in exile where he taught at different North-American universities. He was one of the leading French intellectuals and had been a powerful spokesperson of condemnation of anti-Semitism, the Nazi racial doctrines and the Vichy regime for collaborating with the Nazis. He developed a philosophy he called "integral humanism," which differed from the secular "humanism" in that it acknowledged the spiritual dimension of human nature, which he saw as a fundamental dimension of human beings. A leading exponent of Thomism, his epistemology was person-oriented and based on the experience of divine love (Weindling, 2010, pp. 219-220). The actively political and worldly form of Christian faith he advocated has greatly influenced many Christian-oriented intellectuals and politicians in France and elsewhere, such as Jacques Delors who will play a major role in this study. Maritain had always been interested in the idea of a "world political society," and he had been favourable towards the League of Nations (Barré, 2005, p. 254; 392). After and in parallel to his involvement with UNESCO, he emerged as one of the drafters of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

A very different figure was Julian Huxley, the central Englishman in those early years of UNESCO, who was appointed as the organization's first Director-General. An atheist scientist, he represented a very different worldview than Maritain. He had made a name for himself with research on genetics and animal behavior and as a strong opponent of Nazi racial theories. The Americans resisted his appointment as they believed him to be "soft on communism" (Weindling, 2010, pp. 178; 185), and his term as Director-General was limited to two years, from December 1946 to December 1948. The Catholics were suspicious of his secular and materialistic worldview (p. 182). Many preferred

Alfred Zimmern, former Deputy Director of the IIIC and first Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission of UNESCO, as the "obvious choice" (Toye & Toye, 2010, p. 308) for the position of Director-General. Zimmern's illness at a crucial moment in the preparatory process played in favour of Huxley, but, as Toye and Toye (2010) argue, Huxley's appointment stems from the "two cultures" controversy between Britain's literary and humanities-oriented intellectuals, represented by Zimmern, and the proponents of a scientific worldview, represented by Huxley. In fact, the proposal for the new organization, drafted by CAME, foresaw a "United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization" (UNECO) that turned into "UNESCO" at the founding conference held in 1945, after the British had pushed for inclusion of "scientific" into the name of the organization (pp. 319-324).

   While the Director-General was a concession to Britain, and the headquarters in Paris a concession to France, it was an American who wrote the preamble of the UNESCO constitution, Archibald MacLeish, the long-term Librarian of Congress who held the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Public Affairs in the Roosevelt government before he was seconded to the founding conference of UNESCO. "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." This much cited phrase from the UNESCO constitution rested on the statement "wars begin in the minds of men," from the speech by Clement Atlee, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, at the UNESCO founding conference in London in 1945. MacLeish later used the phrase when he drafted the preamble of the constitution (Laves & Thomson, 1957, p. 359, n. 5; Cowell, 1966, p. XIX; Karp, 1951, p. 36).

   It is worthwhile to take a closer look at how the wording of the UNESCO constitution captured the spirit with which the organization was founded. The first part of the preamble deplored that the emphasis on the "differences" between human beings and "the doctrine of the inequality of men and races" had caused "the great and terrible war." The second part promised a brighter future in which the focus on differences would be overcome by the "intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind." UNESCO's humanism, based on the universality and equality of human beings, is anchored in this text, which

also contains the concept of "full and equal opportunities for education for all." The purpose of the organization was defined as:

> 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. (UNESCO Constitution, Article 1(1); see UNESCO, 2004)

The UNESCO idea reflected a particular post-World War II moment which emphasized "equality," "mutual respect" and "solidarity" over "suspicion," "mistrust," "ignorance" and "prejudice," all terms the constitution put in juxtaposition to each other. A word that stands out, as it appears twice in the preamble, is "dignity." In one instance it is being used in a negative formulation, referring to the war which "was made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men," and in the next paragraph it appears in a positive formulation stating that "the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man."

Given the diversity of UNESCO's member states, the claim of the dignity of every human being and mutual respect among all human beings called for unifying principles. The challenge of achieving universality in a world characterized by diversity was a key topic in the discussions of the delegations to UNESCO, and in those early years, some of the delegates saw this diversity as a "problem" that needed to be overcome. Reinhold Niebuhr, the United States delegate to UNESCO at the 4th General Conference in 1949, deplored "the hopelessly pluralistic world," which constituted "a problem so great, so perplexing, that it might actually…drive us to despair" (UNESCO, 1949a, p. 119). To overcome this pluralism, Julian Huxley considered it of vital importance that the organization pursued the "task of unifying the world mind" (Huxley, 1946, p. 17). He aspired for UNESCO to work towards "a unified way of life and of looking at life" (p. 62) and "to help the emergence of a single world culture," with the ultimate aim of "world unification" (p. 61). Huxley proposed "scientific humanism" as a

principle that would emphasize the unity of all human beings no matter their cultural or ethnic background. Huxley's scientific humanism was based on the belief in science and rationality as the vehicle of progress (Huxley, 1946; Pavone, 2008). Huxley was convinced that "a purely humanist tone would have antagonized the world's major religious groups" (1973, p. 16). He defined his vision of humanism as

> a world humanism, both in the sense of seeking to bring in all the
>
> peoples of the world, and of treating all peoples and all individuals
>
> within each people as equals in terms of human dignity, mutual
>
> respect, and educational opportunity. (Huxley, 1946, p. 7)

Huxley was further the proponent of a cosmopolitan worldview, and he believed that the organization could achieve world peace by creating a "world community" (Huxley, 1946, p. 44; Sluga, 2010). He saw UNESCO's role in "constructing a unified pool of tradition for the human species as a whole" (Huxley, 1946, p. 17) and maintained that "political unification in some sort of world government will be required for the definitive attainment of this stage" (p. 17). Huxley proposed "the advance of world civilization" as UNESCO's central role, which was based on the idea of world citizenship, driven by the sharing and multiplication of knowledge and the belief in evolutionary progress (Sluga, 2010). In his view, the concept of world civilization implied peace at the global level and transcended nationalism and its offspring, internationalism (UNESCO, 1948a, p. 6). Huxley's cosmopolitan view of international relations was built on cooperation not only of nations and states, but of people, which traces back to inter-war internationalist movements that promoted international understanding through the cooperation of intellectuals, such as the IIIC (Renoliet, 1999) or the New Education Fellowship (Brehony, 2004).

Many delegates to UNESCO in the early years expressed their confidence that science could contribute to the understanding of the people of all nations, as "scientific truth is a universal possession" (Mr Zérega Fombona for Venezuela, UNESCO, 1949a, p. 124). One of the delegates put it in a nutshell by citing Pasteur: "Though the scientist may have a country, science has not" (p. 125). Huxley's approach towards unification of knowledge based on a belief in reason and science driven by a secular humanism was a common feature of the scientific community of that time, and it goes back to the inter-

war period. Against the backdrop of the atrocities committed by the Nazis in the name of their racial theories, decolonization and the Apartheid system in South Africa (which was politically established in 1948), a group of scientists, in particular anthropologists, furthered by UNESCO, attempted to dismiss "race" as a category to distinguish human beings. In 1950, UNESCO published a *Statement on Race*, which contended that race discrimination was not scientifically justified and declared that "race is less a biological fact than a social myth" (UNESCO press release, cited by Duedahl, 2007, p. 12; see also UNESCO, 1950a). UNESCO also commissioned studies on the question of race, which were published in a collection of essays titled "The race question in modern science" (UNESCO, 1961), including the essay "Race and history" by Claude Lévi-Strauss. Lévi-Strauss (1953) rejected racial distinctions on genetic, anatomical or physiological grounds and argued that cultural differences of civilizations derived from geographical, historical and sociological circumstances. Lévi-Strauss' position differed from Huxley's insofar as the former asserted the equality of all cultures, while the latter's universalism presupposed the imposition of scientific rationality and the idea of evolutionary progress on all cultures. Huxley (1946) claimed that one of UNESCO's major goals should be the "lightening of the 'dark zones' of the world…because literacy is a prerequisite for scientific and technical advance" (p. 29). Lévi-Strauss (1955/1976) rejected literacy as one of the "criteria which have been put forward to distinguish between barbarism and civilization," because "nothing we know about writing and the part it has played in man's evolution justifies this view" (pp. 391-392). Given Huxley's commitment to eugenics and his affiliation with the British imperial élite, his cosmopolitanism was tainted with "late nineteenth-century conceptions of evolution and empire" (Sluga, 2010, p. 397).

Science was a driving force behind the push to denounce Nazi "pseudoscience" (Weindling, 2010, p. 128), in particular Nazi ideas about race. The implication of science in the atrocities committed during World War II, be it the medical experiments carried out by the Nazis in the concentration camps or the development and use of the atomic bomb, brought science to the forefront as a matter of concern and debate. One of Julian Huxley's collaborators was the Canadian psychiatrist John W. Thompson. Huxley initially hired him as a special consultant for matters of re-education, and in 1949, under Huxley's successor Jaime Torres Bodet, he was appointed UNESCO's permanent

commissioner for Germany. As a wing commander in the Royal Canadian Airforce, he had been involved in the care and relocation of the survivors of the concentration camp in Bergen-Belsen. He had further come into close contact with Nazi science as chief of the scientific and technical branch of the British Field Information Agency Technical (FIAT). Thompson was a key figure in promoting the "moral" responsibility of science, and he had been instrumental in the classification of medical experiments as crimes at the Nuremberg Trials (Weindling, 2010). After having pursued the establishment of the three UNESCO institutes (on education, social sciences, and youth) in Germany – the only one still in existence, the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, will play a role in this study – he left UNESCO in the early 1950s to devote his life to the spiritual Catholic community of Eau Vive in France, where Jacques Maritain was a frequent guest (Weindling, 2010). Thompson would remain deeply affected by his experiences in Bergen-Belsen and Nuremberg. He believed that the instrumentalization of human beings needed to be prevented:

> He recalled that in a two-year written exchange with one of the
> defendants at Nuremberg, the issue was whether "finite values could
> be ascribed to individuals." Disaster became inevitable "when the shift
> has been made from attributing an infinite value to attributing a finite
> value to a single person. (p. 311)

Selcer's (2009; 2011) studies on UNESCO's crucial role in creating a post-war community of internationalist scientists confirm that in its early years, the organization aspired to a world community characterized by the "ideal of 'unity in diversity'" (Selcer, 2011, p. v). Selcer (2009) refers to the UNESCO approach as the "view from everywhere," which diverged from the God's-eye "view from nowhere" of the natural sciences in that it did not aim at detaching knowledge from particular values, but on the contrary entailed an engagement with these values. While the "view from nowhere" represented a universal scientific perspective, the "view from everywhere" put greater emphasis on the diverse local and national perspectives. As Selcer (2009) put it, "the challenge of multiple subjectivities was an opportunity to achieve a more perfect objectivity…a unity in diversity" (p. 310).

Another project along those lines was the *History of Mankind*, promoted by

Huxley with the aim of providing a unifying perspective of world history. Huxley (1973) envisaged this project to differ from other such histories in that it would turn away from the common Euro-centrism and focus on "the cultural achievement of the human race, …dealing with war and politics only in so far as they influenced cultural and scientific progress" (p. 69). The project aimed at emphasizing cultural interchanges between different societies as the precondition for cultural advancement, an idea promoted also by Lévi-Strauss.[8] Huxley's main ally in the advancement of this project was Joseph Needham, a scientist from Cambridge University who had been instrumental in including the "S" for "science" in UNESCO's name. Huxley hired Needham to build up UNESCO's science section. Needham and Huxley convinced UNESCO's General Conference in 1947 to adopt a resolution to move forward the project of the *History*, putting an emphasis on the "understanding of the scientific and cultural aspects of the history of mankind, of the mutual inter-dependence of peoples and cultures and of their contributions to the common heritage" (cited in Duedahl, 2011, p. 107). The project suffered many setbacks, and the last volume was only published as late as in 1976. While the *History of Mankind* has not left a lasting impression among historians as a model of historiography, its significance lies in being "a monument of a universalism that did not quite succeed" (Duedahl, 2011, p. 132). The "unity in diversity" approach is embodied also in UNESCO's cultural heritage program, which has been enshrined in the 1972 *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* and which UNESCO is best known for today.[9]

The project of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) is situated in the same idealist and unifying tradition. Its purpose consisted in formulating a universal protocol of normative claims that applied to all human beings, irrespective of their religion, ethnicity, culture and nationality. The UDHR, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations three years after UNESCO's constitution, draws on a similar unifying discourse and appeals to "the inherent dignity and the equal and

---

[8] Later, Lévi-Strauss moved away from this position. In a lecture he held at UNESCO in 1971, he argued that too much cultural interchange between peoples, coupled with the demographic explosion, led to the impoverishment of cultural diversity and was ultimately to be avoided (Stoczkowski, 2008).

[9] See Laves & Thomson, 1957, Chapter XI, for more early examples of UNESCO's "search for unity in diversity" (p. 244).

inalienable rights of all members of the human family." The right to education was enshrined in article 26 of the UDHR and constitutes an important normative pillar of UNESCO's educational work. Habermas (2012) points to the implicit conceptual connection between the Enlightenment concept of dignity and the more recent concept of human rights (pp. 64-65). He sees "the inviolability of the dignity of the individual person as a source of normative claims" (p. 71). The concept of human rights always entails a universalization, an application to the whole of humanity. Human rights as a normative claim are "grounded in universalistic moral notions" (p. 77). But there is an interplay between universalization and individualization. In the human rights logic dignity is universalized because it "accrues to all persons equally" (p. 70). A decisive stage in the genealogy of the concept of human rights is the individualization that must follow universalization:

> The issue is the *worth of the individual* in the horizontal relations
> between different human beings, not the status of "human beings" in
> the vertical relation to God or to "lower" creatures on the
> evolutionary scale. Second, the relative superiority of humanity and
> its members must be replaced by the absolute worth of any person.
> The issue is the *unique worth* of each person. (Habermas, 2012, p.
> 72)

UNESCO's humanism emphasized this unique worth of every human being and at the same time aspired to universalization by stressing what united people rather than what divided them. As the head of the French delegation at the General Conference in 1949, Maritain's friend Georges Bidault (Barré, 2005, p. 384), a member of the French *Résistance* and two-times French Foreign Minister, posited, "Man exists in all men; and that is one thing I think Unesco might proclaim: that differences are not fundamental and that all men can be found in the mind and heart of every man" (UNESCO, 1949a, p. 117). In the early years of the United Nations and UNESCO, many hoped that this unity in diversity could be achieved by a system of international organizations that would eventually lead to a world government. Georges Bidault affirmed that "the French delegation…believes that international organizations will one day become organizations representing the peoples without the intervention of States" (UNESCO, 1949a, p. 115).

He warned against the risk of nationalism, "which is much more convenient," and he claimed that "the State must transcend itself."

UNESCO's delegates frequently discussed the causes of nationalism and excessive patriotism and how they could be overcome. Several delegates expressed their suspicion of the state as a breeding area for nationalism and their regret about the fact that UNESCO was conceived as an organization of states. Other speakers, however, stressed that "nothing is more human or worthy of respect than the sacred feeling of patriotism" (Fombona, UNESCO, 1949a, 4C/2 Venezuela, p. 2). For many colonies seeking independence the nation state was an aspiration, not something to leave behind. Nationalism was still going strong, and the UN and UNESCO were by no means projects that would undermine nationalist tendencies (Mazower, 2008; 2012, p. 422). The UNESCO Constitution stated that "the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction" (Article 1, item 3). While UNESCO set out to generate norms for a universal humanity, such as the notion of human rights, which transcended the boundaries of nation states, it was clear at the outset that the implementation of these norms would be hampered by the fact that the organization operated as an alliance of states.

The cosmopolitan aspiration of unity in diversity, or "universality plus difference" (Appiah, 2008; Tawil, 2013) is a recurring topic in the history of UNESCO's educational humanism. Difference is celebrated, but only insofar as it underpins the unity of all human beings. Diversity was perceived as the main cause of war, and the belief that the emphasis on difference needed to be overcome in favour of the solidarity of mankind was enshrined in UNESCO's constitution (Stoczkowski, 2009). The claim to universality of UNESCO's educational paradigms, from "fundamental education" to "lifelong learning" to "Education for All," is rooted in this line of thinking. Universalization of educational principles and individualization in terms of the focus on the dignity of every human being are interrelated in this ontology, which also entails the belief in the idea of progress and the "betterment of the world." The "unity in diversity" approach bears at least two risks. First, that UNESCO's recommendations to its member states remain at the level of generalization and may not be "specific enough to be useful" (Jones, 1988, p. 63). Second, and far worse is the risk that, in the name of "unity," certain norms will be

proclaimed as "universal" and imposed on countries with detrimental effects. This is an aspect I will come back to, in particular in the last chapter when I will discuss the *Education for All* initiative, which I qualify as an aberration of the "unity in diversity" ideology.

The Tensions Underpinning UNESCO's Mandate

In the archival documents I examined on UNESCO's early years, in particular the debates at the 1945 founding conference and the first General Conferences, I was surprised to find quite a high level of agreement among the delegates on the universal humanism that should guide the spirit of the new organization, driven by a sense of urgency to build a better understanding between peoples against the backdrop of the devastating dehumanization witnessed during World War II and in the face of the threat of the atomic bomb (Wanner, 2015, p. 10). In the third chapter I will further illustrate this agreement on the importance of international understanding through the example of the views on education as a human right. However, the particular post-war humanistic moment cannot obscure the many tensions that made themselves felt in the early years of the organization. Divergent views on UNESCO's mandate, and the lack of clarity of the constitution in defining this mandate are relevant for the argument made in this study that UNESCO, throughout its history, was forced to depart from its universal humanistic perspective on education because it was not equipped with the mandate, the resources and the legitimacy required to function as the world's main intellectual international organization. In its struggle to survive in the growing arena of multilateral and bilateral organizations, it took a "technical turn," which led to the decline of UNESCO's intellectual capacity to advocate its humanistic educational ethos and entailed the narrowing of UNESCO's educational concepts.

Opinions about UNESCO's role and mandate in the post-war world were divided. On the one hand the early debates reflected high hopes pinned on the founding of the organization. At the same time there were several indications that the circumstances would not allow the organization to live up to its potentialities. This is what William Benton, vice-chairman of the American delegation to the founding conference in London in 1945, likely meant when he claimed that UNESCO was the "most underrated organization in history" (Preston, Herman, & Schiller, 1989, p. 33). It could be argued

that UNESCO's potential was weakened from the beginning by the Great Powers which were in no mood to give up national sovereignty. An example of this was the decision taken by the United States and several Western countries in 1944 to channel funds for post-war reconstruction bilaterally rather than through UNESCO, which meant that UNESCO's budget would remain very limited (Sewell, 1975, pp. 41; 65; Jones, 1988, pp. 36-37; Chabbott, 1998, p. 210), a factor that impaired the organization from the outset. In a similar vein, the U.S. State Department had already undermined UNESCO's role by opting for other institutions to take over two important functions that potentially ranged within UNESCO's mandate: the exchange of scientific information and mass media activities. Alaistair MacLeish, the chairperson of the American delegation to the London conference, reacted with dismay when he became aware of the State Department's actions. In a letter dated 30 December, 1945 to Dean Acheson from the State Department, MacLeish asked for immediate clarification of these matters: "I don't like to be made a fool of, and I don't like to make a fool of myself" (Winnick, 1983, p. 339).

Even before the organization was founded, two competing proposals regarding its mandate had been put forth, one by CAME, based on a proposal by the American government, the other by the French government. While the CAME draft proposed an intergovernmental organization engaged in work of a technical and functional kind, the French proposal represented a vision for an organization based on the collaboration among intellectuals, following the model of the IIIC (Krill de Capello, 1970). Two divergent perspectives competed to define the role and mandate of UNESCO. The first stressed a broad political mandate, involving activities contributing directly to peace. The second was a more limited and technical mandate, involving indirect contributions to peace such as operational projects (Laves & Thomson, 1957, pp. 29-36; Laves, 1951, p. 164; Sewell, 1975, p. 81). The Constitution of UNESCO leaves room for both interpretations of UNESCO's mandate – the technical/functional and the intellectual/political. Laves (1951), a Chicago political science professor and Deputy Director-General of UNESCO from 1947 to 1950, deplored the ambiguity of the UNESCO constitution – the preamble stands for a maximalist (and political) position of UNESCO's mandate, which it presents as contributing to peace through education, science and culture, whereas the body of the constitution mentions activities that promote

education, science and culture for their own sake and stands for a minimalist (and non-political) position (see also Karp, 1951, chapter 2). Laves (1951) further blamed the UNESCO member states for cultivating their own interpretations of UNESCO's mandate and voting for activities that were rather unrelated to the achievement of peace (p. 164).

Julian Huxley advocated a broad mandate for the organization. But Huxley's humanism based on a scientific evolutionary worldview was very controversial in the organization. When Huxley presented his pamphlet *UNESCO: Its purpose and philosophy* to the Preparatory Commission of UNESCO, resistance was so high that his text could not be printed as an official document, but had to be presented as "a statement of personal attitude" (Cowell, 1966, p. XXIX). Many felt that no specific philosophy could do justice to an organization composed of such diversity in its membership. The Catholic group as well as other religious groups could not accept a secular basis for UNESCO. As Sewell (1975) explained, the document's "anthropocentrism shocked various kinds of theists, including pantheists" (p. 107). The anti-Marxists were put off by Huxley's (1946) statement that "dialectical materialism was the first radical attempt to an evolutionary philosophy" (p. 11), but the Marxists disapproved of his critique of dialectical materialism as being "based too exclusively upon principles of social as against biological evolution" (p. 11). Other controversial issues were Huxley's references to birth control and population management (Sewell, 1075, p. 108) and his neglect of the nation state (p. 109). The Americans probably disliked his reference to the "exaggerated individualism found mostly in the U.S.A" (Huxley, 1946, p. 16). In his *Memories*, Huxley recalled that the attack on the document was launched by Sir Ernest Barker, a historian and "ardent churchman" (Huxley, 1973, p. 16) who had quarreled with Huxley before over his "attitude to established religion" (p. 16) and "argued forcibly against UNESCO's adopting what he called an atheist attitude disguised as humanism" (p. 16).

The Cold War also cast its shadow over the future of the organization. One of the main critics of a grand utopian scheme for UNESCO was Reinhold Niebuhr, the United States delegate to UNESCO at the 4th General Conference in 1949. Niebuhr was a Christian protestant theologian who had little sympathy for Huxley's areligious and cosmopolitan leanings. He was suspicious of UNESCO's "too simple universalism" (Niebuhr cited in Sathyamurthy, 1964, p. 43) and questioned the organization's grand

intentions to secure peace (Niebuhr, 1950). In his view, the rationalist objectivity promoted in Huxley's "scientific humanism" was unable to overcome "ideological corruptions" (p. 8) and the "religious divergences" (p. 9) that divided cultures. Niebuhr did not believe that the conflict between the free world and communism could be resolved just by international understanding, and he considered the primary task of the United Nations to "relate American power to a weakened world and American prosperity to an impoverished world" (cited in Sathyamurthy, 1964, p. 38). Along these lines, UNESCO's main role should be to promote the position of the "free world" against communism (p. 45). Niebuhr saw the role of UNESCO as an indirect one in terms of "the contributions it makes to the integration of the emergent world community rather than in its supposed but illusory contributions to 'peace'" (p. 41).

Jacques Maritain, who acted as President of the French delegation at the second General Conference of UNESCO in Mexico, occupied a middle ground between Huxley's utopian and Niebuhr's minimalist perspective. Maritain represented the polar opposite of Huxley's disembodied and empirical scientific worldview, and in his speech before the General Conference he indirectly responded to Julian Huxley's attempt to impose a "philosophy" on UNESCO. He expressed his belief that agreement on UNESCO's "paradoxical" task, in that "it presupposes unity of thought among men whose conceptions are different and even opposed" (UNESCO, 1948b, p. 1), could be achieved through a pragmatic approach, not on the basis of "a common speculative philosophy, but from a common practical philosophy" (p. 1; see also UNESCO, 1948c, pp. 3; 6; Fourcade, 2007, p. 146). This pragmatic view was shared by many who rejected Huxley's attempt to provide UNESCO with a common philosophy based on "scientific humanism" (McKeon, 1948; Karp, 1951, pp. 59-61), and it offered a compromise that would allow delegates to agree on universal principles despite the many religious, cultural and ideological divergences represented in UNESCO's member states, not least the Cold War antagonism reflected in Niebuhr's statements.[10] Maritain's speech was reiterated by the second Director-General, Jaime Torres Bodet, in his inaugural speech at the third session of the General-Conference in 1948 (Karp, 1951, p. 72).

----

[10] Although the Soviet Union became a member of UNESCO only in 1954, some communist countries such as Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia had joined the organization before (for their views on UNESCO; see Sathyamurthy, 1964, pp. 163-169; Karp, 1951, pp. 53-58).

Maritain, Niebuhr and John Thompson represented the strong movement seeking religious renewal after World War II, combined with a deep mistrust towards science. Huxley, Needham and others considered science rather than religion to be the best ontological basis for post-war peace-building. Across both groups, overall agreement existed on UNESCO's universal outlook and the "unity in diversity" approach. Laves (1951) anticipated that the dichotomy between the intellectual and technical interpretations of UNESCO's role would have far-reaching consequences on program building, staff structure and "appraisals of the organization's effectiveness" (p. 165). UNESCO's humanistic ontology is closely tied with its intellectual-political mandate. The diverging viewpoints on the mandate of the organization and the tension between its technical and intellectual role have contributed to weakening the organization and opening up a vacuum that was filled by other organizations.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter is to lay the groundwork for this study. Apart from explaining my motivation and the rationale behind it, I have in particular sought to define UNESCO's humanistic ideology, which I will refer to as a "tradition," and to lay out the disparate viewpoints – "intellectual-political" versus "technical" – on the purpose and mandate of the organization and the tensions inherent in UNESCO's constitution. In the remainder of the study, I argue that the technical came to predominate over the intellectual approach, which has affected UNESCO's ability to spread and propagate its educational ideology.

UNESCO's constitution was the first normative and symbolic expression of the organization's humanistic-idealistic ontology that ascribed the causes of peace and war to the ideas that were constructed "in the minds of men." While some organizations may diverge from their founding mandates, I have observed that the constitution has a very special symbolic meaning among UNESCO staff, and many of my interviewees have referred to it. I would argue that few international organizations have such a great attachment to their constitution, and, as I will show in this study, the people who shaped UNESCO's educational work would continuously reclaim the humanistic principles stipulated in this document.

When proceeding to UNESCO's educational work, I will emphasize the

commonalities and continuities between the actors who contributed to shaping the meaning of education in UNESCO, as I have observed ideological affinities that are common to most of them. They were driven by a concern about the dehumanizing effects of an overly economic focus on education, as well as a suspicion of other alienating features of human society that had shown their devastating effects during and after the war, such as the use of machines and technology. In this respect, they were champions of UNESCO's humanistic tradition, based on the dignity of the human being, the intrinsic value of education, and modernity's claim that human beings can change their world for the better.

The tensions underlying UNESCO's founding and the opposing ideas that prevailed as to the mandate of the organization are important in so far as they put pressure on the actors who were involved in shaping UNESCO's educational concepts. Reducing UNESCO to a technical role impacted the organization's ability to engage with larger political questions and forced it into competition with other technical organizations, such as the OECD and the World Bank. The latter organizations were equipped by the powerful industrialized countries with much better resources and greater legitimacy and they operated under a competing educational ontology, human capital theory. UNESCO stayed faithful to its universal humanism and opened its doors to the newly independent countries of the South. But the "technical turn" and the constant challenge to its educational authority seriously undermined the organization's capacity to assert its educational ideas.

When the process of decolonization made development into an important domain for multilateral organizations, UNESCO had to demonstrate its functionality as an operational agency, in order to compete with the other agencies that gained influence in the multilateral arena. This "retreat into the technical" (Hoggart, 1978, p. 93) stems to a certain extent from the resistance of some of UNESCO's member states against a political mandate for the organization. As I will show in the next chapters, in the course of the following years and decades, UNESCO's programmatic focus on literacy and adult education gave way to arguments favouring primary education. Many UNESCO functions were taken over by other international and supranational organizations. In education, UNESCO has yielded a lot of influence to the World Bank, which is the most

important funding agency for education in developing countries,[11] and to the OECD, which dominates the education discourse among the Western industrialized countries and is also increasingly involved in development.

The two "forces" that have impacted UNESCO's educational ideas are, on the one hand, the continuity of the organization's humanistic tradition; and on the other hand the pressure exerted on this tradition by tensions deriving from different sources: diverging interpretations of UNESCO's mandate, other organizations that operated with similar roles but competing ideologies, and changes in the global political economy. Maritain pointed to another source of tension in his report from the 1948 General Conference when he referred to the "Latin-European-Arab" and "Anglo-American" groups. The rivalries between these two groups in UNESCO, which perceived themselves as culturally and ideologically distinct from one another, is not to be underestimated. Most of the people I will refer to in the first chapters are nationals of one of the "big three," Britain, France, and the United States, and especially the French influence will play a major role in this study. French thought, culture and politics very much influenced UNESCO, and the concept of lifelong learning, which initially emerged as *éducation permanente*, has a distinctly French flavor. This is certainly due to a large extent to the location of UNESCO's headquarters in Paris, and to the large amount of French intellectuals that joined UNESCO after the war.

This study will trace the development of UNESCO's humanistic approach to education, with a focus on lifelong learning, from the inception of the organization in 1945 to the present day, by looking in particular at the early years of UNESCO (1945

---

[11] A comment about the use of "developing countries" in this dissertation is in order. According to Iriye (2002, p. 103), it was at a meeting of the newly independent nations in Cairo in 1961 that they defined themselves as "developing countries." However, especially in the Cold War years, when the "developing countries" had formed the "Non-Aligned movement" and the Group 77, they often used the term "Third World countries." In the absence of a better term, I will use the terms "Third World," especially when it fits into the historical context, and "developing country," but I dislike them for reasons expressed in the *Faure report*: "There is …a logical snare in the very expressions 'developed country' and 'developing country,' for they may suggest that the condition towards which nations in the 'third world' aspire is by definition what is found today in allegedly developed countries, as if they too were not involved in a process of continual development" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 49). UNESCO uses the terms "North" and "South." I briefly considered to use Dave Hill's (2009) terms "rich world" and "poor world," but both UNESCO's and Hill's terminology do not always fit into the context.

until the 1950s), the 1960s and 1970s, the 1990s and the present time. Chapter two will present the theoretical framework and define the main concepts that will be employed in this study. Chapter three on UNESCO's foundational years will focus on the historical conditions from which UNESCO's humanistic ontology emerged, with a particular emphasis on the ideological underpinnings of the view of education as a human right, which is the backbone of UNESCO's educational philosophy and of the concept of lifelong learning. In that chapter, I will also discuss UNESCO's first educational flagship program, fundamental education, and the priority the organization attributed to adult education. Chapter four will discuss the context of the emergence of *éducation permanente* in UNESCO. It will shed light on the French and international influences on the concept, its close relation to adult education and its existentialist underpinnings. In parallel to the humanistic notion of *éducation permanente,* the economic perspective on education gained influence in the new Cold War domain of development, exemplified in the concept of human capital. The economic approach to education put pressure on another UNESCO priority, literacy, which could not be pursued to the extent the organization had hoped for. Chapter five will examine the context of the work of the *International Commission on the Development of Education*, chaired by Edgar Faure, which was carried out between 1970 and 1972, marked by the crisis of education systems both in the industrialized world and in the newly-independent developing countries. The Faure Commission launched the report *Learning to be* (otherwise known as the *Faure report*), which proclaimed "lifelong education" as the global educational master concept. The chapter will further discuss the key messages of and the reactions to the report. Chapter six will focus on the 1990s, in particular on the second UNESCO education report, *Learning: The treasure within* (the *Delors report*), which was the product of the *International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century*, chaired by Jacques Delors. The *Delors report* reiterated lifelong learning as the global educational vision in a very different political and economic climate and for different reasons than its predecessor. While the *Faure report* was situated in the "revolutionary" spirit of the late 1960s, which called for a profound change of education systems in the context of societal transformation, in the *Delors report* lifelong learning connoted a notion of resistance against the rise of neoliberalism. Chapter seven will offer some reflections on the

contradiction between UNESCO's claim of continuity and the turning away from its "tradition" in the context of the *Education for All* initiative, which has dominated UNESCO's work since 1990 up to the present day. It will reflect on the transformation of the meaning of lifelong learning under neoliberalism and on the question why UNESCO's humanistic approach took a back seat in the arena of global educational governance, by recapitulating and drawing conclusions from the previous chapters. In the final section of chapter seven, I will present the main findings of this study.

Chapter Two

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework: Interpretive Contextual Understanding

This is a study about how educational ideas, in particular the concept of lifelong learning, were shaped by individuals and global politics throughout the history of an organization in the context of their time. Given my central concern for the shift in the meanings of educational concepts, I have framed the study with theories related to the understanding and interpretation of utterances and statements made in the past. Interpreting the shifting meanings of ideas requires the consideration of changing political, social and economic conditions as well as individuals who shaped these meanings with their experiences and beliefs. These actors interacted in one way or the other with the institutional culture of UNESCO, which is infused with a humanistic ideology. From my current vantage point, it is not always easy for me to relate to the experiences and beliefs of those actors. This is why I have been drawn towards interpretive-constructivist approaches to the study of ideas and institutions.

The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the conceptual and theoretical assumptions that underpin this study. It is broadly organized in three sections. The first section will start by presenting Gadamer's hermeneutical approach to contextual understanding, in particular his key concept of "tradition," which I will continuously come back to and by which I mean the consistency of UNESCO's humanism. In terms of explaining the behavior of the actors in this study, I rely on theoretical approaches to historical change, in particular on Mark Bevir's concept of "dilemma," as I argue that the individuals that play a key role in this study reclaimed UNESCO's humanistic tradition as a reaction to a "dilemma" they faced. At the same time I trace changes in the meaning of educational ideas by examining the shifts in what Quentin Skinner calls the "normative vocabulary." Finally, I will define concepts that are central to this study, such as "global governance," "neoliberalism" and "globalization." The second section of this chapter will discuss the methodology and methods I have employed in order to collect and analyze the

data. The third section will briefly address the limitations and the significance of the study.

Gadamer's Hermeneutics and the Concept of Tradition

In the context of my work in an international UNESCO institute, I was used to balanced and consensus-oriented discussions about foreseeable issues in which differences of opinions only occurred within boundaries that were known to all stakeholders involved in these deliberations. Certain assumptions were taken for granted and the given economic and political order and the institutions that represent this order were rarely questioned. When I opened the *Faure report*, which was drafted by a group of men who, despite their different regional and ethnic backgrounds, were all educated in European and North-American universities and belonged to an elite of international diplomats, former ministers and heads of states, I expected to find the picture of a situation I could "read" and foresee. But my expectation was shattered when I found ideas that from my current perspective seem either astonishingly old-fashioned or refreshingly radical, ideas that would not be uttered in discussions or public documents in the UNESCO context today because they do not belong to the common acceptable discourse: ideas about the "complete man," about a society without school, the claim for "solidarity" with developing countries (not "development"), the possible enslavement of human beings (who are always referred to as "men") by machines. Although the *Faure report* is "only" 43 years old and was written at a time when I was already born, it is not accessible to me from my current standpoint, because it comes from a context very different from the one I know. My inability to understand the context in which people have acted in the past, has sparked my interest in theories of contextual understanding, in particular in Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutic approach to the study of history. Gadamer's philosophy is concerned with how human beings situate themselves historically and how they engage with the study of the past. He argued that we approach the past on the basis of our "fore-understandings," or our "prejudices." In his view, "the true locus of hermeneutics" lies in the "in-between" between the historical distance and the familiarity of tradition (1975/2013, p. 306). Coming back to the *Faure report*, I approach this document like every historical source coming from a distant past, in a hermeneutical manner, by mediating between the meaning this document may have had

in the terms of its time and the meaning that it has to me today, taking into account my fore-understandings and my positionality. Maybe the ideas and discourses that seem very radical and new to me, or in other cases totally archaic, were not so radical or archaic at the time. Henri Lopes, one of the Commissioners of the *Faure report*, told me that the humanistic worldview of the report was "normal" at the time. His statement makes me wonder, what happened between then and today? My theoretical approach to this study, which draws on theories relating to the understanding of historical context, in particular hermeneutics, helped me tackle this question.

Following Gadamer, I am not limiting hermeneutics to an epistemological and methodological approach to the interpretation of texts. I see hermeneutics as an ontology, as the way human beings make sense of "being in the world" (Gadamer used Heidegger's term "Dasein"), which is very much conditioned by the temporality of their existence. This is what I meant in the previous chapter when I referred to Gottfried Hausmann's hermeneutic worldview, which is at odds with today's "results-based" management practices. Proponents of a hermeneutic worldview believe in the lessons of experiences, which are always linked to the biographies of the individuals involved. Every learner will learn differently, because every person has different characteristics and experiences. Every project will evolve differently, depending on the social and cultural context in which it is embedded. I will come back to this point in my last chapter, when I will discuss some of the downsides of "one-size-fits-all" interventions, such as the export of the Western school system and structural adjustment programs to developing countries, which contradict the hermeneutic worldview.

The concept of tradition is central to Gadamer's thought. This important explanatory category also appears in other fields of social sciences, such as in sociology in Max Weber's concept of "traditional governance," or in Pierre Bourdieu's "doxa," or in Émile Durkheim's "collective consciousness." All of these concepts denominate an attachment of people to shared conventions, which shape their behaviour and their society. Most people consider tradition a condition for the unity and the cohesion of a society or of a community. The historian Jörn Rüsen (2004) defines traditions as "indispensable elements of orientation within practical life" (p. 71). In his view, "historical consciousness functions in part to keep such traditions alive" (p. 71). As one

of his four categories of historical consciousness,[12] the "traditional type" is defined as "the temporal whole, which makes the past significant and relevant to present actuality and its future extension as a continuity of obligatory cultural and life patterns over time" (p. 71). Seixas (2005) defines this type of historical consciousness as "the conservation of sameness over time" (p. 145). Certain rules, assumptions and norms are unquestionably accepted and carried from generation to generation. As concepts of historical understanding, the concept of change complements that of tradition. Historians are interested in how change occurs and how knowledge is being altered throughout time.

In the German originals of his writings, Gadamer (1975/2013) sometimes used the word "tradition," which has the same meaning as the English word, and sometimes the word "Überlieferung." "Überlieferung" means "something that is being handed down (or passed on) from the past." It can be a story or a belief, a custom, or an institution. He defined tradition as "the authority of what has been handed down to us" (p. 292), and this authority "has a justification that lies beyond rational grounding and in large measure determines our institutions and attitudes" (p. 292). He drew on the German idealist romanticist movement in that it accepted no authority (something it shared with the Enlightenment) and "takes tradition as an object of critique" (p. 285), but at the same time brought back into the picture the role of tradition in determining our behaviour (pp. 285-287), which was a category rejected by the Enlightenment. Gadamer ascribed to tradition an "element of freedom" (p. 293), because tradition aims at preservation, and "preservation is as much a freely chosen action as are revolution and renewal" (p. 293):

> The fact is that in tradition there is always an element of freedom and of
> history itself. Even the most genuine and pure tradition does not persist
> because of the inertia of what once existed. It needs to be affirmed,
> embraced, cultivated. It is, essentially, preservation, and it is active in all
> historical change…Even where life changes violently, as in ages of
> revolution, far more of the old is preserved in the supposed
> transformation of everything than anyone knows, and it combines with

---

[12] The four categories are: the traditional type, the exemplary type, the critical type, and the genetic type.

the new to create a new value. At any rate, preservation is as much a

freely chosen action as are revolution and renewal. (p. 293)

In this study I consider the humanistic approach to education as a tradition within UNESCO, in the Gadamerian sense, not as a "permanent precondition" (p. 305), a given transhistorical notion which endures throughout time, but as a tradition the actors in this study participate in and determine, something they are constantly in dialogue with, something that they reclaim, renegotiate and reinterpret in light of the changing times and in the context of their lived experiences, which explains how and why meanings are generated, debated, sustained and altered.

According to Gadamer (1975/2013), our prejudices qualify us for the hermeneutic endeavor. By doing historical research, we relate to tradition, to what we know. This is why every historian will interpret a text in her own way, depending on the time and context in which she lives. The gap between the historian and the past is not a "yawning abyss, but it is filled with the continuity of custom and tradition" (p. 308). There is a productivity that lies in this continuity. For Gadamer, tradition constantly changes as does the meaning it has for us. The historian engages in a dialogue with the past, in which the "past and present are constantly mediated" (p. 302). Understanding involves bringing the horizon of the historian and the horizon of the past together: "Understanding is always the fusion of these horizons…" (p. 317). The "hermeneutic situation" in which I find myself vis-à-vis the documents and interviews that have informed this study is the situation in which I am trying to understand the past with the "fore-understandings" that constitute my "horizon." I endeavor to find the "right horizon of inquiry" (p. 313) towards the past, which has a lot to do with "finding the right questions to ask" (p. 312). For Gadamer, "the hermeneutical task becomes of itself a questioning of things" (p. 281).

When in 2009 the current Director-General of UNESCO, Irina Bokova, built her inaugural speech on the "new humanism," she reclaimed a tradition in the organization. She showed "a consciousness of something enduring, of significance that cannot be lost and that is independent of all the circumstances of time" (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p. 299).[13]

---

[13] Ms Bokova was not the first Director-General to invoke "new humanism" in an inaugural speech. The second Director-General Jaime Torres Bodet had done the same (Karp, 1951, p. 72; UNESCO; 1948e, p. 169). Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, Director-General from 1974 to 1985, also used the concept (M'Bow, 1977, p. 21).

As Gadamer put it, actually in relation to the same term, "every 'new humanism' shares with the first and oldest the consciousness of belonging in an immediate way and being bound to its model" (p. 301). I argue in this study that actors that engaged with UNESCO reclaimed humanism as a tradition, while constantly altering it.

Tradition and Change

This study examines how the humanistic tradition of education emerged in UNESCO and how its meaning was shaped in the course of its history when the tradition was passed on by different actors throughout time. For Gadamer, tradition is a key concept that explains historical change; our attitude towards tradition is what brings about change. Historical consciousness is "filled with a variety of voices," which are the voices of tradition (p. 296).

For Mark Bevir (1999) the central concepts for explaining change in history are those of tradition and dilemma. Bevir, Rhodes and Weller (2003) define tradition as "a set of understandings someone receives during socialization" (p. 6). But like Gadamer, they do not see it as an essentialist concept that determines the actions and beliefs of human beings for the rest of their lives. Traditions are "a starting point, not a destination" (p. 8), and people can chose to move away from them. Bevir's concept of tradition explains change through the capacity of individual agency, in contrast to explanations that focus on changes of discourse, as in Foucault's "episteme." In Bevir's view, changes occur when agents are faced with dilemmas that arise in the form of new knowledge that challenges traditions and inherited beliefs. Bevir and Rhodes (2006) use the concept of "belief" instead of "language" or "discourse" to make clear that beliefs are "the properties of situated agents" (p. 7). Bevir argues that political practices can only be understood through the beliefs on which people act. He claims that the historian can only understand the intended meaning of an author by relating the expressed beliefs to the author's "wider web of beliefs" (Bevir, 1999, p. 29) and to the wider "intellectual traditions" (p. 29) we assume have influenced the author. In identifying this "wider web of beliefs," Bevir emphazises the subjectivity of understanding. Rather than focusing on abstract concepts and structural matters, he insists on focusing on the understandings held by the individuals involved in the examined processes, in order to provide an "authenticity that can only come from the main characters involved in the story" (Bevir &

Rhodes, 2004, p. 136). Bevir calls this approach "procedural individualism" (1999, p. 323); it "implies that hermeneutic meanings exist only for individuals: they do not exist autonomously" (p. 232). He writes history in terms of the dilemmas certain developments constituted for different actors and how these dilemmas contributed to change. In that way, he emphasizes the interaction of tradition and agency:

> Historians study people who held webs of belief against the
>
> background of traditions, where these traditions themselves must
>
> have derived from people holding webs of belief against the
>
> background of earlier traditions, and so on. (1999, p. 195)

Quentin Skinner's method of understanding texts combines "the study of their social context" and their "illocutionary force" (1969, p. 46). For Skinner, the emergence of new vocabulary is "the clearest sign that a society has entered into the self-conscious possession of a new concept" (1978, p. x). His much-cited article *Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas* (1969) was a reaction to the debates of historians about the meaningfulness of the so-called "classic texts" (such as Macchiavelli's *Prince*) in contemporary history. At the heart of this debate stood the question of whether these classic texts addressed "perennial issues" in history. Skinner, in the 1969 article, argued for a more historical approach to history by claiming that "earlier thinkers may have been interested in a range of questions very different from our own" (p. 3), a view that recalls Kuhn's (1962/1996) historical approach to the history of science. Skinner critiques the traditional "textualist" method of focusing on the classic texts because

> it is hard to see how we can hope to arrive at...historical understanding
>
> if we continue...to focus our main attention on those who discussed
>
> the problems of political life at a level of abstraction...unmatched by
>
> any of their contemporaries. (2002, p. xi)

Instead, he proposes to "surround these classic texts with their appropriate ideological context" (p. xi) in order to connect political theory and practice. In Skinner's historical view, theory and practice, as well as language and action, determine each other. Therefore, it is indispensable for a historian to "recover the terms of the normative vocabulary available to any given agent...as one of the determinants of his action" (1978, p. xiii). Skinner (1969) proposes the study of the "relations there may have been between

various different statements even within the same general context" (p. 47); this is what contemporary discourse analysts call "intertextuality" or "interdiscursivity".

Skinner explains change through the intentions of actors expressed in linguistic action. He often uses the word "moves" as a metaphor for how ideas and concepts are being put into action in order to bring about change:

> There is a sense in which we may need to understand why a certain proposition has been put forward if we wish to understand the proposition itself. We may need to see it not just as a proposition but as a move in argument. To understand it, we may need to grasp why it seemed appropriate to make just that move, and hence to issue just that utterance. (Skinner, 1996, p. 146, cited in Palonen, 2000, p. 304)

I rely on the above scholars for the contextual understanding of the texts that are central to my study. For example, the *Faure report*, which is the central document in chapter five, "is but a fragment of meaning" (Gadamer, 1975/2013, p. 349), which I seek to interpret by drawing on different ways of contextual interpretation. I embark on hermeneutic understanding, which involves examining the socio-political context of the report, the motivations of the people involved in creating it, the linkages to other texts that these people have written, the vocabulary that was at their disposal at the time and new vocabulary or linguistic "moves" that they introduced. I follow the above scholars in their view that the intentions (Skinner) or beliefs (Bevir) of actors have a very important role to play when it comes to explaining change. The ideas examined in this study have certainly been strongly influenced by the beliefs of the involved individuals who, for their part, were situated in a "wider web of beliefs" in a very specific historical context. Change here happened as the result of dialectical relationships of actors who were involved in a struggle over authority in the definition of education, and often these actors faced dilemmas that motivated their actions. I will also relate the key documents and concepts of this study to each other, by looking at the changing context they reflect in the "normative vocabulary" they use – concepts such as the "learning society," the "complete man," or "solidarity," that need to be put into "their appropriate ideological context." When comparing UNESCO's normative documents throughout time, such as the *Faure report* of 1972 and the *Delors report* of 1996, some of the vocabulary stays the same, and

others changes. What does that tell us? What are the "moves" that the actors who created these documents have made by reformulating concepts, by proclaiming, for example, "lifelong education" as the new global master concept, or shifting from "learning to be" to "learning to live together," and what was their intention behind these moves? In what way were these shifts influenced by the wider socio-economic and (geo-)political context in which the actors were situated, such as the emergence of the "Third World" as an influential political group, or the end of the Cold War?

Intellectual and Conceptual History

I see this study, which traces the continuity as well as the shifts in the meaning of UNESCO's educational concepts, as an intellectual and conceptual history of UNESCO's humanistic approach to education, with a focus on the concept of lifelong learning. In what follows, I aim to clarify intellectual and conceptual history as theoretical and methodological approaches. Sternhell (2010) defines intellectual history as aspiring to

> bring out…the continuity of a tradition, the lineage of ideas…the
> translation into politics of processes of change…considering the
> intimate connections between philosophical reflection, historical
> research, literary production and politics. (p. 31)

Conceptual history (the German *Begriffsgeschichte*) is strongly related to intellectual history, but focuses more on "the central place of language and translation in political and social discourse" (Richter, 2012, p. 1). Conceptual history aims at shedding light on the relationship between concepts or discourses and political and social activity. Common concepts such as "democracy" are central to social life, and people (re-) introduce and (re-)interpret concepts in order to push political agendas. Basic concepts are always contested and ambiguous, and this contestation partly derives from their translation between different contexts and languages. Reinhart Koselleck, who is one of the main proponents of *Begriffsgeschichte*, classified concepts into three categories: 1) those whose meanings have stayed more or less the same so that they remain understandable throughout time; 2) those whose meanings have substantially changed over time and whose usage in earlier periods can only be understood by reconstructing their meaning in historical documents; 3) neologisms such as "Marxism", which have

been shaped in periods of social transformation (Richter, 2012, p. 11). I would argue that lifelong learning belongs into the second category – as I have pointed out in the first chapter and will return to in the last chapter of this study, its meaning has been transformed considerably in a short period of time, depending on the context and the actors who have used it. Lifelong learning in the context of the Keynesian social-democratic welfare state of the 1960s and 1970s had a different meaning than it has in neoliberal employability policies today. If I simply applied Mojab's (2006) understanding of lifelong learning as "the educational response to the new market order" (p. 353) to the meaning of the term in the *Faure report*, I would stumble into the pitfall of anachronism, one of the major sins a historian can commit (Condren, 1997, pp. 51-58).

Without knowledge of the history that leads up to a certain usage of a concept, we tend to see only the outcome or the snapshot of a longer development. In her dialogue with the past the conceptual historian undertakes "translations" from the past to the present and the other way around with the ultimate aim of engaging critically with the contemporary context. Conceptual and intellectual history can therefore be seen as a style of political theorizing as it questions the taken-for-granted assumptions in the use of concepts (Palonen, 2002). This kind of political theorizing can be observed in the work of Zeev Sternhell and Mark Mazower whom I draw on throughout this study. These intellectual and conceptual historians trace the history of concepts and ideas with the purpose of bringing across a message relating to the present. In one of his articles Mazower (2011) refers to his historiographic approach as a "conceptual trajectory" (p. 44). He writes history by giving the accounts of the debates of contemporaries who reflected about the time in which they lived. Rather than telling history by describing historical events, Mazower tells history by rendering and interpreting the voices of those who were involved, putting a lot of emphasis on language and how it expresses ideologies. Mazower traces concepts and ideas, such as "civilization" (2011), the ideological origins of the United Nations (2008), or the idea of international cooperation and global governance (2012). In the latter book, he follows the trajectory of internationalism from "an era that had faith in the idea of international institutions to one that has lost it" (p. xiii), and his primary interest lies in the relevance of this message for the present time. This approach addresses the three-dimensionality of narrated time.

Mazower intertwines the present, the past and the expected future when he lets a person of the past say something which is relevant in the present and seems prophetic for the future. What the reader takes away from this way of writing history is an understanding that historical facts, events and ideas were never given or self-understood, but that they were always contested. Divergent worldviews not only emerged as a result of looking back at historical events and periods, but already formed part of the historical period we are looking back upon. When Henri Lopes maintains that the humanistic approach to education was "normal" in the early 1970s, he certainly has a point in that the "humanistic vs. utilitarian" dichotomy was not as strong as it is today. However, it was already highly contested at the time by the changing political economy and by the post-modern challenge to the principles of modernity, which I will try to show in chapters four and five.

Quentin Skinner often refers to the "history of ideologies" rather than the "history of ideas," and indeed through this study I have come to understand UNESCO's humanistic approach to education as an ideology. At the level of the ideas and the discourse, this ideology, which is characterized by a cosmopolitan worldview, an Enlightenment belief in the value of every human being, in progress and the ability of human beings to shape their world, remained relatively consistent in UNESCO over time. What changed were the motivations of the actors to reclaim and reinvent this ideology as a reaction to the social and political contexts in which they were situated and the dilemmas they faced. Certain terms and vocabulary changed slightly, reflecting shifts in meanings and understandings of education and learning, as did relationships and partnerships which shaped these meanings. The pressure on its ideology was a permanent factor throughout UNESCO's history, but the leading idea − what Sternhell (2010, p. 30) calls the "idée-mère" − is still kept alive in UNESCO at this moment, because there are still people who safeguard the tradition and resist the pressure placed on it.

Relating the above to my study, I conduct an intellectual history of lifelong learning in so far as I am interested in shedding light on "the continuity of a tradition" and "the lineage of ideas" in the context of a shifting intellectual, political and economic climate, and by taking into account the intellectual and ideological background and "wider webs of belief" of the actors involved in shaping the concept of lifelong learning.

I equally conduct a conceptual history as I pay attention to the emergence of new concepts such as "lifelong education," "lifelong learning," and "learning throughout life" and to the interrelation between the semantic shifts and the shifts in the meaning and interpretation these concepts have undergone. The ultimate aim of this intellectual and conceptual history is to comment critically on the present and to raise questions for the future. Especially in the last chapter, I will discuss the change in the meaning of lifelong learning, and its contemporary and future implications for the purpose of education and learning, which has shifted from a humanistic to a utilitarian and instrumental purpose. The "meta-narrative" of this study is the concern about the dramatic economization, marketization and dehumanization of education we are witnessing today.

The "Neo-institutional" Approach

This study further draws on the constructivist approach to organizations and institutions, often referred to as neo-institutionalism. The breakthrough of constructivism in international relations (IR) theory in the 1980s occurred with the end of the Cold War, which presented a dilemma (to use a Bevirian term) to the dominant realist and neoliberal school in IR theory, which regarded power interests of actors as the central causes of change. This event led scholars to believe that the material (in terms of economic and military) interests of states could not anymore be regarded as the main factors in IR theory (Finnemore, 1996). The constructivist turn entailed a greater awareness of the usefulness of a historical and contextual perspective (Reus-Smit, 2008) as well as a more ideational perspective (Goldstein & Keohane, 1993) for understanding change. It further led to a reconsideration of the role of institutions and organizations in shaping social meanings (March & Olsen, 1989; Scott, 2008). Chabbott (1998) demonstrated that organizational features such as competition for resources and professionalism are the main drivers of the actions of international organizations in education, rather than nation states. Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore (1999; 2004) shaped a new interpretation of international organizations in that they no longer see them as the long arms of states that have created them as instruments of foreign policy to pursue their own interests, as the "realists" in IR theory had posited. Instead they emphasize the role of symbolic meanings and norms, and the concepts of legitimacy and ideology to explain the behavior of international organizations. Barnett and Finnemore argue that international

organizations draw their authority in the international realm from the legitimacy they have obtained through the meanings and norms they generate. Finnemore (1993) understands institutions as "teachers of norms," which shape collective identities, interests and practices. The neo-institutionalists stress the social, cultural and ideological dimension of institutions, in which actions and the generation of meaning are context-specific. Institutions generate meanings and norms that are being recognized and followed by states and other actors because they have been "socialized" to understand them as "appropriate." Lifelong learning is an example of a concept shaped by international organizations that governments, funding agencies and NGOs have widely accepted – even if interpreted in different ways – as a norm to be followed in educational policy.

The neo-institutional approach matches my observation that the tradition of UNESCO's view of education cannot be exclusively explained in terms of *Realpolitik*. On the contrary, it is sometimes difficult to understand why UNESCO would hold on to its humanistic ethos although the world around it – the other international organizations, its member states and sometimes even some of its staff members – have lost interest in this approach. Of course countries have used UNESCO for their own interests, but it cannot be denied that UNESCO has a strong "life of its own." It is the tradition of its ideology that in large measure determines UNESCO's behavior. Nielsen's (2011) study of bureaucratic practices in UNESCO's cultural sector shows how the UNESCO ideology is being sustained by exercising institutional authority. Official documents that have been ratified by UNESCO's governing bodies serve as "reference points" – the keywords they contain are "safe" to use. "Perpetuating dominant language" (the "UNESCO jargon") is one way of exercising authority, and concepts such as "culture of peace" and "cultural diversity" "are invested with institutional authority and political legitimacy" (p. 284). Nielsen's study demonstrates that UNESCO is an ideological organization in that it operates as a collectivity on a shared meaning and belief system, a "self-referring system" (p. 283) – humanism being one of UNESCO's core beliefs.

Although UNESCO is an organization composed of its member states, it is not primarily the member states that determine UNESCO's actions, although they certainly influence them. One of my interviewees pointed to the importance of the "strong

secretariat" as the guardian of UNESCO's universal principles and tradition. He said that even during the years of East-West conflict among member states, the secretariat was keen to promote the culture of UNESCO and ensure that the aims of the organization be always kept in mind: "In UNESCO the secretariat is strong" (Interview with Jacques Hallak).

It is the secretariat that holds on to certain ideas, to the ideology that underpins UNESCO, and which passes it on to new staff members. This ideology derives from UNESCO's humanistic founding mandate from which the organization continues to draw its legitimacy. However, that does not mean that there are no challenges, shifts and turns. Changes in the environment and also in its institutional culture had an effect on UNESCO's humanistic approach to education. UNESCO's tradition has been weakened by many factors, by its waning legitimacy in its environment, but also by a lack of strong intellectuals who are able to defend it. Many of my interviewees pointed to the importance of these strong "defenders" that are more and more disappearing from the organization.[14]

The humanistic approach to education has marked the identity of UNESCO's educational work, provides a sense of continuity and builds a bridge throughout time, but the context in which it is being applied has shifted throughout the decades in accordance with changing ideologies and practices in global politics. One could argue that the continuity of UNESCO's humanism is deceptive as it only exists at the level of rhetoric, somewhat disconnected from practice. The humanistic tradition has been challenged by other competing ideas which have constituted dilemmas for UNESCO, and which have contributed to internal and external tensions.

Definition of Key Concepts

When tracing the shifting meanings of "lifelong learning" against the backdrop of changing social and political contexts and constellations, three concepts will constantly

---

[14] Phillip Jones on whose work on UNESCO I greatly draw, gave me the advice not to "underemphasise the intellect, personality and influence of René Maheu in the early years…(His was such a commanding, even domineering, presence in Unesco that people had no choice but to listen)" (E-mail Phillip Jones, 9 October 2014).

recur throughout this study that denote the shifting global environment in which UNESCO operates: "global governance," "globalization" and "neoliberalism." The purpose of this section is to define these concepts. The term "global governance," which was first coined by the phrase "governance without government" (Rosenau & Czempiel, 1992), reflects the transformations of the dynamics of government and power in the international system, including the changing role of the state and the increasing heterogeneity of the actors that shape and finance education globally. In the course of the 70 years covered by this study, many agencies, frameworks, mechanisms and programs of global governance of education have emerged, such as the UN-wide *Education for All* (EFA) initiative, involving not only governments, but also a myriad of international and non-governmental organizations – and increasingly also corporations and philanthropic foundations. In this study the main argument with regard to global governance will be related to UNESCO's declining role in it in favour of other international organizations, in particular the World Bank. Global governance is linked to the concept of globalization that I use to capture transformations in social, economic and cultural relations that transcend the boundaries of the nation state. In this study the actors who shaped UNESCO's educational ideas constantly referred to these transformations as a dilemma for them, in particular the aspect of commodification, in terms of "the subordination to market forces of areas of human activity" (Overbeek, 2003, p. 15), a phenomenon that scholars have widely recognized as a key feature of globalization, in particular in relation to education.

At the time of the *Faure report*, the term "globalization" (or "mondialisation" in French) was not yet in use. Notwithstanding, the drafters of the report expressed their concerns over what we have come to understand as the features of globalization. They wrote about "these times of socio-economic, scientific and technological change" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 30), the "scientific-technological revolution" (p. xxvi), the dramatic expansion of international travel and trade, information and communication technologies, and the complex and changing interrelationships between developing and industrialized countries (pp. 87-99). Significantly, the French version of the *Faure report* was published by Fayard (in cooperation with UNESCO) in the context of the series *Le monde sans frontières*, which was dedicated to the study of "the world today [in which] the former

42

boundaries of space and mind no longer exist" (my translation). For the authors of the *Faure report* these developments held a "great promise for justice" (p. 101), but they also warned of the environmental risks and the threat of "alienation within the consumer society" (p. 103) and pointed to the importance of education in supporting human beings to adapt to the changes ahead and to cope with the "clashes" and "contradictions" that these developments would bring (p. 104). The *Delors report*, published 24 years after the *Faure report*, clearly presented "globalization" as the broad global context that determined the thinking of the Commission (Delors et al., 1996, p. 14). In the sub-chapter "Towards the globalization of human activity" (pp. 41-42), the report described globalization in a rather negative and pessimistic tone. The report placed the emphasis on the economic aspect of globalization. The "deregulation and the opening-out of financial markets" (p. 41) led to all economies being "dependent on the movements of a steadily growing mass of capital" (p. 41), which entailed "interest-rate differentials," "speculative forecasts" and "short-termism" (p. 41). The "economic interdependence" brought about by globalization was painted in a predominantly negative light, in that "the industrial crises of the most developed countries reverberate throughout the world" (p. 41), making "the disparity between winners and losers in the development game even more blatant" (p. 42). Apart from the economic aspect, the report took a strong stance on another feature of globalization, particularism and identity politics. It further mentioned "the establishment of science and technology networks," which excluded the poor countries and resulted in the widening of the "knowledge gap" (p. 42), and the globalization of crime and trade of "drugs, arms, nuclear materials and even human beings" (p. 42).

In chapter six, I will argue that the *Delors report* represented a reaction to neoliberalism. In contrast to "globalization" this is a term that the report actually does not use as such, but that it paraphrases. After the economic crisis of the 1970s the system of the Keynesian welfare model and the "embedded liberalism" (Ruggie, 1982) that had dominated the post-war era came under attack by a movement that was theoretically fuelled by neoliberal laissez-faire economists associated with the "Chicago school" such as Friedrich von Hayek, who received the Nobel Prize for Economics in 1974,[15]and

---

[15] The prize was awarded jointly with Gunnar Myrdal, author of *Asian Drama*, a Swedish economist who was ideologically opposed to von Hayek. Myrdal later called for the abolition of

Milton Friedman who received it two years later, which illustrates the rising influence of their economic theories (Crouch, 2011, p. 15; Ebenstein, 2015). According to Jones (2012, pp. 6-10), neoliberalism had three distinct phases: The first was the inter-war period when – at the time mostly European – economists coined the term as a model of a market-based society. In the second phase, neoliberalism was promoted by the American economists mentioned above and in the early 1980s it gained prominence as the economic model of choice of the governments of Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom. In the third phase, after 1980, the principles of neoliberalism, such as market liberalization and fiscal discipline, were translated in the *Washington Consensus* and applied by international financial institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, in their development strategies in the form of structural adjustment programs. Rather than just an economic paradigm that replaced the previous economic order dominated by the Keynesian model of the state-regulated market and a combination of "corporate liberalism" and social protection, some commentators argue that neoliberalism has produced "a new socio-political reality" (Overbeek, 2003, p. 24), which involved a transformation of the social relations of production and labour, the role of the state and the international order. Overbeek (2003) and Overbeek and Van der Pijl (1993) define neoliberalism as a "counter-revolution" to moderate social-democratic forces and Third World calls for a regulation of capitalism and transnational corporations through the New International Economic Order (NIEO), a set of political proposals put forward during the 1970s by the Non-Aligned movement. Neoliberalism has become today a catch-all label that stands for the hegemony of the free market and the reduction of the state as a regulator of the economy. Some of its core precepts are control of money supply, liberalization, privatization, deregulation, cuts in government spending, internationalization and structural adjustment policies (Overbeek, 2003, pp. 25-26). Neoliberalism also entails a "new acquisitive individualist ethic" (p. 25), which displaced the collectivist perspective of the social-democratic post-war era, with the consequence that "the concept of the welfare state became an anomaly to capital" (Overbeek & Van Pijl, 1993, p. 16). Despite its distinct features, there is no

---

the prize and stated that he should have rejected it (The New York Times, 1987). Myrdal was also highly involved in the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race (Duedahl, 2007).

"pure" and uniform neoliberal system (except for a neo-liberal experiment conducted in Chile after the overthrow of President Allende's government in 1973). Depending on historical circumstances and ideological traditions, some countries have adopted neoliberalism more wholeheartedly than others.

Neo-liberalism is ideologically linked to neo-conservatism, as exemplified in the Thatcher and Reagan governments of the 1980s, characterized by family values, law and order, xenophobia, and a revived celebration of the nation and the military (Overbeek & Van Pijl, 1993, p. 15). I have written this study in Canada, under the Harper government (2006-2015), which embodied this blend of neoliberalism and neo-conservatism, and I have witnessed in my immediate environment the canning and closing of NGOs and civil society organizations with a social justice mandate and the outsourcing of social services to private organizations, to the detriment of the most underprivileged.[16]

My study is situated in a time of crisis of neoliberalism. Since the financial crash of 2008, constantly lingering fears of further crashes led the critics of the theory of the infallibility of the free market to raise their voices ever more loudly. The indications of the limits and dangers of the neoliberal dream of the self-regulatory market and the reduced state for the sake of greater efficiency and "freedom" have become too obvious to ignore. Today, the even more dangerous consequence of neoliberal ideology is the dominance of the giant corporations in all aspects of social, political and economic life and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few astronomically rich families and businesses (Crouch, 2011; Oxfam, 2014). The impact of neoliberalism on education has been dramatic as the subordination of education under the logic of the "market" resulted in an increasing commodification and marketization of education (Connell, 2013; Marginson, 1997). Under neoliberalism profit maximization represents the main goal of education. Such a view is incompatible with the view of the UNESCO founders who believed in the "intrinsic value" of education for the purposes of furthering human potential and dignity and who looked at education from a human rights perspective. This tension between UNESCO's humanistic tradition and the shifting political economy continues to be a challenge that the organization has no way of resolving.

---

[16] On 19 October, 2015, the Harper government was voted out of office and replaced by a Liberal government.

Methodology

The methodology I applied to this study involves the triangulation of data obtained from historical and contemporary records: Review of secondary literature, historical-interpretive analysis of primary sources (normative documents such as the minutes and reports of the UNESCO General Conference and Executive Board) and archival materials (internal reports, minutes and correspondence), as well as 13 semi-structured open-ended interviews with 14 participants, representing former UNESCO staff and experts who were involved in UNESCO's educational work at different times.

These various sources complement each other. Using multiple sources of evidence allowed me to corroborate the data from one of the sources with information from the other sources and increase the validity of the findings (Yin, 2009, chapter 4). Although some overlap existed between the information I found in archival materials and in the interviews, each source produced some evidence not provided by any of the other sources. Drawing on Yin (2009, p. 102), I have provided a table presenting the main characteristics of my sources of evidence (see Appendix 2). Of course this approach is fraught with difficulties. In most cases the data obtained from the various sources corroborated each other. But I can think of one instance where I was confronted with a real contradiction between my interview data and the data I found in the archives and in the secondary literature, in relation to the conflictual relationship between UNESCO and the World Bank. Some of my interviewees did not consider the relationship between the two organizations a "competition" – I will come back to that point later in the study. But the "evidence" I found clearly pointed to a picture that can be best captured by the term "competition." Another challenge consisted in the limited availability of the archival data. For example, the 1986 fire at the UNESCO headquarters destroyed the archives of the Faure Commission, and the few boxes that are left in the UNESCO archives contain only some of the minutes of the meetings of the Commission and some correspondence of the secretariat (for example, with publishers and National Commissions), but unfortunately no personal correspondence with the members of the Commission. The files of the Delors Commission are not openly available at this time (as the publication of the report does not yet date back 20 years), and I had to submit a special request to access those I considered most important for the purpose of my study, but I have not been able

to see all of them. In terms of the interviews, I was particularly limited with regard to the *Faure report* as most of the people involved in the secretariat and the Commission have passed away. It seemed to me that the most important people to interview were the chairperson and the secretary, which represents the central hub of every Commission. Edgar Faure passed away in 1988, and Asher Deleon has withdrawn from public life. I was very lucky to be able to interview the youngest member of the Commission (Henri Lopes) and the youngest member of the secretariat (Peter Williams). When I started preparations for my dissertation, another member of the Faure Commission, Majid Rahnema, was still alive. I managed to find his e-mail address and to establish contact, but the interview never happened. Majid Rahnema passed away on April 14, 2015, at the age of 91.[17] I very much regret that I have not been able to meet him. I am equally sad that I was unable to interview Jacques Delors who is 90 years old at the time of writing. Because of these limitations, I have not been able to establish certain connections, which would have interested me and which might have enhanced the significance of this study. For example, I know from the minutes of the Faure Commission and from my interview with Henri Lopes that Majid Rahnema introduced the work of Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich into the Commission. I would have liked to illuminate the connections between Rahnema and these two thinkers (whom he knew personally). I would also have liked to ask Rahnema about his views on why UNESCO was never able to pursue literacy on a large scale – an issue I discussed with Adama Ouane, but to which Rahnema could have contributed from his earlier involvement in key activities, for example the literacy conference in Tehran in 1965. There are other examples of points I have not quite succeeded in making to the extent I would have liked to, for example why the Delors Commission chose to use "learning throughout life" instead of "lifelong learning" or "lifelong education." In the absence of a "conclusive response" provided by my interviewees or by an archival document, I have offered in chapter six an explanation which I believe captures at least some aspects of the rationale behind this semantic shift. Notwithstanding, my reconstruction of the historical events as well as my interpretation of certain connections and developments are based on a thorough "reading" of the

---

[17] http://mediascitoyens-diois.info/2015/06/deces-de-notre-ami-majid-rahnema/
http://www.actes-sud.fr/actualites/disparition-de-majid-rahnema

evidence that was available to me. I tried to compensate for the lack of Jacques Delors' testimony by interviewing two individuals who worked very closely with him, including the secretary of the Commission, and both interviews were very insightful. Although there can be no doubt that interviewing Jacques Delors and others would have greatly benefitted this study, I am quite sure that my conclusions would have been similar.

Interviews

Given my emphasis on the beliefs of "the main characters involved in the story" (Bevir & Rhodes, 2004, p. 136), it was very important for me to complement the archival research with interviews with actors involved in the shaping of lifelong learning who could speak at least to the more recent developments (for a list of my interviews, see Appendix 1). The interviews were conducted between May and October 2014. Except for two interviews in German and French, they were conducted in English. Most interviews were between one and a half and two hours long. I would qualify my interviews as a blend between expert and oral history interviews, with a tendency to the latter as I "investigate a specific historical event through the eyes of someone who was there" (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 32).

The interviews could further be categorized as "elite interviews" insofar as all of my interviewees have held (or still hold) high-level and very influential positions in organizations or in government. All of them were older than me. Some of them were my former superiors, directly (as in the case of Adama Ouane, who was my direct supervisor at UIE/UIL over a period of 10 years) or indirectly (three of the four Assistant Director-Generals I interviewed – Colin Power, Sir John Daniel and Nicholas Burnett – were my indirect and very remote superiors during the time I worked for the UIE/UIL). It certainly facilitated my access that many of my interviewees are already retired and at a stage in their lives where they are interested in sharing their insights. Most of them are academics and can relate to my research interest in UNESCO. Two of my interviewees had just completed a book on UNESCO (Hüfner, 2013; Power, 2015), which may have motivated them to exchange views with another researcher on a topic of common interest. I tried to decrease the imbalance in status between myself and my interviewees by being very well prepared in terms of their biography and scholarly work. Conveying the impression of

being knowledgeable helped gain the respect of my participants (see also Mikecz, 2012).

I also made sure that they had sufficient time to prepare for the interview, and when

arranging the meeting, I showed readiness to adapt to their schedules and preferences of

locations. Prior to the interviews, I prepared a set of general interview questions guided

by my research questions, but every interview was tailored towards the specific role the

individual had played in UNESCO and the specific context in which he or she was

situated. Some of my questions referred to statements my participants had written or said

elsewhere. I sent the questions to the interviewees in advance to give them the

opportunity to prepare themselves. I usually started the interview with a biographical

question about how my interview partner got into the position in relation to which I was

interviewing him or her. In the remainder of the interviews, the participants were invited

to speak to the shifts in the meaning of education and learning in UNESCO, to the socio-

political context of UNESCO, the institutional culture of the organization, their own role

and agency and how change occurred. I sometimes departed from my prepared script to

follow the flow of the conversation or to pursue an aspect that seemed promising, but I

also made sure that I had covered all my prepared questions in the end. That seemed

almost a matter of respect as I noticed that all of my interviewees had looked at my

questions before and somehow waited for particular questions. Several times they

reminded me of questions if they noticed I had not asked them yet. But my inclination to

stray from protocol depended on my level of comfort with that particular interviewee and

on the time constraints. In the case of Henri Lopes, for example, who I interviewed in his

office, I was well aware that I could not occupy more than one hour of his time, and that

interview was characterized by a certain discipline to get through all of my questions. In

other cases, the interviewees seemed to have more time and flexibility, which allowed me

to expand on some side issues.

The interviews were crucial to this study. Although the historical "facts" I present

are based to a greater degree on primary and secondary literature, the statements made in

the interviews drew my attention to aspects I had not had in mind before. For example

several of my interviewees talked about the "Franco-Anglo" tensions, an angle I had not

expected, but which turned out to be a central argument and finding of this study.

My approach to the interviews was very much inspired by the model of the United Nations History Project, in the course of which researchers interviewed 79 individuals (Weiss, Carayannis, Emmerij, & Jolly, 2005, see pp. 459-461 for methodology). The list of interviewees is available in the book and on the project website[18]and all interviews are accessible on a CD Rom. I see the interviews I conducted for this study not only as an input to my research, but as important products in themselves. Therefore, I have asked the interviewees to give their permission to make the transcriptions of the interviews available to other researchers by transferring them to the archives of UNESCO in the context of UNESCO's history project.[19]12 out of the 14 individuals I interviewed have given their consent to this transfer.

The interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcriptions were sent to my participants for their approval (unless indicated otherwise on the consent form). Some asked for a few changes, or they gave me permission to use the interview, but required further editing before the interview will be given to the UNESCO archives. In the process of writing I asked all of my interviewees again for their approval of their direct quotes. All of them gave their approval, and few requested some editing. I initially coded the interviews, using a "focused coding" approach (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 57-60), which means sorting larger amounts of data (skipping the line-by-line coding that is often done as the first step) into codes/categories. These categories were shaped by the "sensitizing concepts" (p. 16) I had defined in my research proposal, such as "context," "change," and "dilemma," and other aspects of this study that I was interested in, such as the meaning and shifts of educational concepts, semantics, institutional culture, and the beliefs and intentions of the involved actors. I analyzed the interviews in a hermeneutical manner, which involved the interpretation of what has been said in "a continuous back-and-forth process between the parts and the whole" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 210). In order to get to an understanding of what the interviewee meant, I tested his or her utterances against other utterances in the interview and in many cases also against other texts or/and utterances that he/she has made elsewhere, which was possible as many of my interviewees have published extensively or given speeches that are publicly available.

---

[18] http://www.unhistory.org/CD/methodology.html
[19] http://www.unesco.org/archives/new2010/en/oral_archives.html

I used *in vivo* ("the external face of UNESCO"; "good" or "small-p" politicization"), *descriptive* ("the World Bank"; "what is the legacy of the report today?") and *values* ("crisis of the commission"; "deskilling of UNESCO") coding (Saldaña, 2013, pp. 6-7). I then extracted the data into grids sorted by categories. However, in the process of writing, my dissertation took some turns that I had not expected. Initially my intention was to write a dissertation about UNESCO's "education as a human right" approach. But after the first draft – in consultation with my supervisory committee – I shifted the focus towards lifelong learning, more specifically. That prompted me to go back to my data again and again, and I ended up marking up the transcripts with coloured pens in order to identify the statements that seemed relevant for my arguments. These shifts in my attention to certain issues went alongside my review of the secondary literature. For example, the more I read French scholarly literature about "éducation permanente," the more I realized that UNESCO's work on that concept was very much connected to the French adult and popular education movement. That made me go back to my interviews and pay greater attention to my interviewees' statements about the "Frenchness" and the already mentioned "Franco-Anglo" tensions in UNESCO. In my first readings of the transcripts, I was not sure what I should do with these statements and in what way they were relevant for my study. In that respect the process resembled a "grounded theory" approach in that I continually evaluated "the fit between [my] initial research interests and [the] emerging data" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 17) and added "new pieces to the research puzzle" (p. 14).

Conclusion

The theoretical framework I have presented in this chapter reflects the central place given in this study to educational ideas and concepts that have been shaped by individuals interacting with an international organization situated within the wider contexts of global politics and the economy. It is appropriate for the study of an organization that represents "the belief in the power of the mind to shape the course of history" (Maheu, 1972, p. 281). Overall I draw on theories of historical and contextual understanding coming from the tradition of hermeneutics and intellectual and conceptual history, which are well suited to frame my investigation of the shifts of UNESCO's educational paradigms. Alongside the historical approach, the neo-institutional

sociological approach is useful because it supports and strengthens my argument that the humanistic approach to education is part of UNESCO's institutional culture and ideology. This explains the consistency of the ideology of humanism in UNESCO, which was continuously challenged by shifts in the constellations of global educational governance and the global political economy.

The hermeneutic interpretive approach corresponds to my way of looking at things, but it also reflects the approach taken by the actors in this study. I have observed some significant similarities between them. Most of them were "universalists" – people who believed in a common humanity and universal values beyond the boundaries of cultures, languages and nation states. They were also democrats, in the sense that they were committed to equality and the autonomy of individuals to shape their world with their own free will. They were situated in the tradition of what Sternhell calls the "Franco-Kantian Enlightenment" and its belief in the intrinsic dignity of every human being and his or her ability to create a better future for humanity by force of reason. Moreover, they approached their tasks in a hermeneutic way. In the previous chapter I referred to Gottfried Hausmann's hermeneutic ontology and epistemology, supporting open processes instead of focusing on results. The approach taken by the *Faure* and *Delors* Commissions reflect this kind of worldview. Although they were often criticized for not offering practical recommendations or ready-made solutions, they provided an analysis of the situation and the challenges ahead, they raised questions and left the process open. This is a very different approach from the results-based measuring culture that dominates education today, for example in EFA, an issue I will come back to in the last chapter.

The fact that this is a study about ideals and utopias, such as the "learning society," could be considered a limitation. As one of my interviewees put it, in relation to the *Faure report*'s "master concept" of lifelong education, "It's a dream. It's a dream of the whole humanity" (Interview with Ravindra Dave). One could argue that the notion of a "learning society" is a sort of Weberian "ideal type," a "mental construct....which in its conceptual purity…cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality" (Weber, cited by Sternhell, 2010, p. 30). This study is primarily about ideas. I am interested in shedding light on the historical context in which the idea of lifelong learning emerged and the

ideology of the central figures who have shaped UNESCO's humanistic approach to education. I do not offer many insights about how UNESCO's humanism actually influenced educational policies around the world. I touch on this issue in chapters five and six, but for those who search for an answer to this question, this study will be unsatisfactory. One of my interviewees reminded me of this limitation when she wrote to me in an e-mail, "if only the problems of the world could be solved by ideas" (Alexandra Draxler, 31 March 2015).

Another limitation I would like to address is that this study does not cover the whole story of lifelong learning in UNESCO. I have chosen to focus on those periods which in my view were particularly significant for the development of the concept in the organization: the foundational years, in which UNESCO's humanism and the concept of education as a human right were constructed as the organizational ethos; the 1960s in which *éducation permanente* emerged in the organization, the *Faure report* in the 1970s; the *Delors report* in the 1990s; and the *Education for All* initiative, which is ongoing. I have neglected the 1980s and the work of Ettore Gelpi who started to work in UNESCO in 1972 and succeeded Paul Lengrand as head of the lifelong education department. Like Lengrand, Gelpi came from the workers' movement, and his work showed a strong focus on the relationship between education and work (for more information on Gelpi, see Ireland, 1979; Griffin, 2001; and Wain, 2004, chapters one and two). My study further focuses on UNESCO's work on lifelong learning, while neglecting the parallel engagement of other (international) organizations with the concept. In particular the OECD, the Council of Europe and the European Union have their own particular histories of lifelong learning, which would warrant much more research, although much has already been done (Hake, 1999; Forquin, 2004; Rubenson, 2006, 2008, 2015; Schuller & Megarry, 1979; Tuschling & Engemann, 2006).

While this is to some extent a historical study, it is driven by a concern for the future of education. The political economy of global governance is shifting from the interplay of nation states with international organizations towards new and even more complex constellations of "philanthrocapitalism," involving corporate and philanthropic partners and public-private partnerships (Bishop & Green, 2010; Ball, 2012; Ball & Olmedo, 2012; Draxler, 2015; in relation to UNESCO, Elfert, 2014b). Increasingly, it is

not only states that are organized in international and supranational organizations which assume the global norm-setting functions for education. Corporations will have more and more say in what the future of education will look like and in defining the purpose of education. This development will entail an impoverishment of the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of education, to which UNESCO has greatly contributed. While today ideas such as the right to education and lifelong learning are invoked in almost every brochure and policy related to education, they have been reduced to empty catchphrases that have lost their meaning. National education policies today are dominated by a utilitarian discourse, represented by the "skills" agenda (see, for example, OECD, 2013; Department of Higher Education and Training South Africa, 2011). The notion of "skills" represents the merely instrumental view of education and reduces the human being to her role in the labour market. In the name of the right to education the "one size fits all" Western school system has been exported into the world in order to produce more consumers for the market economy (Black, 2010).

As already mentioned, I do not offer many answers or solutions to these challenges. I trace the history of lifelong learning in UNESCO, which is a story of many failures and shattered hopes. I tell this story because it is meaningful to me, given my own personal experience with UNESCO and my long-standing interest in education. It may be meaningful for others who are interested in the concept of lifelong learning or UNESCO or the changing dynamics of educational governance in the multilateral system. The study may also be of interest to those who are concerned about the marketization and commodification of education as it offers some insights into how the instrumental view of education has gained the grip it has today.

Chapter Three

UNESCO's Early Years: Human Rights, High Hopes and Harsh Realities

Introduction

This chapter will focus on how the concept of the right to education became one of the core principles of UNESCO's ethos in its early years (1945 up to the late 1950s). The questions guiding this chapter are: what were the organization's educational beliefs and priorities, and how did they fit into the overall intellectual climate at the time? How were these beliefs translated in activities, and what were the challenges UNESCO encountered in the early years of its existence? Drawing on archival research, this chapter will shed light on what the concept of the right to education meant to the founders of UNESCO and what they set as priorities for the organization in terms of the reconstruction of education after the Second World War. I will start by clarifying the historical circumstances and the philosophical underpinnings of the emergence of human rights after the war, followed by a presentation of the key issues raised in UNESCO in discussions about human rights, in particular in the contributions collected by the *Comité sur les principes philosophiques des droits de l'homme*. I will then proceed to examine the meaning that the concept of the right to education had among member states, staff and intellectuals whom UNESCO consulted. The next section will revisit the debates about Article 26 on the right to education of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR). The UDHR was drafted by the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations and is not directly related to UNESCO. However, including a section on Article 26 seems relevant because the drafting process revealed the controversies about the notion of education as a right and UNESCO's standpoint in these debates. The final section will address the priorities of UNESCO's educational program in the early years. Adult education held a central position, as reflected in UNESCO's first educational flagship program, "fundamental education," which was short-lived and held many lessons for UNESCO that still hold relevance today.

Universalization and Individualization: The Principle of Human Rights

The unity of humankind based on the dignity of every human being constituted a key principle of UNESCO's humanism, and the organization aspired to unifying principles. The encompassing notion of humanity, irrespective of race, civilization and class represented a relatively recent concept (Davies, 1997, p. 26). In the first chapter of his book *Education at the Crossroads*, Jacques Maritain (1943) referred to the novelty of the encompassing view of humanity when he stated that he had almost called his book *The Education of Man*, but chose not to do so as the title might have been "provocative" (p. 1),

> for many of our contemporaries know primitive man, or Western man,
>
> or the man of the Renaissance, or the man of the industrial era, or the
>
> criminal man, or the bourgeois man, or the working man, but they
>
> wonder what is meant when we speak of man. (p. 1)

The universalization of humanity – while using the gendered concept of "man" – correlated with a strong individualization. Those who had survived the years of dehumanization and mass killings emphasized the "supreme value of the human person" (Glendon, 2001, p. 169). John Thompson, the UNESCO officer in charge of UNESCO's relations to Germany, believed that "unless the single individual was accorded infinite value, another holocaust would arise" (Weindling, 2010, p. 312). The "making sacred of the human" (Ferry, 2011, p. 245) found its expression in the Kantian term "dignity," a much evoked concept in the early debates carried out at UNESCO. The Cuban delegate to the 4th General Conference, Inés Segura Bustamante, saw one of the main functions of UNESCO in "the raising of human dignity and the full realization…of the dignity of mankind" (UNESCO, 1949a, p. 9).

Human rights offered the ultimate expression of these tendencies of "universalization in individualization" – they elevated the value of every single human being, and at the same time they were universal. The claim to universal validity had not applied to the League of Nations' minority rights, which were attached to the affiliation of minority groups to national governments (Arendt, 1951/2001, p. 272). As Moyn (2010) observed, the idea of human rights has always existed, but they remained a "part…of the authority of the state, not invoked to transcend it" (p. 7). The idea of human

rights, although ultimately also dependent on state implementation, implied a transcendence of the state. Immanent to the idea of "inalienable" rights – as defined in the preamble of the UDHR – is that they exist "beyond state control" (Habermas, 2012, p. 68). Mazower (2011) traces human rights back to the term "civilization," commonly used by Julian Huxley and others, which emerged in the 18th century and denoted the "process by which humanity emerged from barbarity" (p. 30), "a concept bound up with the idea of freedom, humanity and rights" (p. 30) and the emergence of the new discipline of international law as a tool to organize relationships among states. He argues that the League of Nations was based on a colonial and imperial worldview that granted access to those countries considered as "civilized." When the United Nations were founded and were joined by many newly independent countries that had not belonged to the "civilized club" before, the concept of civilization did not seem appropriate anymore, and it was succeeded by human rights, which became a new unifying principle of states (p. 41).

According to Mazower (2004), three historical conditions contributed to the prominence of the concept of human rights after the Second World War. First, after the experience of Nazi fascism "the reassertion of the rights of the individual against the omnipotent state fitted smoothly into liberal political thought" (p. 386). Second, human rights discourse offered an excellent justification for the new direction taken by the United States to become an international leader after moving away from isolationism, as expressed in Franklin Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms" speech. Third, the broader and unspecific human rights offered an alternative to the League of Nations' minority rights treaties, of which the Holocaust had made a mockery (pp. 387-390).

Many testimonies pointed to the devastating experience of the Second World War, which had incited the architects of UNESCO and the United Nations "to serve the best in humanity with an intensity of idealism now difficult to characterize convincingly to those who never experienced it" (Cowell, 1966, p. XIV). Stéphane Hessel (2011), a member of the French *Résistance* who was involved in the drafting of the UDHR and later worked for UNESCO, identified "outrage" as the main motivation of the UDHR:

The real issue at the end of the Second World War was to free
ourselves from the threats that totalitarianism held over mankind's
head, and to do so, the member states of the UN had to commit to

respecting universal rights…The Universal Declaration of Human

Rights owes a lot to the universal revulsion against Nazism, Fascism,

totalitarianism. (p. 17)

As Glendon (2001) has argued, the unique historical circumstances after the war opened a window of opportunity which allowed for the creation of an international system based on human rights that at least held the potential to lead to better international understanding and respect for the equal rights of all people. Different religious and ideological convictions – as represented by Julian Huxley, Reinhold Niebuhr and Jacques Maritain – and clashing political ontologies manifested themselves in the early UNESCO debates in the condescending remarks exchanged between the representatives of the Western liberal democracies and the communist countries and the bitter comments launched by the delegates of the countries under foreign rule towards their oppressors. But in "that curiously utopian moment" (Sluga, 2010, p. 393) after World War II these simmering conflicts were surmounted by the good will towards creating the conditions for a better world, of which human rights constituted the key symbol. Maritain's pragmatic position exemplified this good will. He posited that "the moral charter of the civilized world" had to be a pragmatic act because "the sphere of rational justifications [of human rights] would necessarily "remain one of division" (UNESCO, 1947a, p. 1). Maritain recounted a conversation that occurred at a meeting of a UNESCO National Commission where

someone expressed astonishment that certain champions of violently

opposed ideologies had agreed on a list of those [human] rights.

'Yes,' they said, 'we agree about the rights but on condition that no

one asks us why.' (UNESCO, 1948d, p. I)

For Maritain, agreement between people coming from all parts of the world and representing very different cultures and worldviews, seemed only possible on the basis of common interests of a practical sort. These practical aims could be pursued by all, even if they rested on different beliefs and traditions. In this manner, the members of the United Nations could agree on a universal declaration of human rights no matter whether they believed in "natural rights," the inalienable rights intrinsic in the humanity of human beings, or the concept of human rights as a product of the development of society (p. V).

Despite the metaphysical approach to education he had laid out in his book *Education at the Crossroads* (1943), Maritain pleaded for a pragmatic approach for UNESCO since "theoretical agreement was impossible" (UNESCO, 1947a, p. 1). A practical and pragmatic agreement offered the only way to bridge the ideological divides between UNESCO's members and allow them to work together towards the "unification of the world," for which he considered the declaration of human rights an important step (UNESCO, 1948d, p. III). Finding common ground between different cultures and ideologies constituted the prime concern in the creation of international organizations and norms after the Second World War. Human rights provided a key unifying principle that underpinned the legitimacy of UNESCO. However, that did not mean that states were genuinely interested in implementing them. As I discuss below, the controversy over the civil and political rights and the social and economic rights as well as the role of the state in guaranteeing these rights points to the lack of interest in wholeheartedly embracing the legal consequences of human rights.

UNESCO and Human Rights

At its first session in 1946, the General Conference decided to establish the *Comité sur les principes philosophiques des droits de l'homme*. By establishing this committee endowed with the mandate of conducting an "enquiry into the origins and philosophic bases of human rights" among current philosophers, academics and influential thinkers (Havet, 1948; Büttner, 2004, p. 23), UNESCO revealed its ambition to adopt human rights as a cornerstone of its mandate. The purpose of the consultation among philosophers was to inform the work of the Human Rights Commission at the United Nations (Glendon, 2001, pp. 73-79; Büttner, 2004, p. 23). The compilation gathered by the *Comité* constitutes another example of UNESCO's "unity in diversity" approach examined in chapter one, and it endowed UNESCO with a certain legitimacy to pursue the human rights idea. The initiative speaks to UNESCO claiming an intellectual role for itself as well as a role as unifier and mediator between cultures.

The *Comité* was chaired by Jacques Maritain and carried out its work between 1947 and 1948. It sent out a questionnaire on human rights to philosophers and intellectuals around the world and received about seventy responses, including statements

by Mahatma Gandhi, Benedetto Croce and Aldous Huxley (UNESCO, 1948d). Since 1947 the UN Human Rights Commission knew about the initiative, and in the small world of post-war diplomacy contacts between the two institutions were frequent (Humphrey, 1984). John Humphrey, the Director of the UN Division of Human Rights, was a frequent visitor at the headquarters of UNESCO located at the Hôtel Majestic on the Avenue Kléber. He regularly represented the UN Secretary-General at meetings of the UNESCO Executive Board, also in April 1947 (Büttner, 2004, p. 93), and he had a long discussion with Huxley on the UNESCO initiative (Huxley, 1947b). Archibald MacLeish, the Chairman of the American delegation to the founding conference of UNESCO, attended the first meeting of the Human Rights Commission in January 1947 (Glendon, 2001, p. 51); Jacques Havet, the coordinator of the inquiry and head of the Philosophy and Humanities Division in UNESCO, participated in the first meeting of the drafting committee in June 1947; and René Cassin, one of the members of the Human Rights Commission, attended the first meeting of the *Comité*. Moreover, against the background of some confusion that came up in the Human Rights Commission in relation to the UNESCO inquiry, Havet had explained the initiative to Eleanor Roosevelt in a letter dated December 16, 1947 (Morsink, 2000, pp. 301-302). However, UNESCO's inquiry did not have much influence on the process of drafting the UDHR (Büttner, 2004, pp. 21-27). The parallel human rights-related activities between UNESCO and the United Nations point to the unclarity in the definition of roles between UNESCO and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the UN, which hosted the Human Rights Division. According to John Humphrey (1984), UNESCO had "wanted a share" in other activities that were carried out by ECOSOC, such as a conference on "freedom of information" (p. 16). After the UDHR had been adopted, Humphrey collaborated with UNESCO on several human rights-related activities, and he described an incident when he was criticized by his superiors for doing so (pp. 126-127; p. 161).

The contributions received by the *Comité* confirm that the rise of human rights as a common morality was an idea whose time had come (Booth, 1999, p. 54). All the responses favoured the drafting of a universal human rights bill. Also the contributors from Non-Western countries made a point of claiming the universality of the concept of human rights (UNESCO, 1948d). The Chinese respondent, Chung-Shu Lo, a Professor

from West-China University, explained that human rights-related ideas were embedded in Chinese thought since ancient times in "the right of the people to revolt against oppressive rulers." He explained that "the will of the people is...considered the will of heaven," and "a ruler has a duty to heaven to take care of the interests of his people." For Lo, the concept of rights was further contained in the ethical imperative of "the fulfilment of the duty to one's neighbour," and he stressed that the notion of mutual obligations constituted a fundamental aspect of the teaching of Confucianism (Lo, UNESCO 1948d, pp. 185-186). Mahatma Gandhi's response stated that "the very right to live accrues to us only when we do the duty of citizenship of the world" (UNESCO, 1948d, p. 3). Gandhi's response raised three aspects of the concept of human rights: its universality, the relationship between rights and duties, and the responsibility of human beings to take an active part in shaping their societies, which is embedded in the term "citizenship." Another respondent from India, Humayun Kabir from the Department of Education in New Delhi, saw the "fundamental flaw in the western conception of human rights" in its lack of democratization in so far as human rights "often applied only to Europeans and sometimes to only some among the Europeans." This bias should be overcome by following the example of "the theory and practice of democracy set up by early Islam, which did succeed in overcoming the distinction of race and colour to an extent experienced neither before nor since." Kabir very much welcomed a universal declaration of human rights as "there is no room for different standards." But as "there seems no immediate prospect for the setting up of...a world authority," which he considered the "corollary to a world charter of human rights," there should at least be agreement on the "four fundamental human rights" (food and clothing; housing; education; health services), accompanied by a "degree of control and interference permitted to the State for securing them" (Kabir, UNESCO 1948d, pp. 191-197). Another respondent from India, a professor from Hindu University in Benares, stressed the importance of human rights in view of the spiritual nature of human beings and their need for freedom. He was, however, pessimistic and saw "man's freedom...being destroyed by the demands of economic technocracy, political bureaucracy and religious idiosyncracy" (Putambekar, UNESCO 1948d, pp. 199-200). He posited that human freedoms needed to go along with the development of personality – "human freedoms require as counterpart human virtues"

(p. 200) – and referred to the ten essential human freedoms and virtues developed by Manu and Buddha.

In a letter to his brother Aldous Huxley, Julian Huxley indicated that the initial purpose of the project undertaken by the *Comité* was "to see whether there is any possible bridge between developments of the western individualist conception of the Rights of Man, and those of the Russian Marxist or Communist conception" (Huxley, 1947a). However, it proved impossible to get a statement by a Russian intellectual given that the USSR was not a member of UNESCO at the time. Instead, UNESCO hired the Russian Law Professor Boris Tchechko, who contributed an essay on the human rights concept in the 1936 constitution of the USSR. Tchechko's text did not deliver any ammunition to rising East-West tensions. On the contrary, he pointed out that the Soviet Constitution foresaw the provision of free and universal education (Tchechko, in UNESCO, 1948d, pp. 149-175, see also Büttner, 2004, p. 33, and Spring, 2000, p. 11).

The statements compiled by the *Comité* reveal that – at least in the UNESCO context – representatives of all world regions, despite their cultural and ideological differences, claimed a tradition of human rights and humanism. They also expressed the good will of intellectuals to find agreement on common principles that they believed to hold universal validity. It will become clear later that also in relation to the idea of the right to education a level of agreement and a claim to universality prevailed among the delegates of UNESCO, which is quite surprising from today's perspective. However, a tension existed between the universal idea of human rights that transcended the state and their actual enforcement by states. UNESCO provided a platform for the universalist and unifying tendencies in all cultures, which were reinforced by a general trust in the role international organizations could play in the post-war global order.

Dignity, Fulfillment, and International Understanding: Views on the Right to Education

Only one among the 70 contributions received by the *Comité* related directly to education as a human right. It was authored by Isaac Leon Kandel, a Professor at Columbia University's Teachers' College. Kandel represented one of the leading authorities in comparative and international education at the time. As a proponent of the

school of historical functionalism, he believed that education systems could not be examined in isolation, but in the context of a country's historical, cultural and social conditions, and that each country's education system should be tailored to its unique circumstances. Born and raised in England, he travelled frequently to Europe and wrote several books on the education systems of European countries, in particular France, Germany and the United Kingdom (Pollack, 1993, p. 3). His 1933 book *Comparative education* was translated into many languages, and from 1924 to 1944 he edited the *Education Yearbook*, published by Columbia University's International Institute (p. 4). In 1944 he published a book on international cooperation in which he put forward the idea of an international organization for education (p. 6). In his response to the *Comité*, Kandel (UNESCO 1948d, pp. 231-235) stressed that education had often been used as a means of indoctrination and nation-building, while its importance lay in its contribution to freedom. In the past education had rested on the principle of authority "of the printed word or of the teacher" (p. 233). A universal declaration of human rights would require an education that prepared individuals to "appreciate the moral consequences of [their] actions" (p. 233). This was not meant as a "laisser faire programme," but entailed "the intelligent recognition of responsibility and duty" (p. 233). Kandel claimed that the right to education deserved a prominent role in a universal declaration of human rights (p. 232). He further posited that, despite talk of equality of opportunity, the education system remained unjust because limitations due to social classes remained. He pointed to the problem of quality of education, which would not go away by recognizing education as a human right (p. 232). He further contended that education as a human right excluded education for "national or racial separatism and superiority" (p. 233). Education must be committed to the "true concept of humanism" (p. 234). The latter comments could be interpreted as references to Nazi Germany. In his book *The Making of Nazis*, published in 1935, Kandel had warned of the dangers of Nazi education (p. 5).

In 1950, UNESCO published a collection of six essays on the question of human rights, introduced by Julian Huxley. One of these essays, written by Jean Piaget (1950), constituted a substantial theoretical discussion of the meaning of education as a human right. Piaget stressed the social purposes of education. He argued that article 26 on the right to education had "marked the necessary solidarity that unites the fulfilment of the

person and his/her respect for others" (p. 24; my translation). From his perspective as a psychologist, he pointed out that human abilities, such as language skills, and in particular the development of logic and morality (here he referred to Descartes and Rousseau) did not constitute innate competences. The ability to speak a language, to use logical reasoning and to develop moral judgment was not genetically determined, but needed to be transmitted and developed through education. The right to education meant for Piaget the right of human beings to be exposed to conditions that would allow them to develop their full potential. It did not only mean the right to be initiated into cultural and moral traditions, but – more than that – it entailed the recognition that only through education human beings could unfold their abilities. Piaget further argued that the role of the school not only consisted in transmitting knowledge such as reading, writing and numeracy, but also in developing a child's potential and especially not destroying or harming any of the possibilities that resided within the child (pp. 24-30; my translation).

In a similar vein, in his book *Education at the Crossroads* (1943), Maritain had argued for a humanistic approach to education based on the view that the purpose of education consisted in nurturing the intellect that contained human dignity (pp. 6-7; 27-28; see also Watras, 2006). Education should support the development of a person into a human being. Just like Piaget, he maintained that education "is more than helping someone fit into her or his social circumstances. It means that every one must fulfill her or his human potential" (Watras, 1995, p. 203). He claimed the right of everybody even to higher education: "In a social order fitted to the common dignity of man, college education should be given to all" (Maritain, 1943, p. 64).

In the course of UNESCO's inquiry into the theoretical foundations of human rights, UNESCO also asked all its sectors and units to comment on how to integrate the human rights perspective into their work. The response of Dr. Kuo Yu-Shou, the head of the education section, stressed four aspects constituting the right to education: the responsibility of those who were educated to contribute with all of their means to the education of those who were deprived of basic education; the responsibility of all people to "continue to learn" according to their capabilities, from primary education to secondary education to adult education; the responsibility to employ education for the sake of the betterment (in a material, social and moral sense) of the community; the right

of equal opportunity of secondary and higher education; and the right to "continuing education" (UNESCO, 1947b; my translation).

At the seventh plenary meeting of the fourth session of the General Conference in 1949 the delegates discussed the "duties of the State in regard to education, science and culture for the purpose of ensuring a better understanding between peoples." In most of their statements, the delegates defined the right to education as a means to achieve the unity of "humanity" and foster a better understanding of the people as a condition for peace in a globalizing world. The head of the French delegation, Georges Bidault, considered it UNESCO's task and the duty of the state "to give every man living his chance to help make humanity more conscious of its unity" (UNESCO, 1949a, p. 118). Delegates paid little attention to the practicalities of education as a human right. Suggestions regarding its implementation often concerned instruments for teaching international understanding and the principles of the United Nations and UNESCO across the world (see, e.g., UNESCO, 1949a, p. 124; see also Asher, 1950, p. 15) or the necessity of a curriculum that taught students how to "think internationally" (Piaget, UNESCO, 1949a, p. 132). The United Kingdom submitted a contribution stressing the need for international exchanges of professors, students and school children and a radically reformed teaching of history "without national bias" (4C/2 United Kingdom, 28 September 1949, in UNESCO, 1949a, p. 1). Pointing to the prominence of the stars and stripes in American schools, the United Kingdom recommended that national flags and national anthems should be replaced by a "new international flag and a new international anthem" (p. 5). In a similar vein, the Chinese delegation submitted to the first session of the General Conference a proposal for a "Unesco song to be sung in schools, colleges or on other social and cultural meeting grounds as an artistic embodiment of a feeling for Unesco which we hope will grow with time" (UNESCO, 1946). At its 5th session, the General Conference adopted a resolution authorizing the Director-General to consider setting up a committee to prepare a Charter of the obligations of states with regard to economic, social and cultural rights. Significantly, all of the nine articles presented in the preliminary draft Charter, which was drafted by the Norwegian Commission for UNESCO, spoke about education in relation to understanding other cultures and the rights of minorities. The first article read: "Every State shall ensure that educational

establishments, school textbooks, the press and broadcasting services throughout its territory adopt an attitude of tolerance and respect towards other States or peoples" (UNESCO, 1951a). Even if nationalism was still going strong, the cosmopolitan aspirations towards a new transnational, universal identity and culture across nations as diverse as China and the United Kingdom and the strong focus on international understanding point to a crisis of nationalism after World War II.

The universalist tendencies were supported by the belief in a common human nature, "a nucleus…common to all humanity" (Buschbeck, UNESCO, 1949a, p. 149), which underpinned the many references to a human potential that needed to be fulfilled through education. Niebuhr appealed to "the essential humanity which requires fellowship with their brothers" (p. 121). This essentialist conception of the human being goes back to Aristotle's metaphysics, which entailed that human beings have an essence and a purpose that they needed to understand in order to live ethically: The "gap between basic (potential) humanness and its full realization…exerts a claim on society and government" (Nussbaum, 1992, p. 228). As Nussbaum has explained, the idea is that human beings can rise to a higher humanity if their human capabilities are nourished:

> When their basic capabilities are deprived of the nourishment that would
> transform them into…higher-level capabilities…, they are fruitless, cut
> off, in some way but a shadow of themselves. They are like actors who
> never get to go on the stage or a musical score that is never performed.
> (p. 228)

For UNESCO's founders education held an "intrinsic" value because they considered education essential to the nature of human beings. This view points to an Aristotelian approach in the sense of "bringing every person across the threshhold" (p. 231), as represented by Maritain who in *Education at the Crossroads* (1943) argued that education and knowledge must not be instruments for other purposes (Watras, 1995). In Maritain's view, American education was at a crossroads and, rather than taking the path of pragmatism, which reduced human beings to empirically observable and measurable objects, it should choose "integral humanism," a philosophy based on Maritain's Aristotelian and Thomist traditions, which he had himself developed in a book by that name (Watras, 1995, p. 204; Gutek, 2005, p. 251). Maritain (1943) alerted to "the danger

of an education which would aim, not at making man truly human, but making him merely into an organ of a technocratic society" (p. 113). Maritain's statement clearly represented an attack on John Dewey. He acknowledged that "a great thinker like Professor John Dewey is able to maintain an ideal image of all those things which are dear to the heart of free men" (p. 115). However, he was worried about the consequences of an approach to education that focused on "sensory experience" (p. 115) and did not aspire to finding the "truth." Maritain criticized "erroneous philosophies…teaching us that truth is an outworn notion and must be replaced by…a process of thought expressed in doings, a moment of happy adaptation between our mental activities and the practical sanctions" (p. 115). In his view "the historical impact of this philosophy…will naturally lead to a stony positivist or technocratic denial of the objective value of any spiritual need" (p. 115). Notwithstanding Maritain's critical attitude, Dewey's educational thinking showed significant compatibility with UNESCO's philosophy, as Wain (1987, chapter 6) has shown.

Although he did not directly refer to Kant, Maritain's reasoning evoked Kant's categoric imperative, which implied that human beings should not be treated as mere instruments and that they should not be regarded as means to another end, but always as an end in themselves (Kant, 1785/2005, p. 28; see also Habermas, 2012, pp. 64; 72):

> In the realm of ends everything has either a price or an intrinsic value.
> Anything with a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent,
> whereas anything that is above all price and therefore admits of no
> equivalent has intrinsic value. (Kant, 1785/2005, p. 33)

In the German original Kant used the word "Würde" (dignity), which is often translated by "intrinsic value" because Kant specifically equated those two concepts: "intrinsic value, which I have called dignity" (p. 33). Kant found it "delightful to imagine that human nature can be increasingly enhanced through education and that education can be shaped in a manner which is appropriate to mankind" (Kanz, 1993, p. 12). He therefore claimed that educational planning must follow a "cosmopolitan" spirit with a commitment to all that is "best in the world" (p. 15). The purpose of education is not only to make human beings "fit in with the world as it is today, however bad it may be" (Kant, cited in Kanz, 1993, p. 5), but to serve the betterment of the world.

The views expressed in UNESCO on the right to education were certainly influenced by the Enlightenment's concept of the intrinsic value/dignity of the human being. Kant posited that "all of a creature's natural predispositions are destined eventually to develop fully and in accordance with their purpose" (1795/2006, p. 4). UNESCO's view of education was also very much inspired by another Enlightenment philosopher, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who believed that human beings were fundamentally good by nature (Sternhell, 1996, p. 21). Significantly, Piaget's essay on education as a human right and Kandel's contribution in the collection assembled by the *Comité* referred to Rousseau. The idea of the "full development of the human personality" that we see so often cited in UNESCO's debates and educational documents still today, was further influenced by the Catholic movement, as represented by Maritain.

Several issues raised in the contributions and debates on the right to education stand out: The critique of the traditional school system, built on an authoritarian teacher-student relationship; the risk of education being used for indoctrination and the reproduction of social class and racial hierarchies; the insistence on the "intrinsic" value of education, the purpose of which was not only to socialize human beings in order to make them "fit in," but rather to bring out their full potential and make them "fully human"; the connection between the right to education and the responsibility to participate in society; the idea that education contributed to forming a person who could take responsibility for her actions; the role of education for international understanding, transcending nationalism, furthering the ideals of a global community and contributing to the betterment of the world. Kuo's point that every human being had the responsibility to learn according to his or her abilities; and at the same time should have the right to "continuing education," already pointed quite clearly to the concept of lifelong learning.

Article 26: The Right to Education

The right to education was included as "education for all" in the 1945 UNESCO constitution and later proclaimed in article 26 of the UDHR, drafted by the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations and adopted in 1948 (Glendon, 2001; Normand & Zaidi, 2008, chapter 6). Article 26 was part of the so-called "social, economic and cultural rights." These rights, which included the right to work and the right to education,

constituted the "second generation" of rights after the civil and political rights, such as the right to life, freedom of religion and freedom of speech, which had already played a role in the French and American revolutions and were better established and recognized by states. Morsink (2000) pointed out that in the debates on the UDHR, "a distinction [was] often drawn between the 'old' eighteenth-century civil and political rights and the 'new' nineteenth-century social, economic, and cultural ones" (p. 191). The former were "negative" rights in so far as they protected the individual from state assaults on liberty, demanding of the state nothing more than non-interference into the affairs of their citizens, very much in line with liberal traditions. In contrast, the social, economic and cultural rights were "positive" rights as they demanded of the state the provision of services and goods, such as health care, social security and education, involving costs and efforts on the side of the state.[20]

Because of the contested nature of the social, economic and cultural rights, they were given a special introduction into the UDHR in the form of Article 22 (Morsink, 2000, Chapter 6). Article 22 established that the economic, social and cultural rights were "indispensable for [everyone's] dignity and the free development of his personality." In order to accommodate the reservations against these rights, Article 22 stated that their realization depended on the resources of each state. The majority of the delegates regarded the social rights as a necessary condition for the implementation of "everyone's right to the free and full development of his or her personality" (Morsink, 2000, p. 191) and as a precondition of political rights – "freedom of speech" did not mean much to a person who suffered from hunger. Third World – in particular Latin American – delegates argued for economic, social and cultural rights, and in principle also the Soviets favoured the inclusion of these rights. However, the United States and some other Western countries had reservations. Eleanor Roosevelt made clear that these rights "did not come within her government's understanding of human rights" (Iriye, 2002, p. 92), but that the United States were "willing to view economic and social rights as a matter of

---

[20] Later, a "third generation of rights" was claimed in the context of the debates over the Right to Development (Vasak, 1977; Donnelly, 1993). "Third generations rights" were "solidarity rights" (Donnelly, 1993, p. 29), not the rights of individuals but of collectivities, such as indigenous peoples. Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002, p. 50) has criticized the "failure [of the Western conception of human rights] to accept the collective rights of social groups or peoples."

'aspirations'" (p. 92). In principle, there was widespread consensus that the right to education needed to be included in a Bill of Rights. Many countries, such as France, Brazil, the Soviet Union and China, already acknowledged the right to education in their constitutions (Mitoma, 2015).[21] But while the formulation "everyone has the right to education" was never contested throughout the drafting process, the United States and others opposed the idea of the "duty of the State" to provide the right to education, and this formulation was removed from an earlier draft (UNESCO, 2000, p. 95). Article 26 is one of only six articles out of the thirty-one contained in the UDHR that were not adopted unanimously (UNESCO, 2000, p. 97).[22] Another highly contested article was article 23 concerning the right to work. According to Morsink (2000, chapter 5), it was shaped largely by the Latin American countries with support by the Communist bloc. The United States was the only country to vote against it. Explaining the negative vote on behalf of her country, Eleanor Roosevelt maintained that "to assess a worker's wages by his needs rather than by the work he performed [was] a false principle" (Glendon, 2001, p. 160).[23] The conflicts over the social and economic rights highlight the gulf between states with strong liberal roots and those with socialist traditions. It is worthwhile noting that many of the rights spelled out in article 23, such as the right to work, the right to free employment and equal pay, just and favorable remuneration, and the right to join trade unions, must be considered unrealized today. In some of these domains, for example trade unions, the realization of these rights has developed backwards in many countries.

While the United States and their Western allies went along with the drafting of the UDHR, they opposed a binding covenant of economic, cultural and social rights,

---

[21] John Humphrey had conducted a survey of the right to education in the constitutions of states. He found forty-two constitutions that referenced this right, thirty-seven of which explicitly proclaimed primary education as both free and compulsory (Morsink, 2000, p. 365, note 16; see also p. 213).

[22] The final version of Article 26 was adopted with fifty-three votes in favour, none against, and three abstentions.

[23] Article 23 reads: "1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, and to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment; 2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work; 3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection; 4) Everyone has the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests" (United Nations, n.d.).

which developing countries favoured. The United States was particularly eager to prevent including Articles 22-27 of the UDHR, covering the right to social security; the right to work; the right to rest and leisure; the right to a standard of living; the right to education; and the right to participate in the cultural life of the community. A separation of the two "types" of human rights seemed the only way to push the agenda forward, but it "prevented [the human rights bill] from fulfilling its revolutionary potential" (Normand & Zaidi, 2008, p. 24). De facto, the hierarchy between the political and social rights persisted: The *Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* was equipped with a monitoring body, the Human Rights Committee, while the *Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* was not. Only in 1986, was the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural rights even established, and that body possesses only very limited authority. As of today, the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* has 160 parties. To this date the United States has signed, but not ratified the document (United Nations Treaty Collection, 2015). The *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* has 167 parties (United Nations Treaty Collection, 2015). China has not signed either of the covenants. A third component of the bill of rights, a document regulating measures of enforcement, to which the Soviet Union and the United States were strongly opposed against the majority of the other delegations on the Human Rights Commission (Normand & Zaidi, 2008, pp. 169-171), was never completed, leaving the human rights bill with very little legal power.

    Article 26 of the UDHR on the right to education reads as follows:

    (1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

    (2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall

further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of
peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall
be given to their children. (United Nations, n.d.)

While some accounts of the drafting process of the UDHR (such as Humphrey, 1984; Johnson & Symonides, 1994) subsume the right to education under the social and economic rights, Glendon (2001), and especially Morsink (2000) and UNESCO (2000)[24] have documented the drafting of Article 26 in some detail. In her book about the process of drafting the UDHR, Glendon (2001) argued that Article 26 represented "one of the few articles in the declaration directly influenced by the European holocaust" (p. 189) insofar as paragraphs 2 and 3 regarding the role of education for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the right of parents to choose the education for their children were meant to prevent the subordination of education to totalitarian governments as a means of indoctrinating children (p. 159). The first paragraph of Article 26 reflected the consensus of the Human Rights Commission on the importance of education for "freedom, justice, and peace in the world" (Glendon, 2001, p. 189). The main part of the second paragraph was added at a later meeting at the initiative of the representative of the World Jewish Congress, A. L. Easterman. He noted that the first paragraph "provided a technical framework," but "contained nothing about the spirit governing education," and he pointed out that "the neglect of this principle in Germany had been the main cause of two catastrophic wars" (Morsink, 2000, p. 215; Glendon, 2001, p. 189). When at one point the Commission discussed the deletion of that paragraph, the UNESCO representative Pierre Lebar insisted that "after a war in which most fundamental human rights had been trodden in the dust, UNESCO felt it extremely important to proclaim those rights firmly and clearly in a document of solemn significance as the International Declaration of Human Rights" (Morsink, 2000, p. 216). Referring to the example of Nazi Germany, he found it "absolutely necessary…to make clear that education to which everyone was entitled should strengthen respect of the rights set forth in the Declaration and combat the spirit of intolerance" (p. 216). Mr Bienenfeld, the representative of the World Jewish

---

[24] I would like to acknowledge the author of this document, the late John Smyth, although his name is not indicated in the publication.

Congress during that session, appealed to the Commission not to remove that article, arguing along the same lines as Mr Lebar that the claim for the provision of education alone was not sufficient, but that it was of fundamental importance to "define the spirit in which future generations were to be educated" (p. 216). The delegates added the third paragraph relating to parental rights to choose the education of their children to the original draft of Article 26 after the Dutch delegate, Mr Beaufort, reminded his fellow committee members how German schools had undermined the role of the parents by indoctrinating children with Nazi ideology (p. 159). They further considered the paragraph on parental choice necessary to complement the first paragraph on "compulsory" education (p. 90).

Many delegates were critical of the idea of "compulsory" education. Karim Azkoul from Lebanon pointed out that "the concept of compulsion was in contradiction with the statement of a right" (p. 99), and the representative of India, Ms Hansa Mehta, concurred with his opinion. Geoffrey Wilson from the United Kingdom apprehended that "compulsory" could be interpreted as "state education." Others raised the question whether it was realistic to make fundamental education compulsory. The Turkish representative, Adnan Kural, argued that "all education should be free…or it could not be said…that there should be equal access on the basis of merit" (Morsink, 2000, p. 213). But Kural did not succeed in convincing the majority of the delegates, and in the final document the word "compulsory" was linked to "elementary education."

Particularly important from the UNESCO point of view were the debates about the kind of education the UDHR was referring to: education for children or for adults. When the drafters debated the use of "primary" or "fundamental" education, the UNESCO observer Jacques Havet strongly favoured the term "fundamental" because it "contained the more recent and much broader concept of adult education and represented great progress in the thinking of educators over the past several decades" (UNESCO, 2000, p. 98). Havet mentioned that "UNESCO was working on a programme of fundamental education by which was meant the equal right of all to a minimum standard of education." Ms Mehta supported the term "fundamental" because it "conveyed more clearly than 'elementary' the conception of basic education which was the right of everyone" (p. 98). Mr Chang from China equally favoured the word "fundamental" in the

document on the grounds that "that new and modern concept was particularly well adapted to countries where adult education became imperative for those persons who had not enjoyed the opportunities of grade-school instruction" (p. 98). Eleanor Roosevelt, when wrapping up the debate, explained that some of the delegates favoured "fundamental" as the broader term, encompassing "education for adults as well as for children and adolescents" (p. 98). Mr Pavlov of the USSR doubted whether it was realistic to claim free fundamental education "at the present time in view of existing cultural conditions" (p. 98). In the end both terms, "elementary" and "fundamental," made their way into the document, and they were complemented by a third term, "technical and professional education." Both these terms reflected an awareness of the importance of education that went beyond the school stage.

The deliberations at the Human Rights Commission resonate many of the issues and concepts encountered in the UNESCO debates, and they come out the clearest in the second paragraph of Article 26, which reflected education for "individualization" and "universalization." That paragraph heralded education for the purpose of the "full development of the human personality," and at the same time touted the importance of education for international understanding and the maintenance of peace among the nations of the world: the "right to full development of the personality" was a key idea of the UDHR, and it was stated three times in the document, in Article 22, which introduced the economic, social and cultural rights, in Article 26, and in Article 29. The drafters considered this right one of the most fundamental (Morsink, 2000, p. 212), and most of the rights that followed Article 22, including Article 26 on education, aimed at the realization of that right. The right to education represented a rather new and contested idea after the Second World War, but the Latin American and other developing countries pushed for it, and it fit into the spirit of the time with its rejection of the history of education for indoctrination. In the discussions about the importance of the "spirit governing education" beyond the "technical framework" the debates of the drafters of the UDHR addressed the technical/intellectual binary, which played an important role in the founding of UNESCO. They stressed the role of education for peace and for a better society. They discussed different forms of education, "elementary" and "fundamental," which included the education of adults, an issue some of the delegates were concerned

about, as well as "professional" education, and higher education that "shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit." The drafters clearly supported a democratization of education to the benefit of groups who had been excluded from education until then – people who had not had the opportunity to go to school ("free elementary education;" "fundamental" education), who had no access to the education they required to make a living ("professional" education), and who could not afford higher education. The contributions made by UNESCO representatives to the discussions of the Human Rights Commission point to the organization's broader concept of education, which emphasized adult education and education beyond schooling.

Adult Education as Priority

UNESCO's early approach to education was only loosely coupled to Article 26 of the UDHR. Adult education, a concept unmentioned in the UDHR – albeit somewhat included in the concept of "fundamental" education – constituted one of UNESCO's educational priorities from the very beginning. At UNESCO's founding conference in London in 1945, the American delegation submitted a resolution encouraging UNESCO's engagement with adult education because of its "immediate contribution to the enlightenment of the citizens of the world" (ECO/Conf./15, 1945). The fifth session of the General Conference, held in 1950 in Florence, stated: "Unesco cannot afford to neglect any sphere of education, but it must…pay special attention to fundamental and adult education..." (UNESCO, 1950b, p. 17).

When in 1949 UNESCO held its First International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA I) in Elsinore, Denmark, UNESCO's second Director-General, Jaime Torres Bodet, opened the conference by declaring adult education "one of the most important questions of our day and one likely to have the most far-reaching consequences" (UNESCO, 1949b, p. 7). In his speech, titled "Education for responsibility," he invoked how the Fascist regimes had exploited the workers' leisure time for propaganda and manipulation. In contrast to this past, he stated his conviction that "to educate is to liberate" (p. 7). In reference to the location of the gathering – Elsinore is the site of the royal castle in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* – Bodet cited Hamlet's "to be or not to be" several times, and he addressed the challenges of the "human condition," such as "freedom" and the "loneliness" of the adult. Bodet called for "education for

responsibility," as "there is no better remedy for the terror of solitude than the principle of the universal responsibility of man on earth." He referred to this universal responsibility as a concept of humanism:

> When I say humanism, I am not using the word in the narrow sense which has been given to it by the most uncompromising individualists, but in the far wider, philosophical and philological, sense which comes from its derivation; I am using it with reference to the reconciliation of man and humanity. (UNESCO, 1949b, p. 7)

In line with these notions of unity, in the founding years of UNESCO adult educators often used the concept of "solidarity" (UNESCO, 1949c, p. 8), and they commonly referred to themselves as a "brotherhood" (Jessup, 1953, pp. 65; 68-69; Novrup, 1953, p. 20). The appeal to a sense of community in the face of the adult's "loneliness" reflected the spirit of the war and post-war years when traditional forms of identity, such as nationalism, had been shattered. It was a time of a severe crisis of humanity in which a sense of failure and a strong sense of vulnerability prevailed, as captured by the existentialist literature and philosophy that emerged during that period, such as Albert Camus' *The Plague*, and Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*. Another speaker at Elsinore, Hartvig Frisch, the Danish Minister of Education, referred to Kierkegaard, who is regarded the precursor of existentialist philosophy. Existentialism reflected the crisis of meaning during those years marked by two devastating wars. It conveyed the message that a human life was per se meaningless accept for the meaning human beings brought to it through their actions, for which they must take responsibility. Many found a meaning in a political or social cause, in movements that fought against oppression such as the *Résistance*, or for the rights of underprivileged groups such as the workers.

At Elsinore, the delegates stressed the role of adult education in terms of international understanding, brotherhood and peace, individual development and social justice. They endorsed the UDHR (UNESCO, 1949c, p. 30), and they defined adult education as "more than anything a spiritual condition, a thirst for knowledge, a desire for mental and social freedom, an urge to participate in cultural development" (UNESCO,

1949b, p. 7). The final report of the conference presented the aims of adult education as follows:

- gaps between the so-called masses and the so-called cultured people may be closed;
- to foster the true spirit of democracy and the true spirit of humanity;
- to awaken and stimulate in youth an awareness of life itself. (UNESCO, 1949c, p. 8/9)

Adult education also became one of the pillars of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE), which John Thompson had contributed to establishing in Hamburg, Germany, in 1950/51. UNESCO founded the institute originally to contribute to social renewal in post-war Germany and Europe through education. Later, it became instrumental in conceptualizing lifelong learning, and in 2007, it was renamed the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL) (for a history of the UIE/UIL, see Elfert, 2013). The first two international seminars held by UIE, on adult education in 1952 and on early childhood education in 1953, reflected the influence of the board members Johannes Novrup, one of the leading figures of the Danish adult education movement and Chairperson of CONFINTEA I, and Maria Montessori, the early childhood education pioneer. Montessori had been an active member of the New Education Fellowship, a movement of progressive pedagogues from North America and Europe which opposed traditional educational methods and forms of schooling (Brehony, 2004). The New Education movement, which was strongly influenced by Rousseau's educational ideas, promoted a cosmopolitan view of education for international understanding and peace and emphasized the purpose of education in terms of the development of human potential and social change (Boyd & Rawson, 1965).[25]UIE's governing board considered adult education and early childhood education as "related to each other in so far as the adult

---

[25] The IBE, the oldest UNESCO education institute, founded in 1925 in Geneva, emerged from the Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau at the initiative of the New Education movement. It was created as a private initiative and became the first intergovernmental organization in the field of education, with strong links to the League of Nations (Fernig, 1993; UNESCO, 1997, pp. 56-57). The institute hosted the International Conference on Education (ICE) since 1934; since 1946 this conference was convened in cooperation with UNESCO. In 1969, the institute was officially affiliated with UNESCO.

education of the parent is an important factor in preschool education" (UNESCO Institute for Education, 1953, p. 3). Maria Montessori introduced a notion of lifelong learning in her speech before the first meeting of UIE's governing board in 1951:

> If the Institute is justified in existing, then it is only in pioneering a
> new path for education, that is to say one for education as a support to
> the inner life of man…the school should not be the objective of this
> Institute but people, the whole person, and this person begins at birth.
> (Montessori, 1951, pp. 33-34)

Another board member, the German educator Friedrich Schneider, anticipated lifelong learning when he suggested that the institute should be concerned with all age groups and that boundaries between the different fields of education should be avoided altogether (UNESCO Institute for Education, 1951). Significantly, the title of the first international seminar organized by UIE in 1952 was "Adult education for social and political responsibility," a title which recalled Bodet's speech at Elsinore. In his opening address, UIE's Chairperson Johannes Novrup pointed to the difference between adult education and traditional forms of education:

> The roots of adult education are very different from the roots of
> elementary and secondary education. Whereas the latter are intimately
> connected with a thousand years of authoritarianism in church and
> politics, adult education is a genuine child of democracy, or perhaps I
> should say…of democracy and Christian humanism. From its very
> start it was a revolt against both church and political dogmatism and
> authoritarianism, and against a pattern of culture, according to which
> human beings necessarily were divided up into cultured people and
> uncultured…(Novrup, 1953, p. 15; for more information about
> Novrup, see Skovmand, 1962)

Novrup (1953) emphasized the importance of adult education in an age "of technology, of leisure, of the masses" (p. 17), aiming at "creative, unfolding of slumbering activities, unfolding of themselves, and of their personalities" (p. 17). He viewed adult education as a "radical, almost revolutionary educational idea," in so far as "adult education is a type of non-vocational education….for those who are going to

remain what and where they are" (p. 17), providing adults with "new forms of life" (p. 18). It is astounding to what extent the meanings that educators attached to adult education in those early years after the Second World War differ from the present time. While for Novrup adult education was a "non-vocational education," today adult education in the global discourse and in most country policies around the world has been reduced exclusively to vocational education (Elfert & Rubenson, 2013). Novrup might have represented a particular Scandinavian tradition of popular education, but the UNESCO debates and documents reflect a broader emphasis on adult education at the time. Chapter four of this study will show that the adult was also at the centre of the French popular education movement. Adult education was considered a response to the vast educational needs of returning soldiers and other adults who had been deprived of education during the war and who were needed to rebuild the economies and societies after World War II. It was also necessary to "re-educate" the youth that had been indoctrinated by totalitarian governments (UNESCO, 1947c, p. 6). Another important characteristic of adult education was its strong link to democracy. Novrup addressed the concept of "responsibility," highlighted also by Kandel and Bodet, in terms of the responsibility of adults as citizens to engage with "social and political affairs" in the democratic political system (p. 18). In that respect, adult education, as stated by Novrup, was very much a child of democracy (Elfert & Bochynek, 2002). Education – and adult education – had an important role to play in forming the "whole person" (a concept that will come back in chapter five in the notion of the "complete man"): a person who had developed every facet of her potential and who was empowered to resist oppressive and totalitarian governments and take an active role as a citizen in a transformed and democratic society. Such a person could find meaning and purpose by assuming responsibilities for her community and society.

Fundamental Education

"Fundamental education" was UNESCO's first educational flagship program. As Huxley formulated in imperialist language, it constituted the organization's first attempt to "enlighten" the 1,000 million illiterate people who lived in "the 'dark zones' of the world" (Huxley, 1946, p. 29). Alfred Zimmern laid the ground for a program with a

strong focus on literacy in his speech before the Preparatory Commission for UNESCO (UNESCO, 1947c, p. 9). As Jones and Coleman (2005) put it, literacy's "political appeal was irresistible: 'the struggle against literacy' was a powerful expression of the organisation's general ideals and purposes, capturing both the symbolic and functional character of UNESCO" (p. 57). The most conflictual issue in setting up the program concerned its designation. The Anglo-Saxons favoured the term "mass education," which the British had used in their colonies. The French opposed the term as too egalitarian and evoking "unpleasing connotations of educational methods which pay insufficient attention to individual differences" (UNESCO, 1947c, p. 5). They preferred "popular culture" (Jones, 1988, p. 49), the term with which the French have traditionally denoted the democratization of education. I wonder whether the real stakes behind that "battle for words" (p. 49) had to do with the larger oppositions between the Anglo-Saxon and French approach to culture (Mathy, 1995, p. 345). The French aversion to the term "mass education" could derive from their long-standing elitist and top-down approach to education and to growing apprehension of Americanization and hegemony of American culture in France, while in the American imagination the French "elitist views [were considered] incompatible with American pop culture" (p. 345). The Blum-Byrnes Accords of May 1946 granted reduction of French debts and new American credits for reconstruction on the condition that France opened their markets to U.S. cultural products, in particular American movies. As a consequence, "the years 1950–6 witnessed successive waves of French public protest against American economic and cultural imperialism" (Thomas, 2007, p. 218).

Kuo Yu-Shou, the first director of UNESCO's education program, proposed the term "fundamental education" or "éducation de base" as a compromise. He argued:

> One might speak [...] of 'illiteracy,' 'mass education,' 'basic
> education,' or 'popular education.' One should, however, think not
> only of an attempt to liquidate adult illiteracy, but also of the problem
> of providing elementary education for all the young people of all the
> world [...]. The phrase 'fundamental education' at least has the merit of
> indicating an 'education on to which more could be built.' (UNESCO,
> 1947c, p. 5)

Although the program was meant to reflect a mass education approach, in line with UNESCO's constitutional claim "education for all," "fundamental education" also denoted "a field of activity which would include and go beyond mass education, adult literacy campaigns, popular education, and the provision of primary education" (UNESCO, 1949d, p. 12). A Commission on Fundamental Education was set up, which produced a programmatic document (UNESCO, 1947c). Some of its members, such as Margaret Mead and Thomas Jesse Jones, had been involved in the New Education movement (Watras, 2007, p. 64). Frank Laubach, the literacy pioneer, and Isaac Kandel, the Professor from Columbia University who had contributed a paper about the right to education to the *Comité*, were also members of the Commission,[26] which was chaired by Kuo Yu-Shou.

Fundamental education was in line with the new emphasis on education as a right, as represented by article 26 of the UDHR. It was concerned with the "full development of the human personality" and, although it focused on literacy and basic skills for adults who had missed out on formal schooling, it also encompassed "the extension and improvement of primary schooling" (Bowers, 1948, p. 4). UNESCO was interested in fundamental education for several reasons: First, it needed a flagship program that would legitimize the organization; second, the program fit into the overall aspirations towards a transformation of society, which required educated and "enlightened" citizens who could serve the well-being of their communities; third, "ignorance" was seen as an obstacle to fulfilling UNESCO's mandate, which emphasized a "unity of thought" and the belief in scientific, technical and economic progress, democracy and international understanding (UNESCO, 1949d, p. 14). As Huxley (1946) argued:

> For one thing it will be impossible for humanity to acquire a common
> outlook if large sections of it are the illiterate inhabitants of a mental
> world entirely different from that in which a fully educated man can
> have his being, a world of superstition and petty tribalism in place of
> one of scientific advance and possible unity…Further, a satisfactory
> common scale of values can obviously not be attained so long as large

---

[26] Kandel continued to work as a consultant for UNESCO and for the United Nations Human Rights Division until 1962 (Pollack, 1993, p. 6).

sections of mankind are preoccupied with the bare material and physiological needs of food, shelter, and health…science will not achieve its optimum rate of advance, either in research or in its application, until its light is more evenly shed over the dark surface of the world's ignorance… (p. 17)

As this statement reveals, Huxley perceived fundamental education as a sort of imperialist crusade against ignorance, in which Western education would bring a scientific worldview to those who lived in "ignorance" and "darkness." He appointed John Bowers, a former military officer, as head of the Fundamental Education Division. Bowers tended to use military terms, such as the "attack" or "assault" on ignorance and poverty (Jones, 1988, pp. 52-53). Their deficiency approach, which dismissed indigenous cultures as "superstition" and "petty tribalism," contradicted the core principle of fundamental education that education should serve the needs of the community and therefore rest on traditional cultures. As Watras (2007) noted, the introduction of a scientific way of thinking was a "tragic flaw" (p. 71) of the program as it led to the weakening of the traditional character of societies.

Literacy campaigns constituted an important pillar of fundamental education (UNESCO, 1949d, pp. 33-37). The concern for literacy reflected the aspiration of many involved in the founding and early years of UNESCO that the organization should contribute to "equalisation" (Huxley cited in Jones, 1988, p. 33), democratize education and promote "popular education" (Constitution, UNESCO, 2004, article I, 1a). Huxley (1946) considered literacy the main precondition for development and one of UNESCO's most urgent tasks (p. 29). Bodet, who was Minister of Education in Mexico before he took office as UNESCO's Director-General, had been in charge of a mass literacy campaign in his country, and he strongly believed that education formed the heart of any development effort, and that literacy constituted a right that needed to be provided by governments (Jones, 1988, p. 39). But "fundamental education" offered a more comprehensive approach than a mere illiteracy campaign, as it was "linked with the general system of education…with general social education, notably in relation to health, agriculture, and citizenship" (UNESCO, 1947c, p. 14). "Civic and political education" constituted a key element of the program (UNESCO, 1949d, p. 20), and it emphasized

"the development of the intelligence of the individual and not merely on his economic betterment" (UNESCO, 1949e, p. 21). Fundamental education aimed at fighting poverty through educational measures "in a wider program of community education for better living" (Bowers, 1948, p. 4), based on "the needs and resources of the local community" (Records of the Third Session of the General Conference, cited in Jones, 1988, p. 55), and by providing the "knowledge and values needed for full participation in society" (UNESCO, 2000, p. 27).

Until 1950, the program consisted of experimental projects, run in cooperation between UNESCO and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the World Health Organization (WHO). A fundamental education pilot project in Haiti started with great enthusiasm in 1948, but had to be given up in 1953, due to continuous bureaucratic, logistical and political problems, including the resistance of local people and authorities to the project (Watras, 2010; Jones, 1988, pp. 65-71). In 1951, the General Conference decided to launch a twelve-year program that involved the establishment of six training centres in Latin America, Africa, Arab states and Asia (UNESCO, 1951b, p. 6). The project planners had foreseen that in twenty-one months, the centres would train 5,000 "fundamental education specialists" (p. 6), who on their part would set up a network of national and local centres with the purpose of training teachers (p. 6). Apart from the training, the regional centres would be in charge of research, production of educational materials and support to education activities. The program testified to an imperturbable faith in education and in the effects of modern technology. Each regional centre was to be "equipped with a complete production crew to turn out films and other visual materials" or "staffed for radio work, with an experimental recording studio included in its equipment" (p. 6). Although the project foresaw that the communities would be the drivers of the project, it relied on the dissemination of specialized knowledge to developing countries, such as library systems (Watras, 2010, pp. 227; 229). The plans to employ audiovisual materials in order to communicate with illiterate populations were doomed to fail not only because of technical and logistical problems, but because the films that were produced used images and messages that were meaningless to the targetted populations, such as films produced

for indigenous villagers in Spanish, a language they could not understand (Watras, 2010, p. 231).

The first regional centre was established in 1951 in Pátzcuaro, Mexico, with funds from UNESCO, the Government of Mexico and the Organization of American States. This centre – the Regional Centre for Fundamental Education in Latin America (CREFAL) – still today functions as a regional clearing house for adult education. The cost of the training centre network was estimated at more than US$20 million (UNESCO, 1951b, p. 6), an amount that would have had to be obtained from extra-budgetary sources. Initially UNESCO officials were highly optimistic that these funds could be raised (Bowers, 1948, p. 4), but it proved to be impossible, as member states did not share UNESCO's enthusiasm for the project (Watras, 2010, p. 227). Many countries, such as the United States, India, New Zealand and France did not contribute to the project at all as they considered it "over-ambitious and costly" (p. 228). The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (today known as the World Bank) did not fund educational projects at the time (Dorn & Ghodsee, 2012, p. 373). Eleven years after the inauguration of the first centre in Mexico, only one more centre had been opened, the Arab States Fundamental Education Centre (ASFEC) in Egypt. In the years 1955 and 1956, the costs for ASFEC and CREFAL amounted to more than half of the fundamental education budget and about one fifth of the total education budget of $3,442,351 (Jones, 1988, p. 95). Jones (1988, pp. 81-84) described the centres' activities, which consisted mainly of training educational personnel, as the most successful element of the fundamental education initiative. However, the centres trained only 600 instead of the foreseen 3500 people.

Clarence Beeby, Assistant Director-General at the time, expressed his disappointment about UNESCO's limitations as an "operating agency" (Beeby, 1997, p. 257) and favoured a role for UNESCO as an "'active clearing house' for ideas and practices in education" (p. 259). When the delegates of the fourth and the fifth sessions of the General Conference discussed the need for UNESCO to develop a more focused program and decided to launch the "Major Projects," one each in the fields of education, science and culture, the Major Project for education, which ran from 1957 to 1966, promoted the extension of primary education in Latin America. This was in line with

Beeby's prioritization of compulsory schooling (Beeby, 1997, p. 259; Mundy, 1999, p. 33). According to Jones and Coleman (2005), developing countries themselves aspired to "build up formal systems of education along western lines" (p. 59). However, one could argue that they also faced a high level of international pressure to do so. I will return to this aspect below.

I concur with Jones' (1988, pp. 90-92) interpretation that the demise of the fundamental education program cannot be solely ascribed to its flaws or financial challenges. Jones' research showed that the program got entangled in power struggles between the United Nations and UNESCO. The United Nations Bureau of Social Affairs was looking for a new field of activity in the developing world after its post-war reconstruction work was phasing out in the early 1950s. The Bureau was the driving force behind a new approach to "community development" as a new paradigm of development assistance, which entailed promoting the provision of "technical and social services" (UNESCO, 1956, p. 7), in which education was only one aspect among others, such as infrastructure improvements. In the course of the multilateral negotiations on this approach, the opinion prevailed that fundamental education was "not coincident with community development" (UN report cited in Jones, 1988, p. 92). On top of this, the UN Bureau of Social Affairs claimed for itself the coordinating role for development activities in the UN system and assigned a minor role to UNESCO, limiting it to specific technical services.[27] UNESCO's fundamental education staff, when called to a meeting about the changes this new direction entailed for them, expressed their view that these services did not exist in most communities, and that fundamental education had to be the "'spearhead' of social and economic development…a single service initiating development by wholly educational means" (UNESCO, 1956, p. 8). Clinging to the idealistic worldview anchored in its constitution ("it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed"), the report of the meeting justified fundamental education as a way of changing the consciousness of a community and supporting "the development of the individual to play a constructive part…and to adjust himself to his

---

[27] The attempt of the UN Bureau of Social Affairs to take on a leading role in development assistance lasted about a decade. In the long run, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the World Bank came to dominate this domain (Jones, 1988, chapter 3).

constantly changing social and physical conditions" (p. 7). The report further elaborated on the "competition…between fundamental education and the formal education system (p. 6):"

> At its worst this competition may develop into a direct conflict
> between two more or less opposing policies for the solution of the
> problem of illiteracy and economic under-development. In one camp
> are those who contend that there is no substitute for a system of
> universal and compulsory primary schooling as a means of achieving
> widespread literacy, nor for technical and vocational schools and
> teacher training institutions to raise productivity and staff the primary
> school system. …In the other camp are those whose purpose it is to
> raise the living standards of the present generation…and who believe
> that the adult population must be mobilized. (UNESCO, 1956, p. 6)

It is clear that UNESCO's fundamental education experts saw themselves in the latter camp and pursued an approach to education based on consciousness-building of the adult population. This statement resonates the view expressed by the UIE governing board, that the education of children only made sense if it was linked to the education of adults. In fact, UNESCO itself has constructed an image of the fundamental education program as a "precursor of the theses of the leading ideologists of the Third World, Gandhi, Paulo Freire and Nyerere" (UNESCO, 1997, p. 121). All of these names are associated with the idea of educating the poor for self-reliance and "conscientization," with the ultimate aim of achieving a revolutionary transformation of society that would overthrow the traditional class and racial hierarchies – ideas that during the Cold War years "became hopelessly entangled with fears of socialist revolution" (Dorn & Ghodsee, 2012, p. 398).

In parallel, the fundamental education program came under attack by some of UNESCO's member states in the General Conference who criticized it as "colonial" and called for greater attention to the development of school systems in developing countries. The criticism was certainly justified, but it begs the question in what way a focus on schooling would be less "colonial." Dorn and Ghodsee (2012) ascribe the demise of the fundamental education program to the politicization of literacy at that time. When Cold

War tensions rose, UNESCO was under continuous criticism by the United States for having fallen under Communist influence. A U.S. report about UNESCO identified the goals of fundamental education as "contrary to American ideals and traditions" (cited in Dorn & Ghodsee, 2012, p. 375), and the American Director-General Luther Evans did not stand in the way of the attacks on the program (p. 383; Jones, 1988, pp. 92-93).

In 1957, the assignment of fundamental education to the Division of Out-of School Education rang in the end of the program, and a year later, in 1958, the delegates of the 10th session of the General Conference instructed the Director-General to focus on the expansion of universal compulsory school education (Watras, 2010, p. 237). The demise of the fundamental education program marked the first occurrence of the "literacy versus schools" pattern which will run like a thread through the history of UNESCO and global education.

The first experience with an operational project proved disillusioning for UNESCO. It confronted the organization for the first time with some harsh realities that the organization continued to face throughout its history: The mismatch between the grand intentions and utopian ideals and their actual realization on the ground; the insufficient funding for its programs; competition with other UN agencies that jeopardized UNESCO's work; the challenges of uniting member states behind a holistic vision of education that was not limited to school education; and the defamation of its activities as "socialist" or "communist." These challenges have remained with UNESCO to the present day.

Conclusion

The trauma of World War II and the Holocaust were indicative of the dilemmas that facilitated the founding of UNESCO and the idealism that countered the existentialist *angst* of the early post-war years. At least for a few years considerable religious and ideological divides could be bridged through agreement on unifying principles such as human rights and great enthusiasm for the idea of international cooperation and multilateralism as epitomized by international organizations. A key rationale for including Article 26 on the right to education in the UDHR was the experience of insubordination of education to the interests of a totalitarian system. Inspired by the

Enlightenment idea that a human being needed education to become fully human, the intellectuals involved in the founding of UNESCO believed in education as a means of raising a human being to a higher level of humanness, as signaled by the notion of the "whole person." The right to education contained a normative claim that was justified on moral grounds and based on the dignity of human beings. However, the contestation of the social and economic rights points to the unwillingness of some countries to actually guarantee this right.

The priority placed on adult education derived from the interest in the "human condition," the emphasis on democracy as an aspiration after the experience of fascism and the resistance against the traditional hierarchical and elitist approach to education. Democracy required citizens who were not indoctrinated, who were literate and could take up responsibilities to shape their societies. Therefore, adult education at the time was rather "non-vocational" and focused on citizenship. UNESCO's early focus on adult education and its first major operational program, "fundamental education," exemplified the organization's attempt to put into practice its worldview based on universalization, as expressed in the notions of the "common humanity" and "education for all," and individualization, as expressed in the notion of "dignity." However, the high expectations set on fundamental education to become UNESCO's flagship educational program were dampened when UNESCO's founding members showed no interest in providing the money, and even the target countries showed a lack of enthusiasm, which was in part due to the neo-colonial approach embedded in the program or their aspirations to build a formal school system. Early on, UNESCO's authority as the lead educational organization in the new multilateral system was challenged by other United Nations agencies. The parallel human rights groundwork carried out between the United Nations' Human Rights Commission and UNESCO's *Comité sur les principes philosophiques des droits de l'homme* revealed overlapping territorial claims, and a few years later the ambition of the UN Bureau of Social Affairs to appropriate UNESCO's territory represented a severe setback to UNESCO's authority.

UNESCO's contributions to Article 26 of the UDHR emphasized the organization's broad approach to education, in which compulsory primary education, prominently positioned in the UDHR, represented just one aspect of education as a

continuum. The new human rights perspective required new approaches to education and learning that could overcome inequalities. The focus on the adult and on the "full development of the human personality" further developed into UNESCO's humanistic lifelong learning paradigm. But from the outset UNESCO's worldview took a back seat in favour of a more technical focus on compulsory education, a trend that was set to continue in the following decades. As the period of post-war *entente* was short-lived, the organization got caught up in Cold War politicization, and UNESCO's adult-oriented, ideational and self-reliant approach to education was tainted as "socialist."

Chapter Four

Éducation Permanente and the "Crisis of Education"

Introduction

The previous chapter sought to establish how humanism and the human rights perspective became UNESCO's *leitmotiv* in relation to education. This chapter sets the stage for chapters five and six, in which I will argue that UNESCO's two flagship reports on lifelong learning, the *Faure report* (1972) and the *Delors report* (1996), attempted to construct themselves as expressions of UNESCO's humanistic tradition. This chapter aims to illuminate the context in which the *Faure report*, which brought to the forefront the concept of *éducation permanente* (lifelong education), was situated. The centrality of this concept in UNESCO at the time warrants its broader historicizing and contextualizing. *Éducation permanente* had a history in France before it made its way into UNESCO's educational thinking. During the 1960s the concept rose to prominence in French educational and governmental circles as an educational strategy and flagship of the post-war welfare state, and it was taken up by other international organizations as well, in particular the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 1970; Kallen, 1996, p. 18).

This chapter will speak less to the developments within UNESCO than the previous one and the chapters that will follow. It will trace the various underpinnings of *éducation permanente* and the French and international influences exerted on the concept in the global context of societal debates on education. I will further examine how the concept became implicated with literacy and other approaches to education, in particular "human capital" that gained influence around the same time in the context of the Cold War, the rise of development and the overall "crisis of education."

The concept of *éducation permanente* provided continuity in the transition between the post-war years and the socially transformative 1970s in that it fit into UNESCO's humanistic worldview while reflecting the political and intellectual climate of that time, in particular in France. While *éducation permanente* was very much rooted in the French *Résistance* and popular education movement and played an important role in educational reforms after the May 1968 crisis, it also reflected influences from international adult education movements. Lifelong education offered an alternative to literacy, one of

UNESCO's priority areas, which lost support among member states and came under pressure from the concept of "human capital." However, given its ideological foundations, lifelong education was at odds with the rising priority on economic growth taken by the new development agencies with which UNESCO entered into competition over the authority of education.

Peuple et Culture

Éducation permanente was rooted in the renewal of adult education in France brought about by the *Résistance* movement after the Second World War, which followed a first wave of interest in adult education after the Dreyfus Affair around 1890 and a second wave in the 1930s after the creation of the *Front populaire* (Lengrand, 1953, pp. 26-28), under which Léon Blum's socialist government had introduced the 45 hour week as well as paid annual leave for workers, which opened up the prospect of leisure time, an aspect of life they had not known before (Lengrand, 1994, p. 64).

In the context of the *Résistance*, left-leaning Catholics, Socialists and Communists gathered in an array of clubs and organizations that engaged in educational activities and political and intellectual activism. Some of them would become instrumental in shaping the concept of lifelong education in UNESCO, such as Paul Lengrand, Edgar Faure and Jacques Delors. One of the most influential organizations that came out of the *Résistance* was *Peuple et Culture*, which offered popular education to workers (Troger, 1999). It emerged from the *Comité départemental de Libération* (departmental liberation committee) in Vercors, a region of the French Alps that constituted an important base of the *Résistance*. These committees were founded in 1944 to allow for the political representation of the members of the *Résistance* movement. The *Peuple et Culture* Manifesto of 1945 was inspired by the experience of the *Résistance*, in which workers, artists and intellectuals had fought together to liberate their country from Nazi occupation and build a new type of society. The founders of the organization situated themselves in a time marked by "a revolt against the separation of culture and the people, and the separation of education [enseignement] and life" (Peuple et Culture, 1945, my translation). They sought to create a society built on a "*culture populaire,*" which would be accessible to all people undivided by class, "to intellectuals, to

executives, to the masses," who would be enabled by education to participate in a "common civilization." The manifesto demanded a "new humanism," which required a "new man" ("*l'homme nouveau*") who aimed at playing an active part in his community and society. The idea of popular education required a break with "the intellectualist teaching in the bourgeois university" and with the "methods of the school" (Peuple et Culture, 1945, my translation).[28]

Two of the four founders of *Peuple et Culture*, Joseph Rovan and Paul Lengrand, joined UNESCO (Rovan, 1999, p. 314; Forquin, 2004, p. 22), as did many others who had been involved in the *Résistance*, such as René Maheu and Stéphane Hessel. Other *Résistance* members such as Léon Blum and Georges Bidault interacted with UNESCO as heads of the French delegation in the early years. Rovan was charged with the coordination of youth and popular education movements (*culture populaire*) in the French occupation zone in Germany, and he left UNESCO after a few years. However, he stayed a part of the small circle of educational reformers active at the time, and he appeared, for example, in the list of experts consulted for the European Union's *Janne report* (Commission of the European Communites, 1973), which was a kind of EU version of the *Faure report*. Paul Lengrand became head of the adult education department in 1962 and the pioneer of the concept of *éducation permanente* in UNESCO. In his autobiography Lengrand referred to the "spirit of the Résistance" in terms of "the hope for a new age" (1994, p. 80) that had guided the work of *Peuple et culture*. The organization offered classes in a range of topics such as the history of the workers' movement, physical and economic education, esthetic education (p. 75) and "mental education," which was a sort of auto-suggestion training inspired by psychological insights (Troger, 1999, pp. 33-35). The course offerings show the aspirations of *Peuple et culture* to connect its students to their cultural and intellectual heritage. The cultural dimension prevailed over work preparation. Courses such as "esthetic education" reflect the push towards democratization of culture characteristic for that time, but they also speak to an elitist "top-down" approach. On its website,[29] the organization, which is still

---

[28] Later *Peuple et Culture* expanded throughout France and also into developing countries under the name *Culture et Développement* (Lengrand, 1994, p. 106).

[29] http://www.peuple-et-culture.org/

in existence, tells us about its origins: "When the founders of Peuple et Culture descend from the high plains of the Vercors or get out of the concentration camps, they are the heirs of a history: that of the Enlightenment and of the French Republic" (my translation). This statement – formulated in the present tense – constructs a continuity of the *Peuple et Culture* movement with the tradition of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. It is tinged with a sense of French cultural superiority. This perspective differs from other traditions of popular education, such as Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy and approach to literacy, in which the learners themselves defined what they learned based on their own interpretation of the world (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

Éducation Permanente in the Context of May 1968

The concept of *éducation permanente* later played a key role in the education reforms following the May 1968 student uprisings in France, in particular the *loi d'orientation* or *loi Faure* of 1968 and the *loi de la formation permanente* or *loi Delors* of 1971. At the same time similar concepts circulated in other Western countries, such as recurrent education, which was pushed in the OECD by Sweden where it represented the guiding idea of the 1968 Government Commission on Higher Education (Rubenson, 1994; Tuijnman, 1991). I will come back to recurrent education in chapter five. After the May events, which came as a shock to the French government, General de Gaulle offered the post of Education Minister to Edgar Faure who later led the UNESCO commission that produced the *Faure report* (Faure described this encounter with de Gaulle in Faure, 1971, pp. 23-33). Faure's main task was to implement reforms of the education system, in particular of the universities that had become the symbol of a much hated elitist and bourgeois system not only of education, but of French society as a whole. With his advisors he discussed ways to connect the university to the world of work and allow workers to benefit from *éducation permanente* (Faure, 1971, p. 164). Inspired by the British extra-mural departments and the American colleges that integrated adult education, the 1968 movement called for the opening of the universities (p. 158; Rovan, 1999, p. 345). One of Faure's main collaborators in the newly created *Secretariat à la formation continue* (Secretariat of continuing education) was his friend (Faure, 1971, p. 214) Bertrand Schwartz, one of the leading figures of *éducation permanente* in France

(Schwartz, 1968; 1974). From 1960 to 1972 Schwartz was Director of the CUCES (*Centre universitaire de coopération économique et sociale* - University Centre for Social and Economic Cooperation). Before he took up that position, he had made a name for himself as Director of the *École nationale supérieure des mines* de Nancy, where he had conducted surveys aiming at adapting the training of mining engineers to the needs of the employers. The CUCES was founded to build a bridge between university training and industry, and it also offered evening courses for workers who wanted to become engineers (Heikkinen & Kraus, 2009, p.125). In 1963, it was expanded by the INFA (*Institut national pour la formation des adultes* – National Institute for the Training of Adults), a public institution with national outreach and ties to the National Ministry of Education. The purpose of the INFA was to train instructors and conduct research on adult education. Together, these two institutions became known as the *complexe de Nancy* for their pioneering work in adult education and connection to the labour market (Laot, 2000). After the May 1968 demonstrations, in which many of the CUCES and INFA staff had actively participated, the INFA fell into disrepute as a "nest of leftists" (Heikkinen & Kraus, 2009, p. 131), and it lost many industry and state-funded contracts (p. 131). The *complexe de Nancy*, which employed 150 staff before the May 1968 events, was subsequently dismantled, and it was closed in 1973.[30] Faure attempted to create a body similar to the *complexe de Nancy*, the *Associations universitaires régionales d'éducation et de formation des adultes* – Regional University Associations for Adult Education and Training (AUREFA) – that would replace CUCES and INFA at the national level and take charge of adult education in close collaboration with industries and unions. But although AUREFA was created on paper, it never came into being (Faure, 1971, pp. 158-159; Heikkinen & Kraus, 2009, p.129). Faure could not realize any of his plans relating to *éducation permanente* due to the insufficient budget he had at his disposal. He referred to "le disastre de mon budget" as the greatest challenge of his term as Minister (Faure, 1971, p. 163).

A few years later, in 1971, under a new government, the *loi de la formation permanente* (continuing education law), or *loi Delors* came into effect, which was shaped

---

[30] It was survived by its journal *Éducation Permanente*, which was founded in 1969 and is still in existence.

by Jacques Delors, who more than 20 years later became the chairperson of the second UNESCO education commission that launched the *Delors report*. The *loi Delors* had a double aim: First, to accommodate employers' needs of qualified personnel; and second, to offer social promotion opportunities to workers. As Forquin (2004) observed, this law was a double-edged sword, because it took a much more vocational and work-driven approach to *éducation permanente* than envisaged by AUREFA. It contributed to the mainstreaming of continuing vocational training, which put an end to the more socially oriented *complexe de Nancy*. Some regarded the *loi de la formation permanente* as an important milestone in the institutionalization of the political claims of the post-war period. For others, it symbolized the beginning of a process of "banalization, dilution, or disillusionment," in any case a "reduction of the alternative utopian dimension of éducation permanente" (p. 28; my translation). Paul Lengrand saw it as an important step but also expressed his regret about the narrowness of the perspective taken on professional education, a position shared by Delors himself (Delors, 1994, p. 340; Lengrand, 1994, p. 116). After the introduction of the *loi Delors*, the term "formation permanente" was used more frequently and the term *éducation permanente* receded into the background, signaling a more functional and professional turn of the concept (Forquin, 2004, p. 28), which may have led to its replacement by the term "éducation tout au long de la vie" (lifelong education), an issue I will come back to in chapter six.

International Adult Education

Although Paul Lengrand came from the *éducation permanente* movement, he emphasized the influence of the Anglo-Saxon adult education tradition on the concept (Forquin, 2004, p. 22). The literature on lifelong learning commonly ascribes the first appearance of the Anglo-Saxon variant of the concept of lifelong learning on the political stage to the 1919 Report of the Ministry of Reconstruction Adult Education Committee in the United Kingdom, which – under the influence of the First World War and the educational needs of the returning soldiers – stressed the importance of adult education for economic recovery and the formation of public opinion. The Committee referred to adult education as "a permanent national necessity, an inseparable aspect of citizenship [which] should therefore be both universal and lifelong" (cited in Jessup, 1969, p. 18; see also Field, 2001, p. 5).

Around the year 1960 *éducation permanente* emerged in UNESCO as a programmatic educational paradigm out of adult education circles. Initially, it was sometimes translated as "permanent education," but that term "slowly and gradually disappeared" (Interview with Ravindra Dave; see also Ireland, 1979, p. vi) in favour of "lifelong education." According to Ravindra Dave, it disappeared because the idea gained prominence that education was not limited to a certain age: "the *lifespan* was an important thing—and therefore you had to put the word 'lifelong'" (Interview with Ravindra Dave).[31] Roby Kidd (1974) emphasized that adult education was the "chief advocate" (p. 1) of lifelong education: "The strongest and most clear-sighted proponents of education permanente are the adult educationists" (p. 33). In 1960, the concept already appeared at the Second International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA II) – the successor of the Elsinore conference – held in Montreal under the theme "Adult education in a changing world" (Kidd, 1974, p. 20).[32] Lowe (1975) has asserted that "this was the first international assembly which, in its Final Report, set lifelong education as a goal for the future policies of governments" (p. 10). But Lowe's claim is not entirely accurate. Nowhere did the report of the conference refer to "éducation permanente" or "lifelong education," its most common English translation. However, the concept loomed on the horizon as the following passage from the *Declaration* shows:

> Our first problem is to survive. It is not a question of the survival of the fittest; either we survive together or we perish together. Survival requires that the countries of the world must learn to live together in peace. 'Learn' is the operative word. Mutual respect, understanding, sympathy are qualities that are destroyed by ignorance, and fostered by knowledge. In the field of international understanding, adult education in today's divided world takes on a new importance. (UNESCO, n.d.b, p. 11)

---

[31] Jessup (1969, p. 25) raised the question why "éducation permanente" was not translated as "continuing education," a term used in the United States to "denote continuing professional education." Jessup argued that "continuing education" "tends…to obscure the fact that lifelong learning is compatible with discontinuous education" (p. 25).
[32] For a history of the CONFINTEA conferences, see Knoll, 2007; and Ireland & Spezia, 2014.

While most of this quote reads very much like some of the statements from the early debates of UNESCO, in which delegates stressed the relevance of adult education for international understanding, the sentence "'Learn' is the operative word" signalled the emergence of lifelong education. Moreover, the report of the Montreal conference stated that the closing remarks by the Chairman of the conference, the Canadian adult educator Roby Kidd (1974), "stressed the fact that education must now be conceived as a process that continued through the whole of life" (UNESCO, n.d.b, p. 10). The use of the term "learn" in the *Declaration* represents an early indication of what Biesta (2015) has called the "learnification" of education, which was a reaction to the resistance to traditional hierarchical forms of education based on the authority of the teacher (p. 76).

Montreal marked another important step towards lifelong education in that the conference called for the establishment of a permanent committee on adult education (UNESCO, n.d.b, p. 30). UNESCO later complied with this request and created the *International Committee for the Advancement of Adult Education*. Lifelong education was articulated for the first time in UNESCO as an educational program in the report of the third session of that committee (UNESCO, 1966a; see also Kidd, 1974, p. 20; Wain, 1987, p. 68, n. 2), following a report on *Éducation permanente* submitted to and a presentation held before the Committee by Paul Lengrand (Lengrand, 1994, p. 113), the head of the adult education section who had also been a delegate at Montreal (Jessup, 1969, p. vii). The Committee declared:

> Unesco should endorse the principle of 'lifelong education'…which
> may be defined briefly as 'the animating principle of the whole process
> of education, regarded as continuing throughout an individual's life
> from his earliest childhood to the end of his days, and therefore calling
> for integrated organization. The necessary integration should be
> achieved both vertically, throughout the duration of life, and
> horizontally to cover all the various aspects of the life of individuals
> and societies. (cited in Jessup, 1969, p. vii)

This quote is significant, as the references to the "vertical" and "horizontal" dimension of lifelong education, the "life-long" and the "life-wide," have often been invoked in the history of lifelong learning, denoting the lifespan of the human being and

the different formal, non-formal and informal settings and situations in which human beings learn. Some have even referred to three dimensions of lifelong education, including a depth dimension (Kidd, 1969, p. 11). One of my interviewees argued that lifelong education has a "vertical dimension, horizontal dimension, and the depth dimension. It gives you direction. It gives you vision. But within that, you have to work" (Interview with Ravindra Dave). The strong connection between adult education and lifelong learning derives from the focus on the entire lifespan of the human being, "from his earliest childhood to the end of his days." In the span of a lifetime, adulthood encompasses a much greater period than childhood. As one of the pioneers of research on lifelong learning, Arthur Cropley, pointed out in my interview with him, "since most people spend more of their life as adults than as children…a system of lifelong learning would mainly be concerned with adults."

Lifelong Education and the "Human Condition"

Lifelong education stood for the shift from the focus on institutionalized education to learning in "all the various aspects of the life of individuals." It was closely related to the lived experience of the adult, as expressed by Johannes Novrup (1953), the Danish adult educator and Chairperson of CONFINTEA I, when he talked about "our own grown-up world in all its complexities, with its scores of unsolved, burning and often tragic problems" (p. 9). This lived experience concerned the adult much more than the child. Bogdan Suchodolski (1979), known as the philosopher of lifelong learning, wrote about the connection between lifelong education and the adult:

> …if lifelong education is to encompass people's entire life, it must be
>
> closely linked with a social and metaphysical conception of life,
>
> ….the importance of these elements is much greater in the education
>
> of adults…The major, difficult problems of life will make their
>
> appearance later. (p. 37)

The connection between lifelong education and adult education, with its focus on the lived experience of the adult and the "human condition" points to the strong influence of existentialism on the concept (Wain, 1987, pp. 118-134). Existentialism was the dominating philosophy in France at the time and highly influential of the overall intellectual and political culture.

Lengrand (1994) wrote about the educational program of *Peuple et Culture*: "The essence of the material on which we built our educational programmes was the inexhaustible richness which the content of the human condition constitutes" (p. 77; my translation). The "human condition" that Paul Lengrand frequently referred to formed part of the concept of lifelong education with its view to "the particular destiny of man that leads an existence, constructs a life, reflects the universe in his conscience and through his action participates in his transformation" (Lengrand, 1994, p. 114; my translation). Lengrand (1994) identified Hegel's *Phenomenology of the Spirit* as the "inspiration" for lifelong education (p. 104). Although Lengrand did not go into detail about his interpretations of Hegel, he seemed to refer to Hegel's philosophical engagement with the idea of human freedom and the "free will" of human beings as shapers of history (Vernon, 2012). Hegel was also a very important influence on Paulo Freire, and on Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialism, another thinker Lengrand repeatedly mentioned. In his book *An Introduction to Lifelong Education* Lengrand (1970) discussed different approaches to Sartre's (1984) "human condition of every individual" (p. 25) and clearly situated lifelong education in a phenomenological approach (differentiating it from a sociological approach), as it focused on "human experience in its individual form" and the "being and becoming" of "a particular individual" (Lengrand, 1970, p. 7).

Maritain's influence faded in post-war France as Sartre became the dominating intellectual figure (Barré, 2005, 386-387). Both were existentialists in that their philosophies focused on the human condition, but while Maritain was a metaphysician, Sartre was an atheist and the proponent of an existentialism of "nothingness." The rich intellectual and philosophical works that arose in France during the 1960s challenged the metaphysical foundations of humanism, as represented by Maritain. Humanism had come into discredit among the 1960s generation of philosophers because they related it to totalitarianism and colonialism. As stated by Theodor Adorno, "after Auschwitz" it was no longer possible to praise the grandeur of man. Horkheimer and Adorno's book *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1973) connected the Enlightenment to Nazism. The authors argued that while the initial impulse behind Enlightenment was to question all knowledge and authority, the Enlightenment project changed as reason underwent a transformation from being critical to being instrumental: "Instrumental reason is not driven by a need to

inquire but is driven by a need to dominate and conquer" (Wheatland, 2009, p. 163).
Books such as Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man* and Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*
represented the critique of modern instrumental rationality. They unmasked the bourgeois
universe of modern industrial societies and they deconstructed modern humanism whose
final form they identified as the "technical world" (Ferry & Renaut, 1990, p. xii). The
influential thinkers of that time, such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Louis
Althusser, were profoundly anti-humanist and declared "the death of man." For Foucault
(1970), "man" was "an invention of recent date. And one perhaps nearing its end" (p.
387).

The 1968 "anti-humanists" would have dismissed UNESCO's humanism, which
was reclaimed by the concept of *éducation permanente* and by the *Faure report*, which
will be discussed in the next chapter, as a bourgeois ideology and an oppressive rather
than a liberating force. The assumption of the unity of mankind, proclaimed by
UNESCO, was considered hopelessly metaphysical (Ferry & Renaut, 1990, p. 18).
Foucault stated that "the search for a moral form acceptable to everyone, in the sense that
everyone must submit to it, seems catastrophic to me" (p. 18). Althusser actually referred
to Edgar Faure's "bourgeois intelligence," which helped him to disintegrate the student
movement (Rancière, 1974, p. 178-179, n. 38). UNESCO's worldview, based on the
essential nature of human beings that needed to be developed through education, stood at
odds with Sartre's existentialism, which postulated that "existence preceeds essence"
(Sartre, 1946). Sartre rejected the idea that human beings were born with an essence, or a
value (as denoted by the concept of "dignity"). In his view human beings could give
meaning and value to their lives only through their existence, through their actions with
which they could make a difference in the world.

However, despite the marked differences, the anti-humanist philosophy contains
many ideas that derive from existentialism, and therefore some of the concerns of the
anti-humanists can be found in UNESCO's works on lifelong education, and in the *Faure
report*. The revalorization of the subject against the "system" represented one of the big
concerns of the 1968 student movement (Ferry & Renaut, 1990, p. xxiii), and it appears
as a recurrent issue in the writings about lifelong education and in the *Faure report*, as
does the concept of "alienation." The fear that previous forms of totalitarianism would be

replaced by other forms of totalitarianism, in particular the enslavement of human beings by instrumental rationality, machines and technocracy, which constitutes the theme of Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*, was one of Edgar Faure's greatest fears.

Despite ontological differences, UNESCO was a part of French intellectual life, and the connections between French philosophers and UNESCO were quite strong. In 1964, Maheu organized a symposium on Kierkegaard at UNESCO, in which Sartre participated (UNESCO, 1966b). Sartre was one of Maheu's best friends. They knew each other from the École Normale Supérieure and later studied philosophy together at the Sorbonne (Rowley, 2006, pp. 1-3). As a historical curiosity, Maheu actually introduced Simone de Beauvoir to Sartre after having dated her for some time (pp. 1-3). Also Derrida gave several lectures at UNESCO, and one of his biographers, Jason Powell (2006), asserted that Derrida was "a complete patron of UNESCO" (p. 217). Stéphane Hessel (2011) who worked in UNESCO under René Maheu for many years, emphasized the influence that Sartre's message, "you as an individual are responsible" (p. 17), had on his time. The emphasis on the "responsibility" of individuals to shape their societies, which represented a very important message of existentialist literature, was a recurring theme in the post-war discussions on the right to education and adult education.

The Rise of Development and Human Capital Theory

After having focused on the various, in particular French, influences on *éducation permanente*, its philosophical underpinnings and its emergence in the international adult education movement, I will now turn to the global context marked by decolonization and the rise of development as an important field of activity for governments and international organizations that shaped the educational discourse at the time. I will explore the conflictual relationship of lifelong education with another influential educational strategy, literacy, and with human capital theory. During the 1960s international organizations discovered development as a sphere of influence, fuelled by the Cold War East-West confrontation. After the short period of *entente* between the Great Powers during the first years after World War II the United States shifted from internationalism to a "U.S.-centered foreign policy dedicated to the narrow pursuit of national security through the containment of communism" (Wang, 2006, p. 214). In the

political climate characterized by the ideological polarization between the United States and the Soviet Union, development gained ground as a foreign policy issue, and "the fear of communism became one of the most compelling arguments for development" (Escobar, 1995, p. 34). The launch of the Sputnik satellite in 1957 sharpened East-West confrontation and triggered a veritable technological catch-up race with the USSR in the United States, which involved the increase of investments in education in Western countries (Hüfner, 2011, p. 22; Tröhler, 2010). Economic growth was an "obsession" of the United States during those years; not only was it an understandable concern for a nation that had gone through a devastating economic crisis before World War II, but it also constituted a key factor in the rivalry with the USSR (Biddle & Holden, 2014). The emphasis on economic development and the restructuring of the production of goods pushed to the forefront the concept of human capital in the United States, which emerged through the studies of Theodore Schultz (1963) and Gary Becker (1964). Focusing on "the aggregation of human capital from education" (Schultz, 1970, p. 299) these economists touted education as a major investment in economic growth. As Schultz (1970) put it,

> the beauty of accounting and discounting is that we can take the cost
>
> of education or we can transform the earnings from education and call
>
> it human capital. But this acquired beauty only conceals the difference
>
> between them where there is economic growth. (p. 299)

In a seminal OECD study Denison (1964) postulated that the national income consisted of capital, labour and a 'residual factor' that was attributed to investments in human beings, such as education and health.

The first United Nations Development Decade, initiated and launched by John F. Kennedy (Jolly, Emmerij, Ghai, & Lapeyre, 2004, p. 86), stipulated a development model based on free-market growth of national income through foreign investment and exports. Lyndon B. Johnson's administration wanted to expand what Philip Coombs had called "the fourth dimension of foreign policy" (Coombs, 1964), denoting educational and cultural affairs, as distinct from political, economic and military foreign policy. Throughout the 1960s the World Bank strongly increased its development funding, driven by cost-effectiveness considerations. Many U.S.-spearheaded conferences on

international education convened at the time in which UNESCO cooperated, such as the Bellagio meetings and the International Conference on the World Crisis in Education at Williamsburg, Virginia, in 1967, called for by President Lyndon Johnson. The 1960s marked the breakthrough of planning as a tool for development that was "essentially rationalist in approach and interventionist in conclusions" (Myrdal, 1968, p. 709; see also Jolly et al., 2004, p. 90). As Myrdal (1968) pointed out, the idea of the relation between economic and educational development was as old as economic thinking, "but none in this tradition has tried to put educational reform into the conceptual strait jacket of a quantity of financial investment, accounted for in a capital/output ratio. This is the only innovation in the newest economic approach" (p. 1545; see also Balogh, 1964).

Some scholars tend to demonize human capital theory as the principle that led to the hegemony of the economic over the social purposes of education. Klaus Hüfner, who was instrumental in making it known in Germany (Hüfner, 1970), mentioned how politicians initially embraced this new theory as a welcome side-effect to the view of education as a right: "Great, not only can we realize the right of people to education, but on top of that it also brings an economic return" (Interview with Klaus Hüfner; my translation from German). These two arguments complemented each other, like "two sides of the same coin" (ibid.). Rubenson (2015) makes a similar point with regard to the OECD's work on human capital when he argues that at the time when human capital theory came up, "few social science scholars perceived any conflicts between economic efficiency and social and economic equality" (p. 183). In the early years of human capital theory the concept was put at the service of the push to expand public education in order to achieve greater equality of opportunity, a principle that made sense from a human rights as well as from an economic perspective (OECD, 1961, p. 9). Given booming industries and the expansion of middle-class jobs there was a need to tap the intellectual potential of parts of the population that traditionally had been excluded from educational opportunities. According to Brown, Halsey, Lauder and Wells (1997), equality of opportunity had three functions:

> It acts as an efficiency principle by (in theory) selecting and allocating
> individuals for the labour market on the basis of ability; it acts as a

moral principle by selecting students on the basis of a theory of justice;

and it also acts as a tool of assimilation. (p. 4)

However, the delegates of the conference "Ability and Educational Opportunity" convened by the OECD in 1961 (at the time still the OEEC, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation) were well aware of the risk that the economic considerations might get the upper hand:

Ultimately we must be prepared to recognize that an educational

system which was closely and completely geared to supplying

manpower for the productive organization of society would, at the

same time, be an agency of dehumanization. (OECD, 1961, p. 20)

One of the participants of the conference, the German sociologist Ralf Dahrendorf, insisted that "the arrangements of society for the production of skill and wealth must, in the last analysis, take their place as means to the end of an enriched life for the individual citizen" (p. 20).

As long as a balance existed between the two approaches – the human rights perspective, and the consideration of the economic return – the alliance between the human rights and the human capital perspectives held the potential of being a healthy one. The balance was kept in check in the framework of the social-democratic Keynesian welfare state, which constituted the common political constellation during the 1960s. The forces began to come out of equilibrium when neo-liberal conservative governments came into power in the late 1970s which put the human capital approach at the service of an excessive market ideology, under which profit considerations dominated. As Schultz's statement above reveals, the human capital approach hinges on economic growth and hence capitalism. Without the "humanistic" counter-balance, human capital theory was prone to a takeover by the neoliberal agenda, because the approach per se was a purely economic one that regarded human beings as factors of production. In the logic of this paradigm, the value of human beings on the labour market could be enhanced through investment in the form of education and training. It thus denoted a positive attitude towards education (Vinokur, 1976, p. 290). Economists who propagated this approach were

interested in *the quantitative aspects of education* in a society where

the immediate objective of economic activity is maximization of

monetary gain, i. e. where the main criterion for those who take

decisions concerning production is profit. (p. 289; emphasis in

original)

Many countries enthusiastically imported the human capital perspective. It did not

matter that the transferability of this approach from one country to another was

questionable. Hüfner pointed out that Schultz' (1963) study and Denison's (1962)

analysis of the profitability of investments in education in the United States were

country-specific:

If there is an average economic return of secondary education or so in

the United States, it does not mean that this will be still valid the next

day and even less that it will be equally applicable in Germany or

France or any other country. The primitive transfer was merely

political. (Interview with Klaus Hüfner; my translation from German)

Gunnar Myrdal (1972) offered the same argument in relation to developing

countries:

The finding that in developed countries there was a "residual" in the

capital/output model that could not be fully explained by physical

investment, which was then imputed to education, was based on

statistics such as no underdeveloped country keeps…The new theory

has simply been applied by analogy… Economists of this "new

school" restrict themselves to including education as an additional

item of development. But the model they so present is based on a

number of unwarranted assumptions. In this instance it requires the

assumption that education is a homogenous magnitude, measurable

in terms of financial expenditures. (pp. 360-362)

This new approach to education constituted a challenge to UNESCO's focus on

literacy as it placed pressure on the organization to show the economic returns of

investment in education. As I have shown in the previous chapter, literacy had been a

priority of UNESCO since Zimmern's speech at the 1945 preparatory conference in

London, and it had represented a key element of the fundamental education program. The first two Director-Generals, Julian Huxley and Jaime Bodet Torres, accorded priority to literacy, and so did René Maheu, who took office as UNESCO's Director-General in 1962. In principle, Maheu's dream was a universal literacy campaign, and he once told Phillip Jones that he considered such an endeavour worthy of the Nobel peace prize (Jones & Coleman, 2005, p. 202). At the 12th General Conference held in 1962, at which he was elected, the delegates were presented with a report written by a Committee of Experts on Literacy, which the 1961 UN General Assembly had requested. According to Friesen (1963) the discussion of that item on the agenda (item 17.1.3.) woke up the delegates, who were tired from the long deliberations and "were getting restless to return home" (p. 2), because "the task it posed was direct and staggering: how can UNESCO help to make 500 million men and women literate?" (p. 2). Friesen's observation recalls Alfred Zimmern's speech of 1945 when Zimmern claimed that illiteracy should be the focus of UNESCO's educational work and suggested that "that is a subject which interests a large number of our member states" (UNESCO, 1947c, p. 9).

The delegates of the 12th General Conference approved a World Campaign for Universal Literacy (Friesen, 1963), which the delegates of CONFINTEA II in Montreal had claimed as well, and in 1963 UNESCO submitted a proposal for the realization of such a campaign to the UN General Assembly, which followed up on a Ukranian proposal supported by the Soviet Union (Jones & Coleman, 2005, p. 202; Dorn & Ghodsee, 2012, p. 390). But the General Assembly did not move on UNESCO's initiative. The United States criticized it and favoured a focus on the expansion of formal school education and technical education. At the 1965 World Congress of Ministers of Education on the Eradication of Illiteracy held in Tehran, which provided the platform for "the twentieth century's most significant political consideration of illiteracy" (Jones, 1988, p. 142), Maheu had the difficult task of explaining to the Third World delegates that there would be no mass literacy campaign and mobilizing support for a much reduced alternative, the Experimental World Literacy Program (ELWP) (p. 142). In his speech, Maheu reassured the delegates:

> Do not worry – UNESCO has not sold its soul to *homo economicus*;
> its effort to integrate its action into the economy is not meant to

subordinate one to the other, but on the contrary to humanize the

economy as much as possible. (cited in Morel, 2010, p. 275; my

translation)

Maheu had no choice other than to take a pragmatic turn and embrace the EWLP

as "a kind of consolation measure" (Jones & Coleman, 2005, p. 203), which was adapted

to the parameters of available UNDP funding and shaped by its outlook. UNESCO and

the UNDP regarded the ELWP, which consisted of pilot projects in eleven countries,[33] a

major contribution to the First UN Development Decade, as it underlined the importance

attributed to education for development. The EWLP took a functional illiteracy approach,

which was smaller-scale, more vocational and learner-centred, and adapted to the social

and economic needs of the community (UNESCO, 2000, p. 33); in this respect it

resembled the fundamental education approach. The scholarly literature has widely

emphasized that the ELWP, which ran until 1974 – the year Maheu stepped down as DG

– failed to show the direct economic and social returns of literacy (Gillette, 1987, pp.

198-199; UNESCO, 2000, p. 33; Jones, 1988, pp. 160; 195-212). This reasoning,

however, needs to be treated with caution in light of Myrdal's statement about the

reliability of measuring economic returns in developing countries. Gillette (1987)

asserted that the literacy campaign was not pursued because of the "then-ascendant

influence of education-qua-investment economists, for whom literacy work should be

focused selectively on the actual or potential producers of a given society" (p. 200). This

point is consistent with the debates around "equality of opportunity" that drove recurrent

education. Initially, the idea of equality was "elitist" as it was motivated by tapping into

unused potential among the population for the sake of the economy (Rubenson, 1994, p.

248). Literacy represented a challenge to that kind of perspective as it was not selective

and targeted all. Dorn and Ghodsee (2012) argue that the hidden agenda behind the

discreditation of literacy was its reputation as being too politically charged and equated

with communism.

The idea of a literacy campaign fit into the spirit of the time characterized by a

radical break with the past and the belief in a new beginning. As Arnove and Graff

---

[33] Algeria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Iran, Madagascar, Mali, Sudan, the Syrian Arab
Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania. Around the year 1971, nearly a quarter of a
million of adults were involved in the program (UNESCO, 2000, p. 34).

(1987) have shown, historically, literacy campaigns are related to major social transformations, and governments have used them for political ends: "Usually, there is a profound, if not cataclysmic, triggering event: a religious reformation or a political revolution, the gaining of political independence and nationhood" (p. 4). The resistance to the idea of literacy campaigns on the part of some Western member states may be due to their association with revolutionary and communist governments. The campaigns in the USSR (1919-1939) and Vietnam (1945-1958) offer cases in point. On 20 September 1960, Fidel Castro announced before the UN General Assembly his intention to "eliminate illiteracy in one year" (Kirkendall, 2010, p. 24), and Cuba ran a literacy campaign between April and September 1961, involving 300,000 volunteers. The start of the campaign coincided with the Bay of Pigs invasion when Cuba was very much in the spotlight of public attention.

Dorn and Ghodsee (2012) and one of my interviewees implied that the association of literacy with socialist revolution and Paulo Freire's (1970) "pedagogy of the oppressed" constituted one of the reasons why literacy was never pursued on a grand scale, despite many efforts undertaken by UNESCO. The Americans came to know Freire because he was one of the leading educators and administrators involved in educational programs funded by the "Alliance for Progress," launched by the Kennedy administration. This program was a tool to avert communist revolutions in Latin America by supporting economic growth and infrastructure development. In 1961, USAID launched an extensive aid program in the northeast of Brazil around Recife in the context of the program, because the Americans considered the region prone to revolutionary overthrow. Initially USAID supported a literacy campaign in the northeast (Kirkendall, 2010, pp. 30-31), but it became increasingly worried about the "Popular Culture Movement," in which Paulo Freire was highly involved (p. 26). An American official, Edward Rowell, considered "the adult literacy program of the MCP [Popular Culture Movement] as the program with the greatest potential for mass politicization" (p. 32). Later, the Americans became wary of a literacy campaign Freire had been put in charge of under President Goulart. In January 1964 USAID withdrew its support to literacy programs in Brazil (p. 51). Literacy had the reputation of being driven ideologically by

political aims rather than economic ones, and it was regarded as "subversive" (Interview with Adama Ouane).

Paul Lengrand (1994) suggested that the concept of lifelong education was widely accepted because it broadened UNESCO's traditional focus on literacy, which the organization's Western founding members no longer supported (p. 111). Literacy could disappear under the umbrella of lifelong learning, often in the formulation, "literacy is the foundation for lifelong learning." As already observed in the previous chapter on UNESCO's early years with regard to the program of "fundamental education," a UNESCO vision – universal literacy – was crowded out by the pressure exerted on it by a changing political climate, the competition with other agencies and a competing ideology, the human capital approach. It held more weight as it fit smoothly into the Cold War priority of economic growth, which superseded the emphasis on societal transformation, universality and the creation of a "new man" for democracy that had dominated the debates in UNESCO's early years. After Robert McNamara was appointed as World Bank President in 1968, it became impossible for UNESCO to raise funding for the EWLP. Under the new paradigm, "Redistribution with growth," the Bank under McNamara strongly expanded educational loans focused on poverty alleviation through the promotion of free-market growth. UNESCO's literacy approach fell into discredit in the World Bank and the UNDP, as expressed in an April 1968 memorandum by Duncan Ballantine, the Bank's education director: "Literacy would be regarded as instrumental rather than as an end objective, which it is still to a large extent in the Unesco approach" (Jones, 1992, p. 97; see also Dorn & Ghodsee, 2010, p. 375). The UNDP and the World Bank considered the results of the EWLP disappointing (Jones, 1992, pp. 98-99). This time, UNESCO responded by provoking the World Bank and the UNDP by using a formal evaluation of the EWLP for attacks on their economic approach. The evaluation criticized the "view prevalent in United Nations and Western academic circles…that development was first and foremost a question of economic growth, stressing capital-intensive development and high-level technical skills" (Dorn & Ghodsee, 2010, p. 397).

At that time, UNESCO entered into an open conflict with the UNDP and the World Bank, its potential U.S. backed funders, and aligned itself with the Non-Aligned movement of developing countries that was increasingly vocal in the UN General

Assembly and the UNESCO General Conference. While the United States and European countries had dominated UNESCO during the first decade of its existence, the Third World, in particular the African countries, gained influence throughout the 1960s. In the two decades between 1947 and 1967, 70 countries from Latin America, Asia and particularly Africa joined UNESCO (Morel, 2013, p. 70), causing a shift of the balance of power away from the Western countries. At the 1955 Asian-African Conference in Bandung, where the Non-Aligned Movement had its beginnings, the Third World countries claimed their "right of self-determination" and demanded human rights and economic justice. In the early 1970s, under the influence of "endogenous development" theorists, the Non-Aligned countries sought the establishment of the New International Economic Order (NIEO), calling for more control of their terms of trade, capital flows and fairer redistribution of wealth. "Endogenous development" implied an understanding of development driven at the national level and adapted to the specific circumstances of each country (UNESCO, 1976).

The NIEO came under heavy attack from conservative political forces, led by the United States and its Heritage Foundation, which criticized UNESCO for its engagement with the movement (Preston, Herman, & Schiller, 1989, p. xvii). The situation worsened when, in 1974, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow of Senegal succeeded René Maheu as Director-General. M'Bow was himself a proponent of "endogenous development." He established a committee to explore how the NIEO could be advanced by UNESCO. The committee consisted mainly of proponents of "dependency theory," which held that underdevelopment in the Southern part of the world was caused by structures, regulations and practices set up by the Western countries. While Maheu had collaborated quite well with the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, M'Bow did not shy away from conflict with the United States in order to promote the interests of the Third World, which accelerated the withdrawal of the U.S. from UNESCO a decade later.

The Crisis of Education

In the 1960s educational reform ideas such as *éducation permanente* and recurrent education were driven by the concern about the "crisis of education." Education systems were not adequately equipped to respond to the dramatic increase of secondary and

higher education in Western countries. At the same time the countries of the South, which had come out of colonial rule, were eager to rebuild their education systems. In 1963, UNESCO – with the support of the World Bank, the Ford Foundation and the United Nations – had founded the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) as a response to the rising demands for educational planning in developing countries. The first director of the IIEP was Philip Coombs, who had served as Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Kennedy administration. In his keynote speech presented at the International Conference on the World Crisis in Education in Williamsburg, Coombs declared that "in many countries, the process of educational expansion that had begun in the 1950s, coupled with a parallel demographic explosion, had brought education systems and society itself to the brink of disaster" (King, 2006, p. 9). Coombs (1968) put forth a "systems analysis" of the "world educational crisis" and proposed a series of strategies to deal with it, such as greater international cooperation in the field of education, a strong focus on non-formal education and a role for higher education in planning and strengthening education systems.

In France, the "crisis of education" arrived at UNESCO's doorsteps in the form of the 1968 May "revolution." The 1968 events not only "called into question fundamentally the matter of education," but also "rocked the foundations of society in France" (Interview with Henri Lopes; my translation). Maheu saw the "crise de l'éducation" as the sign of a big societal transformation in France and in the West (Le Monde, 1970). Student protests had erupted in the big cities in Western and Eastern Europe, and Paris, the location of UNESCO's headquarters, was a centre of the protests. In the United States the campuses were places of mobilization of the anti-Vietnam and civil rights activists. This worldwide movement was certainly an important factor that induced René Maheu to commission a flagship UNESCO report on education, and it constituted one of the reasons why many member states supported the project (E-mail Henri Lopes, October 12, 2015). It represented a strategic move to provide a UNESCO response to this crisis of society and education, but it also offered a way of positioning the organization vis-à-vis the other international organizations. In 1969 both the World Bank and the UNDP, the organizations with which UNESCO had a conflict over the EWLP, launched reports that triggered some discussion: the World Bank's *Partners in*

Development (the *Pearson Report*) and the UNDP's *Jackson Report,* a capacity study on the UN's role in development. The latter recommended a more consolidated UN approach to development assistance, which some of the specialized UN agencies considered an attack on their autonomy. UNESCO's Executive Board had a long discussion about these two reports during its 84th session, prior to deciding on the establishment of the Commission that was mandated to produce an education report (UNESCO, 1970a, pp. 103-186). René Maheu referred to the *Pearson report* when he talked about the planned Education Commission. He argued that while the report constituted a "kind of general introduction into the problems of development" and provided a good overview of education as a strategy of development, a strategy for education was needed: "I believe that this [initiating a UNESCO report on education] is the logical and normal follow up of the more general initiative undertaken by the Bank, and I wish this endeavor to be tackled as soon as possible" (Maheu, in UNESCO, 1970a, p. 104; my translation). Maheu spoke much longer about the *Jackson report*, which had far greater financial consequences for UNESCO. He deplored that the author of the report, Sir Robert Jackson, was biased at the outset in his support of a centralized UN system. He particularly criticized the report's view on education, which in Maheu's view would lead to the subordination of education to the short-term perspective on development promoted by the economists:

> Educational planning is linked to the planning of the general future of
> a nation for 10 to 12 years. So how can we accept that the programs
> established by the economists, which don't go beyond a general
> horizon of four to five years, are considered *a priori* imperatives,
> which need to be followed by Ministers of Education, educators,
> parents, children, students, as if they were given by divine providence.
> (UNESCO, 1970a, pp. 105-106; my translation)

Maheu further criticized the report for promoting a view of development that separated the operational and technical domain from the intellectual. He insisted that those two approaches belonged together, as operational work needed to rest on intellectual work (p. 106). Also in budgetary terms, he strongly rejected the separation of UNESCO's technical work, which was largely funded by the UNDP, from the regular

program (p. 106), funded by the regular budget provided by member states' dues. This separation had become commonplace in UNESCO before Maheu's term in order to facilitate the administration of the increasing operational funds the organization received from the technical assistance sector of the UNDP (Jones, 1992, pp. 46-47). Maheu's remarks point to the conflict that was smouldering between UNESCO and the UNDP over the decrease of UNDP funds provided to UNESCO (Jones, 1988, pp. 124-125). Maheu indirectly referred to this conflict in an article published in 1974 in which he argued that the "operational activities, particularly those financed by the United Nations Development Programme, are often too tributary…to a technocratic attitude of mind, which…seriously handicap the full flowering of our efforts" (Maheu, 1974, p. 196). Establishing an international Commission to produce an education report was a way of affirming UNESCO's authority as an intellectual driver of education (Jones & Coleman, 2005, p. 84). Moreover, as a contribution to the Second Development Decade and the International Year of Education (UNESCO, 1970b, April 8), the report was supposed to help member states "formulate strategies for the development of education." Edgar Faure explained in one of the meetings of the Commission that the First UN Development Decade had focused on "studying the development of the economy," and that the Commission should focus on the development of education, both in relation to the economy, but also by "going beyond the problem of the economy" (UNESCO, 1971a, p. 6).

Conclusion

René Maheu initiated the *Faure report* as a response to a series of circumstances and dilemmas the organization faced at the time. The rise of development as an arena of the Cold War established new "players" in the multilateral system such as the UNDP and the World Bank which threatened UNESCO's position. The conflict with the World Bank and the UNDP over the EWLP was symptomatic of the new dynamics in which UNESCO was financially dependent on organizations that proved unwilling to fund educational programs that emerged from a worldview very different from their own. UNESCO's view of education was shaped by French idealist traditions, while the U.S. backed organizations were under the influence of the new paradigm of economic growth, as represented by human capital theory. UNESCO's alignment with the Third World

countries that had joined UNESCO in large numbers in the process of decolonization and used the United Nations and UNESCO as platforms to vocalize their political claims sharpened this tension. While the main concern of the United States at the time was its catch-up race with the USSR, UNESCO showed sympathy for the demands of the Third World countries for more self-determination.

The "crisis of education," with its local and international dimensions, had sparked debates about educational reforms, planning and educational development assistance, in which UNESCO wanted to make its voice heard. Lifelong education constituted to some extent UNESCO's response to this crisis as it represented an educational concept broad enough to take account of the social transformations and changes occurring in the education systems. It encompassed traditional forms of education, particularly schooling and higher education, as well as UNESCO's traditional pillar of literacy, and it also left room for new forms and approaches to education, including non-formal education, continuing and vocational education, and the reform of the universities. Its emergence as UNESCO's key educational paradigm may be owed to some extent to the realization that the organization could not pursue its ambitions of a literacy campaign to the extent its Director-General and many of its member states would have liked to see. The United States and some of the Western countries disliked literacy because of its socialist flair. It further lacked appeal because its universal approach was not geared towards economic growth. Literacy continued to be a UNESCO priority for a while, and the concept still persists in developing countries, also in the form of large-scale campaigns (Hanemann, 2015), but it has increasingly disappeared from the education discourse in industrialized countries and at the global level.[34]

---

[34] UNESCO's most recent initiative to advance the literacy agenda was the United Nations Literacy Decade (UNLD), launched by the UN for the years 2003-2012. The UN charged UNESCO with the coordination of the UNLD, which was shaped to some extent by the United States after their return to UNESCO in 2002 (Limage, 2007). The White House Conference of Global Literacy, held in 2006, started off a series of six high-level regional conferences in support of Global Literacy, which were held between 2007 and 2008. These conferences focused on "good practice models" in four areas, namely mother-child literacy and intergenerational learning, literacy for health and literacy for economic self-sufficiency (UNESCO, 2007, p. 1). The UNLD was from its very beginning understaffed and underfinanced (Limage, 2007, p. 454) and stayed in the shadow of the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD). The UNLD would be an interesting case study in that, I would argue, it promoted a "depoliticized" form of literacy.

While the concept of human capital gained ground in global educational planning and development, *éducation permanente* developed into UNESCO's flagship paradigm. Those two concepts did not have much to say to each other. Human capital was strictly an economic paradigm; *éducation permanente* represented a worldview and philosophy. The concept was rooted in a French Enlightenment tradition of critique towards the established order. Having emerged from the claims of the *Résistance* movement, it pursued the democratization of education and the opening up of more participatory pathways. It had several facets: As the name *Peuple et Culture* reveals, the concept had a strong cultural and citizenship dimension, aiming at connecting people to their cultural and intellectual traditions and empowering them to actively work towards a better society. The cultural component also dominated the Council of Europe's use of the concept (Kallen, 1979, p. 51). Moreover, *éducation permanente* had a strong vocational dimension, as represented by the *complexe de Nancy*, which pursued stronger connections between education and work and promoted collaboration of universities and industries with the aim of addressing the challenge of "supply and demand" between the workforce and its employers. *Éducation permanente* embodied the dissatisfaction of wide circles of society with the insufficiencies of the selective and hierarchical traditional education system. In both movements, *Peuple et Culture* and the *complexe de Nancy*, *éducation permanente* stood for a greater democratization of education. In *Peuple et Culture* the aspect of cultural democracy prevailed, while the activities of the *complexe de Nancy* were more work-related. *Éducation permanente* also showed traces of existentialist philosophy, in terms of questioning the established order, the focus on the "human condition," and the idea of the responsibility of human beings for their actions. Despite its many facets, *éducation permanente* was more of a "'strategy of social action'…with little reference to the economic dimension" (Kallen, 1979, p. 51). It is therefore no surprise that Edgar Faure consistently pointed out tensions between the UNESCO approach and the new economic thinking. As will become clear in the next chapter, Faure was fully aware that the human capital approach constituted a serious challenge to the human rights approach. For him, a focus on the human being as a factor of production and economic growth countered the idea of education as an inalienable right to which human beings were entitled on the basis of their "humanness."

The theorists of human capital were American economists, while the masterminds of *éducation permanente* in UNESCO were French intellectuals and politicians who had been highly implicated in educational developments in France. Both chairmen of the commissions that produced UNESCO's flagship education reports, Edgar Faure and Jacques Delors, had been instrumental in the political staging of the concept. Against this background, Maheu's pushback and the dichotomy he built up between UNESCO's approach to education and the economic perspective may have something to do with the "Franco-Anglo" conflict that I already referred to in earlier chapters and that some of my interviewees emphasized.

In the next chapter I will turn to the *Faure report* that sought to establish *éducation permanente* as the new global educational paradigm. Much of the worldview encountered in the early debates in UNESCO and in the *Résistance* movement, such as the universality of all human beings, humanism, the idea of the "new man," the break with elitist and bourgeois education and the critique of the school will re-emerge in the *Faure report*. When I wrote earlier that literacy was perceived as too political, I did not mean to say that lifelong education was not. UNESCO's humanistic concept of lifelong education, as put forward in the *Faure report*, was very much a political claim, which subsequently also came under pressure from the economic principle.

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the report *Learning to be* (the *Faure report*), which UNESCO published in 1972. It constituted an ambitious endeavor as it was the first time the organization launched a report setting out a vision for the future of education globally. The report marks an important milestone in the history of lifelong learning in UNESCO, in that it saught to establish lifelong education as the new global "master concept." At the time of the report, the concept of lifelong education had already become part of the mainstream in educational thinking, in parallel with similar concepts such as recurrent education or "permanent education" that were used by governments and other international organizations.[35] The third International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA III) was held in 1972 (prior to the launch of the report) under the theme "Adult Education in the Context of Lifelong Education." The "learning society" had become a fashionable concept in educational circles (Grattan, 1955; McGhee, 1959; Thomas, 1963; Hutchins, 1968; Husén, 1974), in line with the proliferation of utopian literature designing societal visions, such as Drucker's *The Age of Discontinuity* (1968), Etzioni's *The Active Society* (1968) or Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* (1970). I will argue that the report acted as a catalytic agent that triggered scholarly engagement with lifelong learning to the present day. It is worthwhile to take a closer look at the *Faure report* – and, in the next chapter, its successor, the *Delors report* – because they are symbolic documents that have been negotiated among actors representing different cultures, ideologies and political systems in order to find a universal meaning for education and endow this meaning with legitimacy and authority. Therefore, they are windows into the ideological struggles that were carried out at their time. They tell us a great deal not only about the beliefs and ideologies of the people involved, but also about the "competing" ideologies the reports were reacting too. They also give us some insights into the shifting

---

[35] These parallel concepts were also mentioned in the *Faure report* as they were part of the educational discourse at the time.

position of UNESCO in the system of international organizations and multilateral development.

The *Faure report* provides a window into the late 1960s and early 1970s, which constituted a defining moment for the world in general, and for UNESCO in particular. In those years the confrontation of divergent ideologies and worldviews played out particularly strongly. *Éducation permanente* represented an educational paradigm related to the welfare state that came under attack from market ideology. Those years were also significant as developing countries pushed for a fairer distribution of resources in terms of better conditions for trade and development assistance and more control over capital flows. In the 1970s the world stood at a crossroads, and the *Faure report* reads like a utopian vision of what the world could have looked like had it not fallen under the total hegemony of the market.

This chapter will discuss the rationale behind the report and its main messages and situate it among the other literature on lifelong education at the time. It will examine the main intellectual currents that influenced the report and the reactions it received. I will argue that the report was to some extent a French endeavor, infused by the French Enlightenment tradition, political claims of the *Résistance*, existentialism and other intellectual movements prevailing in France. The report was shaped by the "dilemmas" of the individuals involved, such as the tension between "efficiency and freedom" (Suchodolski, 1976, p. 90) and the dichotomy between the "humanistic" and the "economic" worldviews that so concerned Edgar Faure. Critics of lifelong learning feared that the concept could be put at the service of the principle of "efficiency." Although governments and educationists in principle welcomed the notion of lifelong education, the "maximalist" version of lifelong learning in terms of a new "social contract" was at odds with the rising influence of the utilitarian perspective of educational planning, which called for a more practical approach.

Implementation of the Commission

At its 84th session, held from 4 May to 19 June 1970, UNESCO's Executive Board authorized René Maheu to establish the *International Commission on the Development of Education*, which it mandated to produce a report on the future of education. In early 1971 Edgar Faure was appointed chairman of the Commission. As

already outlined in the last chapter, Faure had been appointed French Minister of Education shortly after the May uprisings, and he was responsible for the 1968 *loi Faure*, which aimed at reforming the French university system. The May 1968 crisis had left a lasting impression on him, and he referred to these events in his preamble to the *Faure report* (Faure et al., 1972, p. xx). In a speech he delivered before the *Assemblée nationale*, the French Parliament, Faure placed the university reforms in the context of broader societal change. Criticizing those who denigrated the students as revolutionaries, he expressed his understanding of the students' rejection of "the Napoleonic conception of a centralized and authoritarian university" (Marek, 2010, p. 81; my translation), compared the students' aspirations to those of the colonized peoples (p. 81), and welcomed their protests as a chance to change society in order to avoid "social alienation" (p. 83).

Including Edgar Faure, the *International Commission on the Development of Education* was composed of seven members: Felipe Herrera from Chile, an economist and first President of the Inter-American Development Bank; Abdoul-Razzak Kaddoura, a nuclear scientist from Syria; Henri Lopes, Education Minister from 1969 to 1972 and later Prime Minister of the Republic of Congo; Arthur V. Petrovsky, Member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the Academy of Educational Science of the USSR; Frederick Champion Ward of the Ford Foundation, USA; and Majid Rahnema, who had just resigned as Minister of Higher Education and Sciences in Iran. Asher Deleon, a national of Yugoslavia, held the position of secretary of the Commission, and he played a crucial role in the organization of the work. Deleon was a friend of Paul Lengrand's and a man Lengrand greatly admired as "one of the richest personalities I ever had the privilege to deal with" (Lengrand, 1994, p. 108; my translation). Lengrand called him "un communiste de bon aloi" ("the right kind of communist," or a "genuine communist"), who had done tremendous service to the UNESCO education sector (p. 109). Deleon came from the Yugoslav trade union movement. Maheu appointed him to supervise the work of John Bowers on the fundamental education program, and Deleon

went on to manage the EWLP. He was instrumental in shaping the concept of functional literacy, which underpinned the EWLP (Jones, 1988, pp. 142; 148).[36]

In the letter accompanying the submission of the report to René Maheu, Edgar Faure recapitulated the four basic assumptions on which the Commission grounded its work: First, "which was indeed the justification for the task we undertook, is that of the existence of an international community…of different nations and cultures [but]…common aspirations," which called for the "fundamental solidarity of governments and of peoples" (Faure et al., 1972, p. vi). Second, the "belief in democracy, conceived of as implying each man's right to realize his own potential," of which education was the "keystone" (p. vi). Third, "that the aim of development is the complete fulfillment of man, in all the richness of his personality" (p. vi), and fourth, only "lifelong education" could form the "complete man," who needed to "learn to be" (p. vi). These basic assumptions formulated by Faure recall some of the key pillars of UNESCO's humanism: The "unity in diversity" approach, the belief in the ability of human beings to shape their world, the promotion of democracy and the idea that the human potential needed to be brought to the fore through education, in order to yield the "complete man." The reference to "learning to be" underscored the focus of lifelong education on the "human condition."

The Commission based its work on a large number (Rahnema, 1987, spoke of 100) of papers provided by experts on different aspects of education[37] and on fact-finding

---

[36] Years after the *Faure report*, Deleon served as the secretary of another eminent Commission, the McBride Commission, which in 1980 published the report *Many voices one world* (the *McBride report*) on communications and mass media. The report proposed a New World Communication and Information Order (NWCIO), which the Americans fiercely criticized as an attack on the "freedom of the press." The crisis over the report led to the withdrawal of the United States and the United Kingdom.

[37] The selective compilation of the background papers (UNESCO, 1975) reads like the Who's Who of personalities in education, lifelong learning and development at the time. Authors included experts of *éducation permanente*, lifelong education and the "learning society," such as Torsten Husén, Paul Lengrand, Joseph Rovan, Bogdan Suchodolski and Bertrand Schwartz, development economists such as Richard Jolly, Louis Malassis and Gunnar Myrdal (Myrdral's papers were titled "Formal education serves the privileged few" and "For an integrated education") and educational planners such as Philip Coombs and Michel Debeauvais (both had served as directors of the IIEP). A. H. Halsey, the British sociologist of education, who had served as rapporteur of the OECD's 1961 "Ability and educational opportunity" conference, contributed two papers on "Can education contribute to changing society?" and "To what extent is education a factor of social stratification and equality of opportunity?" Some of the authors

missions carried out by members of the commission to 23 countries.[38] It also visited international organizations and invited experts to its meetings. The *Faure report* constituted "an enormous investment in terms of time and money" (Interview with Henri Lopes). *Learning to be* was published in 1972, about 14 months after the Commission had taken up its work.

Key Messages of the *Faure Report*

The *Faure report* had a political-philosophical character in that it tied educational ideas to the overall development of society, to equality and to democracy as a social and political system. It had several key messages: The report proclaimed *Éducation permanente* – "lifelong education" in English – as the "new educational master concept for both developed and developing countries" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 182). Faure pointed to the great change that lifelong education entailed, in that education no longer constituted an "initiation" given to the privileged few, which provided them with the guarantee of a superior and better paid employment. Lifelong education stood for a "real democratization of the instruments of knowledge" – a claim for which, he believed, the

---

were members of the Faure Commission (Majid Rahnema, Felipe Herrera and Arthur Petrovsky) or associated with UNESCO such as Herbert Lionel Elvin who had served as Assistant Director-General for Education from 1950-1956. Others had written previous studies for the organization such as A. P. Dayar from India who had co-authored a study on "Education and Employment" that UNESCO published in 1971. Some authors were former Education Ministers, such as the Tunisian writer and philosopher Mahmoud Messadi, Education Minister in Tunisia from 1958 to 1968, or Henri Janne, the former Belgian Education Minister who later authored the European Commission's "Janne report," a kind of EC response to the *Faure report*. Paul Goodman, Everett Reimer, Ivan Illich and Paulo Freire represented the "radical voices" – Freire contributed papers on "For a dialectical relation between the educator and the educatee" and "Neutral education does not exist." All world regions were covered, the French and francophones forming the biggest group. Also several Russian and Eastern European scholars were represented, such as the Czech educator Jiří Kotásek. It is noticeable that the only two Americans among the authors were the school critics Paul Goodman and Everett Reimer. The section on "Relations between education and the economy" included a paper on "human resources planning" and education as an investment by Michel Debeauvais who in 1962 had contributed a paper on "the concept of human capital" for a UNESCO publication on "Economics of Education" (UNESCO, 1962). Otherwise the human capital theorists were notably absent. Also several institutions such as the UNESCO Institute for Education contributed papers.

[38] Algeria, Cameroon, Chile, Cuba, Arab Republic of Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Peru, Senegal, Singapore, Sweden, Tanzania, USSR, United Kingdom, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zaire (Faure et al., 1972, p. 271).

Commission would "encounter the opposition" of groups that could be called the *élitistes* and the *archaïques* (UNESCO, 1972a, p. 18). The report advocated for a "learning society" – *cité éducative* in the French original – a reference to the Greek *polis*, the ideal society of citizens aimed towards the common good. But in contrast to Ancient Greece, the learning society proposed by the Faure Commission would provide education not only to the privileged elites, but learning opportunities for all throughout life, inside and outside of institutions. This education system − or rather, "un-system" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 161) – would do justice to "the entire human being in all his dimensions, which are far too vast and complex to be contained within the limits of any 'system,' in the static, non-evolutional meaning of the word" (p. 161). The concept of the "polis," the city with its "immense educational potential" (p. 162) underscored the idea that all sectors of society should contribute to the learning of citizens.[39] Citing a paragraph from Hutchins' (1968) book *The Learning Society*, the *Faure report* referred to the Greek concept of *Paideia*, which was often evoked in the literature on lifelong learning, including in the background reports to the *Faure report* (e.g. Goodman, in UNESCO, 1975, p. 18). The ancient Greeks used the notion of *paideia* to denote not only skills and knowledge, but wisdom, character formation and the "education of the soul." Its meaning was also tied to the role citizens had to play in their *polis* – an idea which resonated with the "responsibility" of individuals to actively contribute to shaping their society (Hancock, 1987), which constituted a recurrent theme in the debates of UNESCO's foundational years and also in the *Résistance* and post-war movements and existential literature.

In Athens, education played a key role in society in order to bring about the ideal citizen. But, as Hutchins pointed out in the cited paragraph, the education of the few was made possible through slavery. In that respect the continued references of the lifelong learning theorists to ancient Greece is problematic as *Paideia* represented an elitist humanism for the few and the privileged. This was a marked difference to the *Faure report* with its vision of a real democratization of education. At the time of the *Faure report*, many hoped that the use of machines would bring leisure into the lives of all people, which would enable them to devote more time to the "learning of fulfillment"

---

[39] This idea is still alive in UNESCO in the "Learning Cities" program. See http://learningcities.uil.unesco.org/home

(Faure et al., 1972, p. 162). The notion of *Paideia* in the report emphasized the priority placed on the ethical purpose of education, as opposed to the technical purpose. The idea of the learning society challenged the traditional education system, in particular the school system, and the report declared that "the old idea that schooling is the only valid education and that the time for learning is limited to traditional school age …is fundamentally unjust" (p. 44). Although the *Faure report* accepted the school as the foundation of the education system, it called for a critical reconsideration of the school, which needed to become less elitist, promote a more holistic education, including intellectual and practical skills, and be more relevant to people's lives. The school system excluded the "hundreds of millions of illiterate people" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 44) and young people who had never gone to school or had dropped out of school. It also "acts as a sieve…with an eye to selecting the future élite" (p. 59). The *Faure report* was situated in a broader UNESCO-led debate on school failure at the time. Based on an international inquiry, the June 1972 issue of the *UNESCO Courier* focused on the topic of "school drop-outs and the social background of students," as did the 1971 International Conference on Education held at the International Bureau of Education in Geneva.

The report further called for "solidarity" with developing countries. Alongside the claim for a more equal participation in education went the demand for "equitable redistribution" (p. 49) of other material and immaterial resources, such as scientific knowledge and technologies between developed and developing countries. The Commission favoured "endogenous development," the idea promoted by the Non-Aligned movement's New International Economic Order (NIEO), which entailed structural changes of the world monetary system and of international trade, such as the right of developing countries to regulate the activities of multinational corporations on their territory. The *Faure report* made a point of not viewing developing countries in isolation from industrialized countries. It emphasized the "universal nature" of education (Faure et al., 1972, p. xxvii), and it raised the problem that developing countries copied the education system from the model of their former colonizers, which the report considered "elitist" (p. xxvii) as it failed to provide access to higher education to "working-class pupils" (p. xxviii).

The Influence of Critical Theory and "Humanist Radicalism"

In the discussions of the founders of UNESCO, the call for the democratization of education was tied to better international understanding among the peoples of the world. Against the backdrop of the experience of the Holocaust and the Second World War, their main aspiration was to ensure peace. While in the foundational years the idealistic Enlightenment humanism prevailed, which saw in education the means for human emancipation, *éducation permanente* took a more political stance, influenced by critical theory, that viewed education also as a means of exercising power. *Éducation permanente* entailed an awareness of education as a means of oppression and therefore took a critical perspective on the institution of the school (Lengrand, 1994, p. 113). Lengrand (1970) emphasized the political agenda of lifelong education:

> Our recipe for improving the structures and conditions of individual
> and social life was determinedly…political. We thought of situations
> and problems in terms of power and more specifically in terms of the
> assumption of power. Since the obstacles lay in the structures and
> institutions of an outdated society where disorder and privilege were
> rife, the only solution we could see was to change society. (p. 5)

Majid Rahnema brought the work of Paulo Freire, Ivan Illich, Paul Goodman and Everett Reimer into the Commission (Interview with Henri Lopes; Rahnema, 1987).[40] This group formed a network of highly inter-related people who shared a critical attitude towards education and an interest in Latin America. The circle speaks to the informal relations and affinities that preceded the formal work of the commission and had an impact on its work. Rahnema was a friend and admirer of Ilich.[41]Like Freire, Illich was associated with Latin American Liberation Theology. An Austrian national and Catholic priest, Illich had spent large parts of his life in Cuernavaca in Mexico where in 1961 he founded a centre that offered language training to American missionaries and volunteers who came to Latin America in the context of Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" program, in which Paulo Freire was also involved in Brazil. Illich became a severe critic

---

[40] Rahnema later became a staunch critic of what Illich called "development as planned poverty" (Rahnema & Bawtree, 1997, p. xiv).
[41] See the conversation between Rahnema and Illich, *Twenty-six years later*, in Rahnema & Bawtree, 1977, pp. 103-111.

of American missionaries and of cultural and economic hegemony. In his 1968 speech "To Hell with Good Intentions"[42]he argued that the "Alliance for Progress" program "has created ideal conditions for military dictatorships." His book *Deschooling Society* (Illich, 1971), provided a critique of the institutionalized school system that in his view created workers for the economy but stood in the way of true learning. He proposed self-directed and informal learning based on social relations. Another critic of the school system was Everett Reimer, author of *School is Dead* (Reimer, 1971), who had also worked as a volunteer for the "Alliance for Progress" program and who became a close collaborator of Illich's in Cuernavaca. Illich referred to Reimer in the introduction to *Deschooling Society*. Illich, Freire, Reimer and Paul Goodman, who also belonged to Illich's circle of friends,[43]provided background papers to the *Faure report* (UNESCO, 1975). Illich was quite influential among intellectuals in France in the early 1970s, especially in the ecological movement (Flood & Bell, 1997, pp. 142-143). In his report about the CONFINTEA III conference, Garrett (1972) observed that the influence of the "more radical educational critics (Holt, Illich, Goodman and the like)" (p. 7) showed itself most strongly in the French delegation.

In the 1970s, in the aftermath of the student revolutions, many sections of society called into question the existing order. Erich Fromm (1969), writing about Ivan Illich, referred to the spirit of that time as "humanist radicalism" – "characterized by the motto: *de omnibus dubitandum*; everything must be doubted, particularly the ideological concepts which are virtually shared by everybody and have consequently assumed the role of indubitable commonsensical axioms" (pp. 7-8). In the words of Henri Lopes, "all taboos were broken, there were no certainties…and what had to be done is asking questions, asking ourselves good questions while being attentive to the world evolutions" (Interview with Henri Lopes, my translation). Lifelong education signified the end of what Paulo Freire (1970) called the "banking" model of education, in which the teacher represented the authority and filled the passive and submissive student with knowledge. In an interview, Majid Rahnema, one of the Commissioners of the report, described the

---

[42] Available at http://www.swaraj.org/illich_hell.htm

[43] See Susan Sontag's reminiscence of Paul Goodman, *Paul Goodman changed my life* http://www.paulgoodmanfilm.com/about-paul-goodman/susan-sontag

context in which the report came about as follows:

> Two years before you had all the great events in France, in 1968. In 1965 you had the Major World Conference of Ministers of Education on literacy.[44]Between these two dates you had all these different challenges that were made to the whole educational enterprise in the world. Books like Paulo Freire, Paul Goodmann, Everett Reimer, Ivan Illich. So there was a general questioning of this whole educational process. So both developing and developed countries were eager to find some new answers to what they were doing, particularly the developing countries were obliged to spend tremendous sums of money, some countries were spending 30 per cent of their budget on education...So this evidently prompted the General Conference to see what could be done and what new ideas eventually could come out of an exploration of the problem. (Rahnema, 1987)[45]

The importance the Commission attached to the student movements is underscored by the fact that one of the five sessions held by the Commission was dedicated to a discussion with students. Three "individual" students from Senegal, France and the United States and four representatives of international student federations participated in the session. The students and the Commissioners discussed at length what democratization of education meant to them, in quantitative and qualitative terms. The students raised issues such as the "increasing irrelevance" of the university as well as the school. The American student, Thomas Forstenzer, declared:

> School is…a fearsome institution in which people are graded on their competitiveness, on invidious comparisons between one student and another, rather than in terms of a student's personal development, and all that is related to the essential question of why the control of education is placed in the hands of those who do the teaching rather

---

[44] Rahnema is referring to the 1965 World Literacy Conference in Tehran, where Maheu officially announced the EWLP.

[45] The page number is missing as this is a video interview. Rahnema makes this statement at the beginning of the interview.

than those who do the learning. (Commission internationale sur le développement de l'éducation, 1971, p. 9)

The participants insisted that education should be bound up with the overall development of society, and that it should be tied, but not subordinated to the economy. Michel Jouet, the Secretary-General of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, stated: "The notion of educational investment is erroneous insofar as it posits…the notion of profitability….That necessarily implies a politics of social selectivity" (p. 14; my translation).

The students mentioned several times that they considered the right to education a part of their fight against "imperialism" (p. 13). It is difficult to determine what exactly they meant by that term but the context of the conversation referred to the dependency of the Latin American countries on "American imperialism" that hindered their own capitalist development and to the problematic labels of "developed" and "under-developed" countries. Michel Jouet gave the example of Cuba as a country commonly classified as "under-developed" although it had "abolished illiteracy" and possessed a high-quality education system. The participants frequently brought up the Cuban literacy campaign as a positive example of an attempt to democratize education. The Commission was well aware of the Cuban educational efforts as some of the members had travelled there. The name of Paulo Freire was often mentioned in the discussions as well. The students frequently drifted into a reflection on the capitalist system vis-à-vis the "Marxist-Leninist" system, and Forstenzer argued that both systems manipulated their citizens: "This [manipulation "by an intellectual elite, which is the party cadre"] does not differ very much from the system of a capitalist society, in which education itself is a manipulative system, in which certain industrial and economic needs are met…" (p. 42). Although Edgar Faure tried to cut off the discussion about the two competing economic systems saying that it was not the role of the Commission to decide which system was better (p. 41), he did not succeed, and Majid Rahnema argued that "Marx was one of the biggest humanists that ever lived in the sense that he put the economy at the service of the human being, not the other way around" (p. 45). Rahnema also raised the spirit of contestation and the importance of putting everything into question. In his view, people

had to find a way of liberating themselves from the "ideological ties that we sometimes consider sacred without debating them" (p. 45; my translation).

A Sense of Crisis

In economic terms, the late 1960s and early 1970s were still characterized by prosperity and rising incomes, which is why Hobsbawm (1996) referred to that time as the "golden age." Standards of living rose in an unprecedented fashion, and in the 1960s unemployment in West Europe stood at 1.5 per cent (p. 259). Explosive economic growth paired with a technological revolution within the parameters of the welfare state explained why education was reformed towards tapping the potential of social classes that had previously not participated in public life and economic prosperity. During the "golden age" *laissez-faire* economics was not a consideration: "Certain policy objectives – full employment, the containment of communism, the modernization of lagging or declining or ruined economies – had absolute priority and justified the strongest government presence" (p. 272). That the "new technologies were, overwhelmingly, …labour-saving, or even labour-replacing" was not noticed until after the boom came to an end (p. 266). However, towards the late 1960s many perceived a sense of crisis insofar as the unlimited belief in progress had dissipated, and the *Faure report* identified not only a "crisis of education," but also a "crisis of authority" and "of international cooperation." After the post-war period when societies welcomed economic development as a means of reconstructing societies, people became more aware of its downside. Publications such as the 1972 Club of Rome's *Meadows report*, *Limits to growth*, sold 30 million copies and captured the somewhat apocalyptic mood of that time. The *Meadows report*, which is cited in the *Faure report* (1972, p. 97), predicted ongoing population growth and warned of the environmental risks of economic development, which could not continue indefinitely without considerable risks for humanity and the planet. It greatly contributed to propelling the "green" movement and the founding of environmental parties, clubs and non-governmental organizations in the Western world. Other examples of that kind of literature were the second report to the Club of Rome, *Mankind at the Turning Point* (1974), and *Only One Earth* (Ward & Dubos, 1972), written for the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment.

In their paper on the ideological influences of the *Faure* and *Delors reports*, Lee and Friedrich (2011) demonstrated that the major underpinnings of the *Faure report* consisted of a blend of classical liberalism, social democratic liberalism, and radical social democratic ideas, which show traces of Marxism. Marxism exerted a strong influence on intellectual life in France at the time, and many French philosophers such as Sartre developed their thinking in contest with Marxism. The psychologist Erich Fromm, another member of the circle around Ivan Illich,[46]who is cited in the *Faure report* several times, attempted to combine existentialism and Marxism in his work. Although these doctrines depart from very different worldviews (existentialism assumes that human existence is absurd and meaningless; Marxism holds a rational worldview, in which the reality can be explained), they bear similarities, in particular their concern about "alienation" in modern societies and how it can be overcome. Another similarity consisted in the idea that social, economic and cultural conditions enable human beings to unleash their full creative potential, which is the premise of lifelong education (Wain, 1987, p. 84). According to Finger and Asún (2001), "philosophically, éducation permanente combines a Marxist analysis of history with a humanistic vision" (p. 23). The *Faure report* exuded a rational-scientific worldview and situated itself in the UNESCO tradition of "scientific humanism" as a universalizing concept in terms of "integrating science into…traditional cultures, …integrating universal thought into…national life" (p. 91).

The report also reflected the interest in existential philosophy of the time, as well as the idea of social justice and the morality of human rights for all the people of the world, including the Third World. The existentialist-Marxist concept of "alienation" consistently emerged in the report, for example in relation to the challenges that human beings faced by living in an age of a "scientific-technological revolution" which bore the risk of enslaving human beings to machines (Faure et al., 1972, p. xxvi). Edgar Faure stressed this point before the Executive Board when he said that he believed that the development of intelligent machines that were able to "immediately transmit a thought" constituted one of the big "historical leaps." He recalled a conversation with a colleague

---

[46] Fromm had also been an influence on Paulo Freire. It was Illich who introduced Freire and Fromm to each other at Cuernavaca (Braune, 2014, p. 44).

who had denied the ability of machines to think to whom Faure responded, "I admit that machines don't think, but it's a good imitation" (UNESCO, 1972a, p. 17). Faure believed that the immediate transfer of thoughts held a tremendous risk of conditioning human beings and a big threat to democracy. In his view, technological development was a driving force behind the transfer of education to developing countries, because "if the industrialized countries have not been able to immediately transfer their prosperity, they can transmit immediately their messages" (p. 17). The concern about the problematic "transmission of messages" in the era of mass communication and mass media from industrialized to developing countries stood at the heart of the MacBride Commission that UNESCO established about a decade later, provoking a storm of indignation that created a major crisis for the organization.

Technologization and the dichotomy between the "humanistic" and "economic" approaches to education were among the most prominent themes in the *Faure report*, and they were themes that preoccupied Edgar Faure personally. In his book *Ce que je crois* ("What I believe") (Faure, 1971), Faure laid out his educational beliefs and his thought process that led to the 1968 *loi Faure*. The main challenges he formulated with regard to education centred on the machination and technologization of human beings in a disembodied "technostructure" (p. 203) – he cited George Orwell's *1984* (p. 35) – and to an approach to education, which he called *économiste* or *mercantiliste*. He categorized this approach as being "*moderniste sans être humaniste*" ("modernist without being humanist") (p. 213), because it focused on the close relation between education and economic development (p. 213). Faure questioned the term "capital" when referring to human beings and pointed to the relationship of the word "capital" to *"cheptel"* (French for cattle, a word related to capital, although the main etymological meaning of capital is head). In his view, the danger represented by the technocratic and economic approach required the emergence of a "new man" *("l'homme nouveau")* (p. 203) endowed with the capacity to understand the world in which he/she lives, to take decisions and maintain autonomy that would allow him or her to resist the instrumentalization inherent in the development of society (pp. 203-205). Faure juxtaposed the "human capital" approach to Bertrand Schwartz' notion of the adult as an "agent of change" (Faure, 1971, p. 214; Schwartz, 1968, p. 36). Although he believed that it might be possible to collaborate with

the economists, he argued that "the ideological barrier remains" (Faure, 1971, p. 214). He ascribed the "May explosion" to the assaults planned by the "technocrat economists" (pp. 214-215), and he saw a compromise between the humanistic and the economic tensions in a "new social contract," which would entail "preserving the remarkable resources offered by the liberal economy and use them for truly socialist purposes" (p. 220; my translation). The "new social contract" was an idea Faure developed in a book of that name, *Pour un nouveau contrat social* (1973), in which he laid out – drawing on Rousseau – a *"société des acquêts"* ("society of gain") in which the surplus produced by capitalism would be spent to the benefit of those in need. He also elaborated on his critique of the *"techno-bureaucratie,"* which he considered a threat to a just society, and the alienating effects of machines (p. 36). Faure's fixation with technologization and technocratic bureaucracy possibly originated with his experiences during the French occupation and also at the Nuremberg Trials in which he participated as one of the French prosecutors. According to his biographer, this period had an important impact on his life and "marked a widening of a collective consciousness of humanity" (Krakovitch, 2006, pp. 31-32; my translation), an idea reminiscent of John Thompson's statements. Similar to Faure, Thompson's experiences at the Nuremberg Trials had given rise to a deep concern about any kind of instrumentalization of human beings. The close confrontation with Nazi technocracy induced a profound skepticism of instrumental approaches that were not driven by a social and humanist ethic.

The concept of alienation has been taken up by other lifelong education pioneers such as Bogdan Suchodolski (1976). He referred to Greek tragedy and the idea that human beings needed to have the courage to take decisions that would have dramatic consequences for their lives. The Greek idea of tragic guilt tied to the notion of freedom needed to be restored in the idea that human beings must take responsibility for their actions (pp. 87-88; Wain, 1987, pp. 84-85). This idea represented a direct continuity between Greek philosophy, the Enlightenment and the ideas of existentialist philosophy. Suchodolski (1976) argued that the future of human civilization depended on the balance of the "interrelationship between efficiency and freedom – the ideals of modern man" (p. 90). While many believed that greater efficiency in terms of the use of machines and computers would lead to more freedom, he emphasized that "human work exceeded

'functionality'" and that "for human beings motives and aspirations are important, as opposed to the world of things, which are mere mechanisms fulfilling certain precisely defined functions" (p. 91). This tension between functionality and freedom represented for Suchodolski "the basic problem of modern humanism" (p. 93), and he saw the role of lifelong education as contributing to the balance between these two contrasting concepts (p. 92). Lifelong education denoted for him "the most important factor of liberation, of courage, of a true life…which is complete in itself and free from the influence of utilitarianism" (p. 94). It offered a means to prevent the spectre of the "one-dimensional man" (a reference to Marcuse's book of 1964), who "needs hardly any education, since the guiding principles of his life are governed solely by the criteria of efficiency" (p. 74).

The *Faure report* was more than an educational strategy – to some extent it represented a humanist manifesto that mirrored the *Weltanschauung* at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s. On the one hand it was an optimistic document, reflecting confidence that the "new society" envisioned by the revolutionary spirit of that time, would come true. The new generation, the first to be born after the war, demanded a real break with the past in terms of a democratization of society. On the other hand a spirit of crisis was noticeable in the fear that instrumental and technocratic forces would enslave human beings and deprive them of their freedom and capacity to act. The risk was palpable that the spirit of inquiry – doubting everything and "asking the right questions" – would be crowded out by a spirit of control. While on the one hand the work of the Commissioners was truly remarkable in that they succeeded in capturing the spirit of their time and putting themselves at the service of a vision of a better society, on the other hand the report makes it all too clear that they were representatives of a patriarchal society and that half of the population – the female population – was eclipsed from their worldview.

Progressivity with a Blind Spot

While being in many ways a very progressive document, the *Faure report* was oblivious to the issue of gender equality. The report used the term "man" throughout. Majid Rahnema, in an interview he gave in 1987, apologized for using the word "man" which, he said, was used at the time to denote both men and women: "We were products of a school system that told us that man was also woman" (Rahnema, 1987). The only specific mention of women in the report was the reference to the "status of women" as

"one of the problems facing people today" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 64). The few archival sources still available in UNESCO's archives on the *Faure report* did not reveal whether UNESCO made any attempts to include a woman in the Commission (in the case of the Delors Commission, the secretariat drew up separate lists of potential female members) – Margaret Mead comes to mind as a potential candidate – but as a large part of the archives have been destroyed, I have no way of verifying this for sure. Also the list of authors of the background reports does not contain the names of any women (although a few women at the time worked in the domain of education and development, such as Alva Myrdal, who had been Director of UNESCO's Social Sciences sector between 1950 and 1955, and Barbara Ward), nor did the Commission invite any women to its meetings. This total void is not particularly surprising in the late 1960s. But the report would have been even more impressive and forward-looking if the Commission had been more avant-garde on this matter. As Voltaire said, cited by Sternhell (2010), "every man is formed by his age…very few raise themselves above the manners and morals of their time" (p. 33). It is significant to note that other authors showed a greater awareness of gendered terms, such as the adult educator Roby Kidd who referred to "the education of men and women" (1966, p. 22), or F. W. Jessup who referred to "different phases in the life of a man or a woman" (1969, p. 25). At CONFINTEA II, held in 1960, the "education of women" was a major item on the agenda (UNESCO, n.d.b, p. 40). It is only since 1975 that the UN and UNESCO started celebrating International Women's Day, and the United Nations Decade for Women 1976-1985 was the decade when the matter of the equal status of women gained prominence in the UN. As Sluga (2007, p. 59) pointed out, UNESCO has since its inception shown little interest in the issue of gender equality although it clearly falls within its mandate. Instead it put its main emphasis on the issue of race, arguing for the equality of all cultures and ethnic groups and for the abolishment of the concept of race. The current Director-General, Irina Bokova, represents the first woman to hold this position. To this date none of the 21 Assistant Directors-General for Education was a woman, except for Aïcha Bah Diallo, who served as Acting ADG between 2001 and 2005, and the proportion of women in the other sectors does not look much different.

One of the key concepts of the *Faure report* is the gender-biased term of the "complete man." The use of this term, which seems very outmoded from today's vantage

point, can be partly explained by the common usage of "man" to denote both genders at that time, as justified by Majid Rahnema. But more importantly, I would like to point to the fact that the report was drafted in French, and the French language – still today – widely uses "homme" for men and women. Given its linguistic conservatism, France has been largely immune to opening the French language to gendered terms as Canada has done. For example, in France the translation of the notion of human rights is "les droits de l'homme," while francophone Canadians speak of "les droits de la personne." The translation between English and French in UNESCO persistently provoked conflicts, in which the rivalry between the Latin and Anglo-American groups played out. Morel (2010) refers to a controversy that ensued over the translation of a publication on social sciences and humanities where the "Latin group" (which she calls *"clan latin"*) insisted on the English translation as "science of man," literally translated from the French term *"sciences de l'homme,"* which is a heritage of the French Enlightenment philosophers. The "Anglo-Saxon group (*"clan anglo-saxon"*) insisted on the term "social sciences," which reflected the contemporary trends in Anglo-American research (p. 165). Under René Maheu's term the Anglo-Saxon group had a hard time asserting its linguistic interests as Maheu placed greatest importance on the consistent use of the French language in UNESCO, as did the French government (p. 165).

The "Complete Man:" Placing the Individual at the Centre

The *Faure report* reflected the spirit of the late 1960s and early 1970s, when a cosmopolitan vision of global justice emerged as a call for a new social contract that not only involved states but "everyone everywhere" (Moyn, 2013), in which "persons [and not states] are the ultimate subjects of international morality" (Moyn, 2013, citing Charles Beitz). In accordance with this Zeitgeist, the 1970s saw the mushrooming of NGOs and civil society organizations with a human rights agenda (Moyn, 2010). Lifelong education as a "master concept" was meant "for both developed and developing countries, for the whole of humanity – that is where the human right is implicit" (Interview with Ravindra Dave). In his address to the Commissioners at their first session, Maheu stressed the democratization of education, which was not any longer the "privilege of an élite," but the right of everyone (UNESCO, 1971b, p. 2).

Lifelong education was related to this new social contract, which emphasized the development of the individual: "The matter was really to form a human being capable of reading the society, the world, and of adapting to the big evolutions that were announcing themselves" (Interview with Henri Lopes; my translation). Rahnema also pointed out that, "it is a concrete man, …not an abstract man…who is the object of education" (UNESCO, 1971a, p. 45; my translation). Lifelong education was at the heart of "learning societies," in which the focus was not anymore on schooling, educational institutions and provision, but on the lifelong learning process of every individual that would enable the formation of the "complete man," an "agent of development and change," "promoter of democracy," "citizen of the world" and "author of his own fulfillment" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 158). The report called upon education to contribute to "free reflection" (p. 150) and "political consciousness" (p. 151), so that human beings "understand the structures of the world they have to live in" (p. 151) and "where necessary [show] a personal commitment in the struggle to reform them" (p. 151).

The report also reflected the strong interest of its time in psychology. It was underpinned by theories of human nature and human beings' relationship to society and technology drawing on a blend of enlightenment humanism, existentialism (Wain, 1987, pp. 118-134) and Marxist thought, in particular Erich Fromm's philosophical psychology, to which Paulo Freire also referred in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. As revealed by the title "Learning to be," lifelong education in the *Faure report* was "closely connected to the experience of life" (Suchodolski, 1976, pp. 62/63) and drew on a phenomenology of being (Friedrich & Lee, 2011). One of my interviewees argued that the title of the *Faure report* showed the " philosophical approach" the Commission took, as it wanted to "create a sort of awareness about the more fundamental aspects of human beings…it is education to be – to become a full-fledged human being" (Interview with Ravindra Dave). Majid Rahnema explained the choice of the title as follows:

> We spent a lot of time deciding about the title. But I think the idea
> was present in all of us that we had to do something to focus on the
> idea of learning and the process of learning, so learning was
> considered something that would help the individual to become the
> best of what that individual was. At one moment in French we took

the title "Learning to become" ("apprendre à devenir"), but then we
felt that in English it didn't sound good. So we then went to an idea
that was very appealing to some of us because it was the idea of
really "being" as opposed to "having," being as opposed to all the
atomized aspects of personality…the state of being. Finally we
decided about this title and personally I was very happy that this title
was chosen. (Rahnema, 1987)

Referring to the psychologists Georges Lapassade and Erich Fromm, the *Faure
report* stated that the "major argument in favour of lifelong education" was the condition
of human beings as coming into this world "unfinished."[47]The human being "never
ceases to 'enter life'" and is therefore in constant need to learn "in order to survive"
(Faure et al., 1972, p. 157–158). Ravindra Dave in our interview stressed that the *Faure
report* was "more global philosophical and influenced by the basic human psyche…And
making it universal. It's this universalization aspect…very much in the Faure report." He
also referred to the issue of universalization versus individualization raised in chapter
three in relation to the right to education: "Universalization of learning needs
individualization of learning…it is through individualization that you can attain
universalization. So the right to human education has to work for universalization − but
through the process of individualization" (Interview with Ravindra Dave).

The "complete man," one of the key concepts of the *Faure report*, was an
essential component of the report's emphasis on "learning to be." Suchodolski (1965)
explained that the concept of the "true man" or "real man" represented a notion from the
Enlightenment, denoting the idea that the "real" nature of human beings was prevented
from showing itself due to the conditions in which they were forced to live (pp. 29-31).[48]
Enlightenment thinkers frequently debated the issue of "the conflict between man and the
world created by men" (p. 30). The "complete man" has learned to be creative and to
"think freely and critically" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 69) and "will consciously seek
individual and collective emancipation" (p. 56). Maritain also referred to the notion of the

---

[47] Huxley (1964, p. 123) made the same point in his essay "Education and humanism."
[48] Literacy campaigns aimed at creating the "new man," a notion used in the Soviet (Brickman, 1968, cited in Bhola, 1984, p. 56) and Cuban campaigns (Kirkendall, 2010, p. 25).

"complete man" when he wrote about "making man truly human" (Maritain, 1943, p. 113). As Ravindra Dave said in our interview, the "complete man" is the "enlightened man." Full enlightenment – the idea implicit in the "complete man" – was the goal of the Enlightenment movement, to be achieved through criticism:

> It was this rational criticism of certitudes and traditional values that produced…the principle of the primacy of the individual with regard to society, and the idea that the well-being and the happiness of the individual must always be the aim of any political action. (Sternhell, 2010, pp. 49/50)

The "complete man" expressed what Hobsbawm (1996) called "the triumph of the individual over society" (p. 334). It represented the modernist idea of the "enlightened" human being as an agent of change and posited that the primary rationale of all activities of society should be the development of every individual's full potential.

Reception of the *Faure report*

After the report was published, UNESCO asked member states and other international organizations to send their reactions. Most of these responses were politely positive. Countries sent friendly remarks and announced translations of the report in their national languages (sometimes coupled with requests for financial support for such translations) and initiatives to discuss the report, such as policy panels and workshops. In some countries the report generated great interest and discussions at numerous occasions, for example in Denmark where Parliamentarians addressed the report during a debate on adult education (Danish National Commission for UNESCO, n.d., p. 1). In Canada the National Commission coordinated a consultation among all the provinces. The Council of Europe sent a very favourable letter commending the Commission for having used the concept of *éducation permanente* as its guiding principle, which corresponded to the Council of Europe's work in this domain (Conseil de l'Europe, 1972; Janne, 1970; Schwartz, 1974). The ILO also sent a positive letter, pointing out that some of the report's recommendations corresponded to the concepts employed in the "World Employment Programme," the ILO's main contribution to the Second United Nations

Development Decade, such as "recurrent education" and education for self-employment (ILO, 1972).

But the report also provoked critical remarks. Many responses reflected doubts as to the practicability of the ideas put forward by the report, and only a few offered the prospect of implementing concrete policy measures on its basis. Some responses had ideological overtones such as the Czechoslovakian letter that stated that the relationship established in the report between education and democracy ultimately revealed "the social and class-bound nature of democracy, which is determined by the character of the social and production relations" (Délégation permanente de la République socialiste Tchécoslovaque auprès de l'UNESCO, 1973, p. 3). Such East-West tensions were also inherent in the report. According to Rahnema (1987) and Lopes (interview) the views of Commissioner Petrovsky stayed close to the opinions of his government. Indeed, Petrovsky claimed the highest number of footnotes in the report, which indicated disagreements among the Commissioners (Interview with Henri Lopes). Petrovsky sometimes complained to the secretariat when he felt that the Commission had not considered his comments. For example, in a letter dated 4 July, 1972, he deplored that

> the report refers systematically to pedagogical conceptions and
>
> systems of education characteristic of capitalist countries and does not
>
> do justice to the very rich experience of development of education in
>
> the USSR and the other socialist countries. (UNESCO, 1972b)

In his response to Petrovsky, the Secretary of the Faure Commission, Asher Deleon, pointed out that Petrovsky had the right to send a document raising his concerns that would be included at the end of the report, but at the same time made clear that no other Commissioner had made use of that possibility. He also assured him that a substantive part of the background texts he, Petrovsky, had written for the report would be published in the companion volume (UNESCO, 1975), which indeed contained two texts authored by Petrovsky and Markouchevitch (Déleon, 1972b). Deleon also discussed Petrovsky's letter with the permanent delegate of the USSR to UNESCO, who "disapproved of the tone of the letter" and recommended not to "take the matter too seriously" and "not to write an official response and not to create problems" (Deleon, n.d.). The permanent delegate promised to talk to Petrovsky in order to avoid

further delays in the completion of the report. Deleon assured him on his part that he would not send his response letter to Petrovsky, but show the letter to him during his next visit to UNESCO.

Others too felt that their interests had been left out. The Japanese response objected that, while the report highlighted the role of Christian schools and Islamic education for cultural development, it had ignored religions in Asia, such as Buddhism (Délégation permanente du Japon auprès de l'UNESCO, 1973, p. 8). The Japanese also deplored that the report did not study nationalism, which could lead to "ethnocentrism" (p. 9), a response that brings to mind the critical remarks about nationalism in the early UNESCO debates. Some responses found the report too broad, in that it did not identify enough the particularities of different "cultural spheres" (p. 8) or economic and social conditions of countries and did not give concrete recommendations for implementation. The Swedish response, while positive overall, criticized the report for its "excessive individualism – inherent in much of Western culture but alien to many other countries" (Swedish National Commission for UNESCO, 1973, p. 1). The Finnish letter argued that the "purely philosophical argumentation needs…to be brought closer to reality" (Ministry of Education Finland, 1973, p. 2). It also maintained that the report did not pay much attention to the role of UNESCO in education (p. 2). The UNESCO office of Pre-Programming, in its feedback on the report, wrote, after a series of positive remarks, that it found the report disappointing because "the conclusions and recommendations are too general, too little oriented towards concrete action" (UNESCO, 1972c, p. 1).

The Swiss response, written by the philosopher Jeanne Hersch,[49]suggested that the Commissioners spent a lot of money rushing around the world unprepared. In the case of the Commission's visit to Switzerland, so Ms Hersch had heard, the Commissioners arrived on the weekend and, after looking in vain for a non-existent federal ministry of education, simply left again (Commission nationale Suisse pour l'UNESCO, 1973, p. II). Her main critique referred to the lack of a typology of education in the report. With regard to the report's critique of the school system, she noted that the references to Ivan Illich in the report "have not only surprised but shocked many people" (p. 5). She considered it inappropriate that the report chose the critique of institutionalized education

---

[49] Between 1966 and 1968, Hersch had headed UNESCO's philosophy division.

in developed countries as one of its key messages, which she saw illustrated by its cover, showing a little blond boy who seemed alienated from society (p. 12). The critical attitude towards the school also annoyed the OECD representative, Edwin M. Martin, a high-ranking American diplomat who chaired the OECD Development Assistance Committee[50]. He basically lambasted the report:

> I do not think the school experience is a useful experience for life if it
> is designed to avoid subjecting the student to hierarchy, competition,
> outside measures of learning achievement of some sort, or frustration,
> or if it operates from beginning to end on the basis of the prescribed
> principles of democracy, unless it is assumed that the society which
> the student enters operates itself on the principles of philosophical
> anarchy. (OECD, 1972a, p. 1)

Martin further contended that "the description of the desirable goals [for education in the respective countries] has heavy ideological overtones which are inappropriate in a U.N. document designed to have global significance" (OECD, 1972b, p. 1). He denounced the report for making statements of wider social problems that "are often greatly over-simplified and sometimes highly controversial" (p. 1), instead of focusing on educational issues. Finally, he confessed to "difficulty in grasping the concrete content" of lifelong education and asked whether it should not be "limited to organized, conscious, specific measures to make available additional concrete opportunities for continuing education" (p. 2). Martin's tone became particularly polemical in relation to the *Faure report*'s call to drop the practice of "tied aid" and decrease interest rates for loans to developing countries (Faure et al., 1972, pp. 255-256):

> Nor do I see why terms of loans should be softened for all
> developing countries, including relatively rich ones where the result
> will only be to make it easier for them to buy more Cadillacs and
> Phantoms and Mirages. For the poor ones sure, but to cut total
> volume to increase the reserves of the oil exporters seems to be a
> little foolish. (OECD, 1972a, p. 2)

---

[50] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edwin_M._Martin

The French satirical magazine *Le Canard Enchaîné* (1972) published a scathing review of the *Faure report*, saying that it was "not worth the weight of its paper" (my translation), basically calling it a pretext for Edgar Faure and the Commissioners to travel around the world at great expense. Another article published in *L'Express* also focused on the costs, which were specified at 1.500,000 Francs (Bonnot, 1972).[51]

The Executive Board discussed the *Faure report* at length (UNESCO, 1973a, pp. 4-33). The reactions of the delegates echoed those made by many member states. After a series of friendly remarks, the Board went on to deplore that the report did not put forward a "typology of education" and a "methodology of the reform of education," which might have given the report "a more realistic and practical character" (UNESCO, 1972d, p. 10).

In his response letter to Mr Martin from the OECD, Asher Deleon reacted to Martin's comment about the report not concentrating enough on education by saying that the Commission was "working on the assumption that education is closely linked with political, economic and social problems" (Deleon, 1972a, p. 1). Referring to two critical reviews of the report that appeared in *Prospects* (Debeauvais, 1973; Latapi, 1973), Deleon (1974) responded to several "misreadings" of the report and referred to the confusion around "the real position of the commission" with regard to schooling. He clarified that "the commission has posited various arguments to show that school systems as they are can not achieve the goals expected of them" (p. 187).

In his speech to the Executive Board, Faure also clarified the position the Commission took towards the institution of the school. He admitted that the Commission had discussed questions such as whether it was necessary for a person to learn to read and that it came to the conclusion that both literacy (he used the term *"l'écriture"*) and the school were "indispensable elements of any acculturation, but on the condition that these instruments are applied in a complex and not by themselves" (UNESCO, 1972a, p. 18; my translation).

With regard to the common critique concerning the lack of practicability of the

---

[51] In an internal memo, the budget of the report was estimated at approximately $ 500,000 (UNESCO, 1970b), but the budget may have been exceeded.

report, it is noteworthy that in part three, titled "Towards a Learning Society," the authors suggested 21 guiding principles for countries to build their education systems (Faure et al., 1972, pp. 181-223). Every principle was accompanied by four sections: "Considerata" (an explanation of the principle), a "recommendation" (outlining what it would mean concretely to follow the principle), a "comment" (pointing out challenges and limitations with regard to the implementation), and "illustration" (providing specific country examples). The authors pointed out that the 21 principles provided a framework that would have had to be "filled with life," depending on the traditions and context of every country, and the Commissioners made clear that the applications of the ideas would differ in every country, "in as many different ways as there are countries in the world" (p. 182). They emphasized the need for an "overall vision of educational systems" (p. 175). As a result, even the practical suggestions consisted overwhelmingly of generalities. The most helpful parts were references to concrete programs and institutions such as the "University-without-walls" in the United States, the "'workers' universities" in Yugoslavia or the Swedish study circles for adults. However, these examples were fragmented and did not clarify how the system as a whole hangs together. Significantly, in a memo to the Director-General, the Assistant Director-General at the time, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, stated that "the Commission report seems thus far to be playing more of a reinforcing and universalizing role than one of opening up new directions of educational reform" (UNESCO, 1973b, p. 4).

Given the scale of the report and the caliber of the Commissioners, it can be assumed that they consciously chose to formulate the report the way they did. Had they wanted to present a practical report with clear guidelines, they could have done so with the support of the UNESCO secretariat that consisted of some of the best technical education experts at the time. I would interpret the openness of the approach the Commissioners took as a way of teaching. They provided a framework within which "you have to work," as Ravindra Dave said. They took a hermeneutic approach that encouraged asking questions, as one of the Commissioners, Henri Lopes, stated in our interview. In this line of thinking Paul Lengrand wrote an article, *"L'homme de la réponse et l'homme de la question"* ("the man of the answer and the man of the question") (1975/1994). Ravindra Dave, who had developed 20 "concept-characteristics"

to identify the implications of lifelong education for school education (Dave, 1973, pp. 14-25), argued that lifelong education was proposed as a "guiding principle" and an "organizing principle," a concept "that helps you in guiding your thinking" (Interview with Ravindra Dave). But it did not give all the countries a blueprint of what to do because "the various applications of this idea will of course differ greatly," depending on the countries' context (ibid.). Henri Lopes stressed the same point:

> UNESCO could not allow itself to give recipes that would be valid to
> all countries in the world. That would mean to negate its proper
> existence because the foundation of UNESCO is precisely to
> accommodate diversity. (my translation)

Lopes' statement brings out UNESCO's "unity versus diversity" dilemma, which many of the reactions to the *Faure report* reflected in one way or the other. In the tradition of UNESCO's "unity in diversity" approach, the report proposed lifelong education as a universal and unifying principle for all of UNESCO's member states. The dilemma of assembling all the countries of the world behind a common idea, so often discussed in UNESCO's early days, was exemplified in the reactions to *Faure report*. But in contrast to the situation of UNESCO's foundational years, the *Faure report* displayed greater East-West and North-South confrontations. Its broad philosophical character left room for all kinds of criticisms regarding political biases and omissions. Its political claims, such as the abandonment of "tied aid" or the critique of the school system, provoked fierce attacks, as exemplified by the OECD position, which lambasted UNESCO for being "ideological" (which could be equated with "political"). Many of the reactions called for more practical recommendations, indicating that the 21 guiding principles were not considered "practical" enough. In the following years and decades the development of global education went more and more in the direction of a practical-technical approach, telling developing countries exactly what to do, tying aid to structural adjustment programs and "governing by numbers." While the philosophical outlook of the *Faure report* left room for the diversity in the unity, in that it invited every country to come to its own interpretation of lifelong education, the technical approach based on data and targets that will be discussed in chapter seven would bring about a much more rigid standardization of education, which ultimately disregarded cultural diversity.

The approach taken by the Commission also reflected the frame of mind of the social-democratic welfare state, in which "education policies are, in essence, welfare policies of the state performing a range of social democratic functions" (Griffin, 1999, p. 331). The report presented lifelong education as "a way of thinking about educational policies…that reflects the concept of the sovereign, national state, and distinguishes policy from strategy. It is, in fact, a planning approach which envisages [a] kind of welfare state interventionism" (p. 333).

A Catalytic Agent of Lifelong Learning

It is not easy to assess the actual influence of the *Faure report* on education policies, as there is no literature on the subject. Asher Deleon (1996) listed Canada, Japan, Sweden, Norway and Argentina among the countries that took up the *Faure report*, but most of the country activities were limited to seminars and panel discussions. For example, in the case of Canada, in 1973 the Canadian Association for Adult Education held five seminars on the report. Frederick Champion Ward participated in a meeting at the University of Ottawa with 500 participants and the Canadian National Commission for UNESCO held a symposium on the report in Montreal, "addressed by educational leaders from all parts of Canada" (UNESCO, 1973b, p. 2). Ryan (1999) traced the influence of the *Faure report*'s concept of lifelong education on Training and Further Education (TAFE) policies in Australia, but "most experiments have been fragmentary and sporadic, with limited resources" (Deleon, 1996, p. 14). Jones (1992) pointed to its influence on the World Bank's strong commitment to non-formal education between 1974 and 1979 (p. 213). The Bank's 1980 *Education Sector Policy Paper* stated that the *Faure report* "has widely influenced the Bank's thinking in education" (cited in Samoff, 1996, p. 267). The educational literature of the early 1970s contained frequent references to the report, and it "has aroused widespread debate on the Continent" (Richmond, 1974, p. xiii). It is fair to say that the *Faure report* functioned as a catalytic agent for lifelong learning.

As a reaction to the *Faure report*, the European Commission launched *For a Community Policy on Education* (the "Janne report") (Field, 2001, p. 9; see Commission of the European Communites, 1973). In parallel, the OECD's Centre for Educational

Research and Innovation (CERI) published a report on recurrent education (CERI, 1973), a concept that had come to prominence since the Swedish Education Minister Olof Palme had pushed for it at an OECD meeting of Ministers of Education held in 1969 (Tuijnman, 1991, p. 18). The European Commission's report, which constituted a sort of opinion survey among experts on the feasibility of a European education policy, primarily used the term "permanent education." The OECD/CERI promoted the concept of recurrent education, as did the International Labour Organization (ILO) (Stoikov, 1975). Recurrent education was widely used between the late 1960s and late 1980s. The 1973 CERI report defined the concept as

> a comprehensive educational strategy for all post-compulsory or post-basic education, the essential characteristic of which is the distribution of education over the total life-span of the individual in a <u>recurring</u> way. i. e. in alternation with other activities, principally with work, but also with leisure and retirement. (CERI, 1973, p. 24; emphasis in original)

The idea of recurrent education stemmed from the crisis of education and the particular situation at that time, when the older generation had received minimal schooling, while the younger generation – given the school reforms and the expansion of secondary schooling – was about to receive many more years of education, which fuelled a strong demand for the older generation to compensate for this lack of education throughout their adult and working lives. The need to reform higher education and align higher education programs with the demands of the labour market further pushed the concept of recurrent education (Rubenson, 1994, p. 249).

Recurrent education had many similarities to lifelong education. As Wain (1987) and Tuijnman (1991) pointed out, it represented one way of conceptualizing lifelong education; recurrent education "was from the outset regarded as a planning strategy for the introduction of lifelong education" (Tuijnman, 1991, p. 18; OECD, 1973). While the focus of the perspective of recurrent education lay on "a programme of discontinuous or intermittent education" for the adult, lifelong education emphasized the perspective of "an integrated whole," including formal, non-formal and informal learning (Wain, 1987, p. 41), encompassing all age groups (the 21 principles put forward in the *Faure report*

also included early childhood education). For Wain (1993) recurrent education represented a "minimalist" version of lifelong learning as it lacked "its reformist, even 'missionary' or revolutionary thrust" and because it was a form of adult education (pp. 88; 92). I would argue that the idea of recurrent education also entailed a reform of society, but lifelong education, given its relationship with popular education, placed a stronger emphasis on "general education" and citizenship, although the CERI and EC reports also addressed the latter aspect. For Tuijnman (1991), recurrent education was "more limited in scope and more utilitarian…and seemed to offer more scope for actual implementation" (p. 18).

I was struck by the similarities in the intellectual context between the *Faure report* and the 1973 CERI report. The latter referred to UNESCO institutions and publications, not only to the *Faure report*, but also to CONFINTEA, as well as other themes that had been discussed in the *Faure report*, such as Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society*. At the time UNESCO constituted a point of reference for the OECD, and for the World Bank as well. This power dynamic has changed dramatically between then and now. The OECD today represents the organization with the greatest policy-defining influence in the Western world, and the World Bank is the most important shaper of education in the developing world. While UNESCO is still today associated with a larger number of people concerned with the purpose of education, such as philosophers and intellectuals, the OECD and the World Bank attracted people who belonged to the field of economics and econometrics situated in a more scientific comparative education approach. Compared to the CERI and EC reports, the *Faure report* was certainly much longer, and much more intellectual and philosophical. It could be qualified as a landmark of existentialism rather than as a strategic educational planning document. While the CERI and EC documents focused on educational issues and the implications of a lifelong/recurrent education system, the *Faure report* offered a remarkably bold reflection about the situation of human beings in the society of its time that raised questions about the future challenges of education systems. However, it wanted to influence policies, and the 21 guidelines indicated that intention.

That begs the question what a lifelong education system would look like. From the perspective of the *Faure report*, the school would be only one phase in a lifelong

process of learning, which also included early childhood education, and in which adult education would hold equal weight. All three documents stressed the importance of a cohesive education system that offered learning opportunities for individuals throughout their lives, not only in formal, but also in non-formal and informal settings, the realization of which would require partnerships and coordination among all sectors of society. A lifelong learning system would allow for all kinds of transitions for learners without any dead ends. While the conventional mainstream path of education (primary school – secondary school – higher or vocational education) was still foreseen, a lifelong learning system would allow for multiple "side-entries" and equivalencies into any of these elements, such as the possibility for adults to acquire basic education equivalent to elementary school or enter higher education with vocational qualifications. Paid educational leave, a key feature of the OECD recurrent education reform strategy, constituted a central element of any lifelong learning policy (Field, 2001, p. 7), and this idea appeared in all three reports.

The OECD experiment with recurrent education did not last very long, but the OECD stayed committed to a lifelong learning perspective and has continued to publish a series of publications in this regard. In the 1990s, during the Presidency of Jacques Delors, the European Union has embraced lifelong learning as its overarching educational paradigm. Field (2000) argued that, while "policy endorsement of lifelong learning is virtually universal" (p. 251), concrete policy implementation lags behind. This might be due to the heterogeneity of lifelong learning, involving such "intangible areas as social capital, cultural change or citizenship," (p. 258) which make it difficult to measure. The responsibilities for lifelong learning cannot be easily assigned to one ministry, but require action by several ministries and a multitude of partners. Both in the OECD and EU, lifelong learning policies have focused on work-related training that is easier to justify as an investment, while also including a social and citizenship dimension. UNESCO's vision of lifelong learning represented what Cropley (1979, p. 105) called the "maximalist position," which involved "a fundamental transformation of society" (p. 105).

Most notably, the *Faure report* triggered a whole research program on lifelong education that the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) in Hamburg initiated. After the

publication of the report, the governing board of the UIE decided to make lifelong education the focus of the institute's program. This new program area gave the Institute the *raison d'être* and legitimation that it urgently needed as it "was constantly faced with the threat of becoming bedeutunglos [sic; insignificant] and losing its support" (Interview with Arthur Cropley; see also Elfert, 2013, p. 275). Under the leadership of Ravindra Dave (one of my interviewees), the institute engaged in numerous research projects, organized seminars and published a series of monographs and other publications with the aim of conceptualizing lifelong education from an interdisciplinary perspective. Between 1972 and 1979 the UIE organized 25 meetings and conferences on lifelong education (and many more thereafter, see Elfert, 2002, pp. 88-89; for early bibliographies of lifelong education, see Giere, 1994, and Tuijnman & Boström, 2002). The UIE publications were more successful in operationalizing the practicalities of lifelong education because they drew on a full-blown research and operative program. While at headquarters the *Faure report* represented just one initiative among many others, the UIE concentrated its work on mainstreaming and conceptualizing lifelong education to the present day (for a list of all publications on lifelong education coming out of the UIE between 1970 and 1980, see Appendix 3).

Despite its influence, the *Faure report* seems to have failed to reach the developing world, although UNESCO meant it to be a contribution to the Second Development Decade. While the report dealt with the perspectives and challenges of developing countries, it differed from previous UNESCO educational priorities such as fundamental education in that it focused on the industrialized world as exemplified by the critique of the school and the little blond boy on the cover. As Rubenson (2006) argued, "the Third World countries regarded lifelong education as a luxury of the Developed World" (p. 71). Significantly, the ADG's follow-up report about the impact of the *Faure report* mentioned that "the report may help break the ice between Unesco and industrialized countries in the matter of educational policy and planning" (UNESCO, 1973b, p. 5). As one of my interviewees pointed out, it exemplified a French endeavor, "the kind of symbolic declarations by the French of the importance of Paris and culture" (Interview with Peter Williams), conceived by highly intellectually trained Commissioners who kept "philosophizing" (ibid.). Peter Williams was seconded to the

Faure Commission's secretariat from the Education Ministry in Ghana where he was working under Ford Foundation auspices. He conceded that the message of the *Faure report* that "alternative ways to learn…are important" had "intellectual validity," but he could not see any impact on developing countries:

> It's very philosophical…it's a long report…I wonder if there were
> more than 10 copies in the whole of Ghana anyway…for a poor old
> politician running a ministry of education it was quite difficult to
> accommodate that with…the fact that you only had 40% of your kids
> in school and you had no money…(Interview with Peter Williams)

Arthur Cropley, himself one of the theorists of lifelong education and a scholar who published extensively on the concept throughout the 1970s and beyond, maintained that the influence of the report stayed "at the rhetoric level." He added, "I personally never observed any concrete practical effects of the *Faure report* on anybody."

Critique of Lifelong Education

Although the individuals who shaped lifelong education in UNESCO understood the concept in political terms as the guiding principle of a democratic and just society, it allowed for another interpretation which enabled its assimilation into neoliberal ideology. Lengrand (1986) had written about the element of freedom of lifelong learning in terms of "choice" (p. 9) and the adult learner being free "to demand, to accept or to refuse" education, according to "the law governing the market, the equilibrium of demand and supply" (p. 9). The notion of the freedom and responsibility of the human being, so important in existentialism and lifelong education, has been distorted under neoliberalism in the sense of justifying cutbacks to the welfare state, which transfers the responsibility – now commonly referred to as "choice" – for education on the individual. This is what Rubenson (2006) likely meant when he invoked the image of the *Janus face* in relation to lifelong learning's economistic and humanistic sides. Early on, critics pointed to the vagueness of lifelong education, such as René Pucheu, who called it a "a rubber concept open to all interpretations" (cited by Vinokur, 1976, p. 287; my translation). Bogdan Suchodolski (1976) predicted the appeal the concept could have from the perspective of the consumer society. He pointed to the relation of lifelong learning to the "change from a society centered upon production to a society centered upon consumption" and the

"ideal of happiness" that comes with it (p. 61). The new phenomenon of leisure to which Lengrand referred and which resulted from the rising welfare state and the enforcement of workers' rights, had the potential for "alienation, boredom and indifference…simple conformism of consumption, the banal diversions of leisure time, the dull uniformity of mass ideals promoted by the 'culture' industry" (p. 93). The Swiss response to the *Faure report* touched somewhat on that point when it declared that some of the aspirations expressed in the report were not realistic and doubted whether a "large majority of the people would choose lifelong education over 'bread and games'" (Commission nationale Suisse pour l'UNESCO, 1973, p. 8).

Other critics opposed the concept of lifelong education as standing for "lifelong compulsory schooling." In the summer of 1974 a small group of scholars gathered around Ivan Illich at Cuernavaca to formulate their concerns about lifelong education in the *Cuernavaca Manifesto*. The main argument put forward by the group was that lifelong education bore the risk of prolonging the coercion of education that was already represented by the school, a "trap of school for life," as Illich put it in an interview he gave in September 1974 (cited by Vinokur, 1976, p. 288; see also Illich & Verne, 1976). The *Manifesto* "translates our opposition to the mandatory education of adults imposed by the law or by social pressure" (cited in Guigou, 1975, p. 233; my translation). Arthur Cropley pointed out that "lifelong learning should not mean a 'life sentence,'" which is why he got interested in the notion of "life-wide learning" and learning in different spaces such as the workplace (Interview; Cropley, 1978). Niemi (1974) pointed to the risk embedded in the notion of "lifelong learning" in terms of adults having to be enrolled in educational programs in order to be eligible for welfare, or even having to undergo an "indoctrination program" (p. 5). Bagnall (1990) called lifelong education "an illiberal and regressive ideology," because of the blurring of education and learning it entailed. If all learning was equated to education, people would be denied the possibility to claim the right to education.

Ohliger (1974) argued that the notion of lifelong education suggested that people were "inadequate, insufficient, lacking, incomplete" (p. 47). He pointed to many professions or groups such as welfare recipients that were obliged to participate in continuing education, be it to keep up to date with new developments in their field or to

justify social benefits they received. Ohliger strongly criticized the *Faure report* and lifelong education, as in his view the concept stressed "structured knowledge…which must never be permitted to drive out…the spontaneous, random, chance, unplanned learning that is the great joy and sorrow of our human existence" (p. 54). He juxtaposed lifelong education with "true adult education," which he associated with Paulo Freire, Ivan Illich, and Everett Reimer, and which entailed "working…for a radically new society" (p. 55).

The *Cuernavaca Manifesto* attacked the concept of lifelong education for conveying the message that everybody could move up the social ladder thanks to education. It argued that continuing education would devalorize qualifications and lead to the degeneration of competencies – a phenomenon we see today in the trend towards "competency-based" training, in which workers are trained towards specific occupations. The critics saw lifelong education as a means of individual advancement to the detriment of collective advancement (Guigou, 1975, p. 234). In a similar vein, Finger and Asun (2001) argued that "éducation permanente and UNESCO certainly legitimised and actively contributed to this movement towards 'credits-for-life-experiences' and certification, a process which has proved particularly counterproductive" (p. 27).

Faure would certainly not agree with these accusations. In his discussion with the Executive Board he warned of the expectation that education implied "a sort of timeless right to employment and a superior salary," which "leads to serious errors in developed countries and veritable disasters in the Third World" (UNESCO, 1973a, p. 11). In his view, education itself was a privilege that should be seen primarily in terms of its social purposes (*"utilité sociale"*) (p. 11). In his preamble to the report, Faure rejected the close link between education and employment. He argued that the motivation to learn in order to find employment "seems unable to ensure true democratization" (Faure et al., 1972, p. xxix). The main motivator for learning should be "curiosity, the desire to understand, know or discover," which was "one of the deepest drives in human nature" (p. xxviii). But the traditional system did not encourage this motivation. Therefore, he contended that the "diploma-employment mechanism" should be abolished in favour of a more democratic education, which "requires a revival of man's natural drives towards knowledge" (p. xxix). Education should stimulate the desire to learn. The aim of

education was not to lead to employment, but "to enable man to be himself, to 'become himself'" (p. xxxi).

Some of the critics of lifelong education misinterpreted the *Faure report*, which explicitly rejected the education-employment formula. However, they had a point in that they anticipated the risk embedded in the ambiguity of the concept, as represented in the image of the *Janus face*. Instead of empowering human beings to adapt to rapid changes in society and contributing to their freedom, lifelong education could potentially develop into a commodity or an oppressive force, putting "lifelong" pressure on human beings to learn for an agenda imposed on them. Illich and his fellow critics showed prophetic judgment insofar as since the late 1970s, following the rise of neoliberal ideology, lifelong education developed into a force of control and instrumentalization, making Edgar Faure's worst nightmares come true. The neoliberal interpretation of lifelong learning, to which I will come back in the last chapter, forces people to "learn" in a purely instrumental sense, towards very specific ends, depriving the idea of its empowering capacity. The risk of diverting the concept of lifelong education was furthered by the strong focus on the individual in the UNESCO conception. The existentialist and philosophical underpinnings could be subverted in favour of an individualist-consumerist perspective. Lifelong education could only unfold its democratizing and transformative potential if it was a part of a social vision with a strong welfare and collective solidarity perspective as represented by Faure's "new social contract." However, when the political climate shifted and the idea of the welfare state lost traction in favour of the hegemony of the market, the "economistic" side of the Janus face came through, which had nothing to do with the *Faure report*'s vision of a democratic and just society.

Conclusion

In principle, governments, international organizations and educationists around the world – in particular in the Western countries – widely welcomed the concept of lifelong education because the idea that people should learn throughout life appealed to all kinds of agendas. It made sense to the Marxists for whom education represented an important tool to make individuals aware of their situation in order to take revolutionary action (the Freirian approach), but it also fit into the American liberal-capitalist ideology

with its focus on individualism, and into the social democratic worldview with its emphasis on the responsible citizen. The problems lay in the details and in how the multifaceted and ambiguous concept was filled with life. Here is where UNESCO's utopian variant of lifelong education differed from other international organizations. The *Faure report* and its message of lifelong education reiterated many features of UNESCO's humanism, which I have referred to as a tradition, such as the focus on the "human condition," the universality of humanity and the idea of the human potential that needed to be developed through education. The report blended Enlightenment ideas such as the "complete man" with contemporary ideological and intellectual influences. The concept of lifelong education represented a continuity with previous UNESCO concepts in that it built on the holistic approach of fundamental education and the post-war priority on adult education but it also differed from fundamental education in that it focused on Western countries and paid a great deal of attention to schools. With its blend of Enlightenment humanism, existentialism, Marxist thought, and its overall social-democratic outlook the *Faure report* was to some extent a French endeavor, thought out in large mesure by French and French-educated or francophile intellectuals.[52]The responses to the report showed that many countries could not relate to it. The report was certainly more of a high-flown intellectual exercise and, with its strong humanist ideology and progressive ideas, did not speak to the mainstream, "did not reflect the world as it was" (Interview with Peter Williams) and did not reach the developing world.

The UNESCO interpretation of lifelong education was more French, more political and more idealistic than the parallel uses of the concept such as recurrent education. It was inspired by the *Résistance* movement and shaped by the 1968 student movements and progressive educational ideas of its time. Lifelong education contained the hope and the claim for a new, transformed democratic society:

> Strong support must be given to democracy, as the only way for man
> to avoid becoming enslaved to machines, and the only condition
> compatible with the dignity which the intellectual achievements of the

---

[52] Frederick Champion Ward was the only representative of "the Commonwealth and the English-speaking systems" (Interview with Peter Williams). Two members originated from the Middle East (Syria and Iran). Syria was a former French "protectorate" and Iran a traditionally francophile country. Rahnema was fluent in French and lived in France after he had left Iran.

human race require…there cannot…be a democratic and egalitarian relationship between classes divided by excessive inequality in education; and the aim and content of education must be re-created, to allow both for the new features of society and the new features of democracy. For these reasons, the commission stressed the fact that education must be regarded as a domain where political action is of especially decisive importance. (Faure et al., 1972, p. xxvi)

As illustrated by this quote, the Commissioners of the *Faure report* believed in the creation of a new society and a new political system. The call for a renewal of society emerged from what Kirpal (1976) called a "crisis of contemporary civilization" (p. 98). Its proponents saw lifelong education as a means to equip human beings to adapt to the changes of society that the future would bring. In the *Faure report* the ultimate purpose of lifelong education was a new society, a point made also by Suchodolski (1979): "Education should not serve to reinforce the existing order but to create a new, alternative order" (p. 45). But the time had passed for lofty idealism and the appeal of humanism had dimmed. Some of the critical reactions to the *Faure report* showed the emphasis on pragmatism in the early 1970s, in contrast to the post-war debates, where the delegates paid little attention to practical considerations. The Cold War brought about a short-term perspective and the rise of econometrics with its "elegant mathematical model out of which a residual can be lifted" (Balogh, 1964, p. 9), which was much easier to deal with than engaging in lengthy complexities of sociological and economic transformations in the Third World – in the fight against communism there was no time to lose.

Against the backdrop of the dehumanization experienced during the Holocaust and the Second World War, the dignity of the individual constituted a key aspect of the discussions in UNESCO's early years, but the predominant issue was international understanding and fostering the unity of humankind as a precondition for peace. The early years emphasized unifying principles that would help overcome the devastating divisions between nations. In the late 1960s the predominant dilemma had shifted to the fear of a rapidly changing automated and overly technologized consumer society, which bore the risk of alienating or even enslaving human beings. As Hobsbawm (1996) maintained, "the ideal to which the Golden Age aspired…was production, or even

service, without humans: automated robots assembling cars…trains without drivers. Human beings were essential to such an economy only in one respect: as buyers of goods and services" (p. 267). The lifelong education theorists in UNESCO focused on the tension between functionality and individual freedom. The influences of intellectual tendencies such as existentialism, psychology, Marxism and critical theory enhanced the drive towards a transformation and democratization of society that would allow every individual to thrive. Individualization, already an important issue in UNESCO's early years, was driven even further as a political claim. As a consequence, the challenge to the traditional "banking model" of education, which was already contained in the post-war adult education movement, reached an even higher level in the concept of lifelong education.

The idea of lifelong learning emerged in a political context of accelerating change, economic growth and social transformation, in terms of a push towards a greater democratization of educational institutions. It marked the transition of labour from static forms of production to more flexible and fluid forms of labour in globalized consumer societies, which demanded more mobility and adaptability from the workforce. As anticipated by the *Cuernavaca* group of critics of lifelong education, the concept was prone to being usurped by that new capitalist society. In retrospect Suchodolski (1976) showed prophetic judgement when he suggested that lifelong learning signified the "change from a society centered upon production to a society centered upon consumption" (p. 61).

While lifelong education hit a nerve, human capital was even more appealing, and in the remainder of this study I will show that while lifelong learning continued to spread as a global educational paradigm, it had to submit itself to a predominantly economic ideology. *Éducation permanente* and human capital represented the intellectual and technical binary that has haunted UNESCO since the beginning, and they stood for divergent worldviews and cultures. Lifelong education was in tension with the technical and economic demands on education that emerged from the globalization of capitalism and the "human capital" theory in development. In his speech to the 90th session of the Executive Board, where *Learning to be* was presented and debated, Faure made a point of stressing the humanistic creed of the Commission. He asserted that the Commission had

been united in its recognition that the ultimate purpose of education was humanistic and not the advancement of the economy. While maintaining that the economic certainly constituted an important effect of education, "the economic means have to be at the service of the development of the human being, and not the other way around" (UNESCO, 1972a, p. 16; my translation). In a comment that could be interpreted as an attack on other international organizations, Faure expressed his hope that the report would contribute to enhancing the resistance of governments to attempts by the partisans of imposing an economistically-oriented education system on countries, which he considered *"contre-éducatif"* (p. 16).

I consider the *Faure report* an expression of a movement driven by socialist and social democratic forces pushing for democratization and the regulation of capitalism in the 1960s and early 1970s. In 1969, Social Democrats held government responsibility in fourteen countries (Van der Pijl, 1993, p. 35). Other expressions of this movement were the NIEO; the idea of a code of conduct for multinational corporations pursued by the Social Democratic International Congress of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) since 1969, which resulted in the "Multinational Charter" of 1975 (pp. 41-42); the *"Ordnungspolitik"* (regulatory policy) promoted by the German social democratic Chancelor Willy Brandt; and the 1976 report of the Club of Rome, *Reshaping the International Order*, led by the Dutch economist and chairman of the Council for World Development Policy of the Socialist International, Jan Tinbergen, which took up the demands of the Third World and the NIEO. In this respect the late 1960s and early 1970s represented a time when the world stood at a crossroads. But this social-democratic movement came under fire by market-oriented counter-forces. In the year 1983 Ralf Dahrendorf, head of the London School of Economics, declared that "we are experiencing the end of the social-democratic century in the OECD world" (Der Spiegel, 1983).

Apart from the broader social and political changes, UNESCO's "statements of dogma," such as the *Faure report*, were also influenced by changes in the institutional environment, fuelled by the competition that stemmed from the emerging field of development after decolonization, in which agencies wanted to get their piece of the pie. UNESCO faced power struggles with other international organizations, noticeable, for example, in the reaction to the *Faure report* by the OECD, which reflected considerable

ontological differences. But more existential for UNESCO at the time was the conflict with the UNDP, which was symptomatic of the intellectual-technical divide. The function of the *Faure report* consisted in spreading the message of "lifelong education" as the new educational master concept. But member states criticized the report as not being practical enough – an indication of the degradation of UNESCO's role as an intellectual organization and the increasing focus on the technical and functional aspects of global educational governance. The rising paradigm of the economic return of education also challenged literacy as a global approach, and UNESCO had to give up its dream of a global literacy campaign. Literacy was weakened by being subsumed under the broader concept of lifelong education.

These conflicts with other international agencies over educational – and ultimately ontological – priorities ushered in the transmission of the authority in the field of education to other organizations, which was part and parcel of the shifting power in the world order from the "old world" to the "new world." UNESCO was established in France as a concession by the British and the Americans to a victorious ally and to the role France had played as the host country of the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation. But in the course of the next decades, "the…power centre was shifting across the Atlantic" (Interview with Peter Williams). The loss of French influence preoccupied Edgar Faure. When Faure travelled in Africa on one of the missions he undertook for the Commission, the news had just come out that "French was not among the 10 most spoken languages in the world," and "Faure, as we went around Africa,…kept bemoaning [that] fact" (Interview with Peter Williams).

Embedded in the emergent concept of lifelong education was the call for a new democratic society and the hope that such a just society could be achieved. The overwhelming message of the *Faure report* and of lifelong education was that of solidarity, hope and an unwavering faith in education as the way to prepare human beings "for a type of society which does not yet exist" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 13). In that respect, the *Faure report* had a utopian message, "to the extent that any undertaking which aims at changing the fundamental conditions of man's fate necessarily contains a utopian element" (Faure, 1971, p. 163). As I will show in the next chapter, the confidence in the possibility of creating a new society faded between the *Faure report* and its successor,

the *Delors report*. The *Faure report*'s cohesive vision of a state-driven planning process within a welfare state perspective had given way to a market driven approach. Although in many ways the *Delors report* followed into the footsteps of its predecessor, for example in advocating the concept of lifelong learning, it reflected the disenchantment brought about by the negative features of globalization, such as financial instability and the emergence of neoliberalism as the main economic paradigm.

Despite the fundamental flaw I pointed out earlier with regard to the role of women, the *Faure report* represents in many ways an inspirational document that was ahead of its time. This is illustrated by the fact that still today the scholarly literature frequently refers to it, while many other endeavours have been forgotten. It is often invoked as "a canonical text within the lifelong education literature" (Wain, 2004, p. 10) and the starting point of the lifelong learning movement (Matheson & Matheson, 1996, p. 221). Knoll (1996, p. 26) situated the *Faure report* in the tradition of the first pedagogical reform movement at the turn of century (likely referring to the New Education Movement). Field (2001, p. 6) saw the report as a "turning point," as it marked a shift from the emphasis on schooling to a broader perspective including less traditional pillars of education such as non-formal and informal education. Boshier (2004) observed the "challenge to formal education [that was] nested in the architecture for lifelong education" (p. 55), and Biesta (2011) emphasized that the *Faure report* "presents us with a vision of lifelong learning in which democratization is the main driver" (p. 64). Jarvis (2014) called the report "almost certainly the most influential book on the education of adults in its period" (p. 49), and Torres (2013) went even further by touting the *Faure report* as the "humanist educational manifesto of the twentieth century" (p. 15). It represented the utopian, "maximalist" vision of lifelong learning that would be reclaimed 24 years later by the Delors Commission.

Chapter Six
The *Delors Report* and the 1990s

Introduction

The second half of the 1970s and the 1980s were years of crisis for the world and for UNESCO. The United States withdrew from the organization in 1984 for reasons I will outline below. As Wain (2004) observed, "utopian approaches grew increasingly anachronistic as the 1970s advanced and the world entered into deep global economic recession" (p. 48). The lifelong education movement lost support and Ettore Gelpi, Paul Lengrand's successor, had to fight for the survival of the lifelong education unit, which had been established between 1966 and 1968 (Wain, 2004, p. 49). By now, it was clear that UNESCO had been overtaken by other international organizations such as the World Bank and the OECD as a player in the multilateral arena. However, the 1990s also saw a revitalization of international cooperation and a renewed interest in human rights after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Throughout the 1990s, the UN system held a series of large conferences, with a much greater participation of civil society and NGOs than ever before. These "summits of idealism" (Bhola, 1998, p. 493) included the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien (1990); the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro (1992); the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna (1993); the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing (1995); and the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V) in Hamburg (1996). UNESCO was involved as convenor (in the case of CONFINTEA V), co-convenor (in the case of Jomtien) or major contributor in these conferences.

Under Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO from 1987 to 1999, UNESCO launched new ambitious initiatives such as the "Education for the Twenty-First Century" program. It is in the context of this program that the utopian message of lifelong learning saw a revival with UNESCO's report *Learning: The Treasure Within*, published in 1996, otherwise known as the *Delors report*. In many ways, the *Delors report* built on its predecessor, the *Faure report*. The mastermind of the report was again a French socialist political and intellectual figure – Jacques Delors – who came from the same tradition of *éducation permanente* and took a philosophical approach to the task of

drawing up a vision for the future of education, and the report reiterated lifelong learning as the main global educational principle. The *Delors report* represented a remarkable consistency with UNESCO's tradition of universal humanism, but at the same time it reflected changes in the "normative vocabulary" of lifelong learning and shifted the emphasis from the individualistic "learning to be" to the more collective perspective of "learning to live together." These shifts indicated the changing dilemmas the report was responding to. In the 24 years that separated the *Delors report* from the *Faure report*, the utopia of the "learning society," framed by the social-democratic welfare state and the leisure society that Lengrand and others had hoped for (Larrabee & Meyersohn, 1958; UNESCO Institute for Education, 1962) had not come about. With the disintegration of socialism as a counter-balance, capitalism continued its triumphant march unabated, and the incentive to accommodate the demands of the workers waned (Overbeek, 2003, p. 26). Throughout the 1990s, institutions protecting workers' rights such as the trade unions, social security and other features of the welfare state were dismantled. The first oil price crisis, which followed the Israeli-Arab military conflict of October 1973 ("Yom Kippur war"), ushered into existence a period of rising unemployment in Western countries and a successive disintegration of the welfare state. The world "lost its bearings and slid into instability and crisis" (Hobsbawm, 1996, p. 404). The *Faure report*, while reflecting a sense of crisis, had an overall optimistic message in that it exuded a modernist belief in the human capacity to build a better future through the forces of reason. The *Delors report* represented a somewhat more "post-modernist" mood in that its optimism in this regard was much more subdued.

Like its predecessor, the *Delors report* was not only a forward-looking document mapping out a vision for education; it also responded to challenges it saw as potentially threatening. The *Faure report*'s concern about the economic approach to education proved to be justified as the global economic framework commonly known as "neoliberalism" had gained increasing influence. The *Delors report* reiterated the resistance to the economic approach to education and addressed the downsides of globalization, in particular the advance of identity politics. Jacques Delors or the *Delors report* never used the term "neoliberalism" as such; they always referred to its characteristics. When Delors summarized the deliberations of the first session of the

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century that produced the *Delors report*, the first two issues he raised in terms of framing the global context of the work of the Commission were "the growing interdependence of the modern world," expressed by the term of the "global village," and the current economic ideology, which he described as follows:

> When President Reagan took office in the United States, a well-defined economic ideology, supply-side economy, based on tax-cuts and financial deregulation, was ushered in. This led to a period of economic growth and job creation, especially in the United States, but it also created the enormous 'financial bubble' which was one of the causes of the market crash in 1987. This had far-reaching repercussions. It became easier to take over businesses than to create them, and financial deals outstripped economic activity proper. These developments had not been without their impact on education since the point was reached when money, having become all-powerful, changed cultural and moral attitudes. (UNESCO, 1993, Annex I, p. 1)

It is somewhat surprising that Delors referred to President Reagan as an instigator of neoliberalism (again, without using the term) instead of referring to the United Kingdom's Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher. It is possible that he did not want to draw the attention of his audience to his well-known conflictual relationship with Thatcher, which I will discuss below. It may also be that he referred to Reagan as he preceded Thatcher to power.

In contrast to "neoliberalism," the report frequently used the term "globalization" ("mondialisation" in French) or related terms such as the "global village" and Delors discussed globalization also in his other writings. During his time as President of the European Commission he pointed to the enormous potential of the "globalization of markets" towards the Eastern European countries in terms of the movements of people, capital, goods and technology (Commission of the European Communities, 1993, pp. 13; 28). He promoted the competitiveness of the European region in the globalized economy by pushing forward the Single European Market, which was enshrined in the Single

161

European Act of 1986 (Ross, 1995, pp. 37-38). The *Delors report* addressed multiple aspects of globalization, such as the flow of capital, the opening up of financial markets and its effects on trade and industry, the rapid development of information technology, international migration, and the environment (chapter 1; "From the local community to a world society"). In the first chapter of the report, written by Delors, he pointed out that he considered "the risk of forgetting the unique character of individual human beings" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 17) one of the major downsides of globalization. Another major concern associated with globalization raised by the *Delors report* was the rise of fundamentalism and particularism.

This chapter will focus on the figure of Jacques Delors. My interviews and the evidence I gathered lead me to argue that he was the driving force behind the work of the Commission. Given the emphasis on Jacques Delors, the chapter will shed light on his background, his beliefs and his motivations for taking on the Chairmanship of the report. However, beside Delors' intentions, I will examine certain UNESCO rationales behind the *Delors report* and its continuities and differences vis-à-vis its predecessor, the *Faure report*. The shifts between the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* are indicative of the shifting educational priorities and the challenges to education, and the situation of UNESCO in the arena of multilateral organizations in light of the overall political constellation of the 1990s. The chapter will further discuss the challenges encountered by the Commission, the main messages of the report and the influence it had on the global educational community. It will interpret the distinct humanistic stance the Commission took by reclaiming the utopian vision of lifelong learning as a response to the dilemmas it faced.

The Crisis Years

René Maheu stepped down as UNESCO's Director-General in 1974. He was succeeded by Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow from Senegal. M'Bow openly took sides with the NIEO movement and the Third World and made the organization more vulnerable to the heavy attacks launched against it by ultra-conservative forces in the United States such as the Heritage Foundation that turned UNESCO into the site of an ideological confrontation between the Third World and the U.S. and some of its allies, in particular the United Kingdom (Preston, Herman, & Schiller, 1989). The Non-Aligned Movement

used the United Nations and UNESCO as platforms to push for the NIEO at a time when the developing world was caught up deeper in the spiral of dependence on the industrialized world, sharpened by the OPEC oil embargo, the high oil price and the debt crisis of the 1970s. At its Sixth Special Session on 1 May 1974 the General Assembly of the UN approved the *Declaration and Action Program in the Establishment of a New International Economic Order*, against the opposition of the United States government (Melanson, 1979, p. 51) and adopted a *Plan of Action*, which incorporated the demands of the Third World countries for a NIEO. On 12 December 1974, the points contained in the *Plan of Action* were reaffirmed in the *Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States*, which called for the creation of the NIEO and presented 15 principles of how international – in particular economic – relations should be governed in a more favourable way for the Third World countries. This document encountered resistance from most Western countries, and only Sweden adopted it (Tinbergen, Dolman, & Van Ettinger, 1976, p. 50). M'Bow supported the cause of the NIEO and was very interested in positioning UNESCO in the debate. He established an international panel composed of 18 intellectuals (one of them, Kaddoura, the Syrian nuclear scientist, had been a member of the Faure Commission), many of them proponents of "dependency theory," which argued that underdevelopment in the Southern part of the world was caused by structures, regulations and practices set up by the Western countries. The report launched by the panel challenged the "Western model of development" (UNESCO, 1976, p. 108) and reiterated many of the positions taken in the *Faure report* four years earlier.

Around the same time, a series of General Conference resolutions with regard to the City of Jerusalem and Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories caused tension among member states in UNESCO. An *éclat* was provoked in the General Conference when, for voting purposes, all UNESCO member states were assigned to a regional group except for Israel (Hoggart, 1978, pp. 75-79). The United States interpreted this incident as hostility against Israel. The conflict escalated in the early 1980s over the debates carried out within UNESCO about the "New World Information and Communication Order" (NWICO), which derived from the NIEO. The idea behind the NWICO, proposed by the MacBride Commission's report *Many Voices One World* (UNESCO, 1980), was to reduce the neo-colonial dependency of the developing countries on the Western news

agencies and the Russian TASS. As a matter of fact, the General Conference never adopted the NWICO. However, the whole case was seriously misrepresented by a U.S. driven media campaign, to an extent that some observers called it a right-wing conspiracy against UNESCO, spearheaded by the Reagan and Thatcher governments and the Heritage Foundation as part of a broader attack on the United Nations (Preston, Herrmann & Schiller, 1989; Astre, 1985a, 1985b). Jones (2007a) classified the incident as "an early expression of the anti-UN stance of neoliberalism" (p. 528). Some scholars as well as some of my interviewees argued that UNESCO's crisis was further abetted by M'Bow's management style, which showed "the dual effect of poor quality in the organization's intellectual work and its failure to provide clear and practical guidance for UNESCO's operational work" (Jones & Coleman, 2005, p. 66). The conflict culminated in the withdrawal of the United States in 1984, with the United Kingdom and Singapore following in 1985.[53] The loss of its major contributor constituted a severe blow for the organization, which had to adapt its program to a budget reduced by 30%, a situation similar to the one UNESCO faces today, since the U.S. stopped paying its membership dues in 2011 after the General Conference adopted Palestine as a full member.

During this period the authority in the field of education shifted from UNESCO to a new group of multilateral institutions that came to the fore, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank (Mundy, 1999, p. 40), which were aligned with the rich Western countries. The challenge to UNESCO's exclusive education mandate had already posed a dilemma for René Maheu during the 1960s exemplified by his conflicts with the UNDP. Symptomatic of the shift in power was the abandonment of the UNESCO-World Bank Co-operative Agreement. The collaboration between the two agencies started in the early 1960s when the Bank got involved in educational lending. At that time UNESCO was the lead authority in education and the World Bank funded many of its projects, such as its planning institute, the IIEP. UNESCO had the expertise, but no money. Maheu courted the Bank, because

---

[53] In a recently published book, Raymond Wanner (2015), a long-term States Department diplomat in charge of UNESCO relations, quotes a memorandum by Dragoljub Najman, former UNESCO Assistant Director-General for External Affairs, as follows: "The one and only reason that provoked the withdrawal of the United States from UNESCO was the fact that the Director-General [Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow] during a meeting with the Ambassador of the United States [Jean Gerard] that took place in mid-June, 1983 insulted the United States" (p. 45).

he knew a good relationship could benefit UNESCO, but the correspondence between the Bank and UNESCO from 1961 and 1962 "reveals the acute sensitivity on both sides about each other's territory" (Jones, 1992, p. 47). The first head of education of the Bank, Ricardo Diez Hochleitner, was seconded from UNESCO in late 1962 (p. 67), and he maintained good relations between the two agencies. The UNESCO-World Bank Co-operative Agreement was established in 1964, as a "product of pragmatism" (p. 71). The World Bank quickly needed to move on staffing its education program as demands for educational loans were rapidly increasing. At the same time, World Bank staff was divided about the scope of the World Bank's involvement in education. Using UNESCO's expertise seemed the easiest solution, and the arrangement served both parties well (pp. 70-74). A joint UNESCO-World Bank department – the Educational Financing Division (EFD) – was established at UNESCO headquarters, which was staffed with personnel from both organizations. The joint department reflected the close collaboration between the World Bank and UNESCO during the 1960s, in which the World Bank acted as funder for educational projects for which UNESCO provided the technical expertise:

> In the 1960s UNESCO's analysis division, they were the people
> who were the think tank really about education development. A lot
> of the stuff on…international education cooperation, on the
> economics of education. I mean…UNESCO was the sort of
> powerhouse and of course when the World Bank first started giving
> loans for education it was always UNESCO who were doing the
> analysis and the program preparation. (Interview with Peter
> William)

Still in 1980, the World Bank's Education Sector Policy Paper highlighted UNESCO's role as the authority in education:

> The [World Bank/UNESCO] Cooperative Program has identified
> and/or prepared more than two-thirds of the projects financed by the
> Bank over the life of the program…In qualitative terms, Unesco has
> been a contributing factor to the broadening of the Bank's lending
> program. The Unesco report, Learning to be, has widely influenced

the Bank's thinking in education, and Unesco missions frequently

proposed lending in categories which the Bank was not prepared to

finance at the time, but which it eventually did…(cited by Samoff,

1996, p. 267)

UNESCO used to have the "interpretive sovereignty" over education, and the World Bank's task was to provide the funding. This power balance changed in the years to come, and the World Bank "sought to play [an] intellectual role" in education (Rose, 2003, p. 67). Throughout the 1970s the agreement between the two agencies lost momentum, and it was discontinued in 1986 (Jones, 1988, pp. 70-74; Jones, 1992, pp. 72-74; Interview with Jacques Hallak). The 1995 World Bank Review stated that "the Bank should concentrate on providing advice designed to help governments develop education policies suitable for the circumstances of their own countries" (cited in Rose, 2003, p. 77). In its 1995 report, *Priorities and Strategies for Education*, the World Bank stated that "its main contribution must be advice, designed to help governments develop education policies…" (cited in Samoff, 1996, p. 253). With this self-understanding as an advisor (and not a donor and investor for education) the World Bank clearly appropriated UNESCO territory. Federico Mayor addressed this challenge:

I do not accept that the World Bank and the IMF should continue to

take decisions and make recommendations on issues in education in

which they are not adequately informed...They should concentrate on

economics, banking and finance and leave education to Unesco and

other agencies mandated to work in this domain. (cited by Mundy,

1999, p. 47)

Why did authority shift from UNESCO to the World Bank? One of my interviewees pointed to greater financial power of the World Bank and a flaw in the United Nations system:

Because at the beginning, the period I am talking about [the 1970s],

the United Nations system divided its tasks. There were the funds

and the programs. The funds and the programs had the money but

they acted like banks. Even the World Bank who is a bit outside

because it emerged from the Bretton Woods system, asked

UNESCO…what are the interesting projects that you have? That we
will finance, that not…But then they let the specialized organisms
take on professional work. That is why today, these programs and
funds, UNICEF, the World Bank, the UNDP, they are also engaged
in thinking about education. As they had more money than
UNESCO, they attracted better professionals. The World Bank runs
its own education projects, which is maybe disputable. So UNESCO
suffered from that situation. In terms of the reform of the United
Nations, I always say, every time I get the chance… things have to
be put back in place. But unfortunately [hélas] this won't be possible
because we have reached a point of no return. (Interview with Henri
Lopes; my translation)

Weiss (2012) problematizes this situation further by pointing to:

The overlapping jurisdictions of various UN bodies, the lack of
coordination among their activities, and the absence of centralized
financing for the system as a whole; struggling over turf is more
attractive than sensible collaboration. The UN's various moving parts
work at cross-purposes instead of in a more integrated, mutually
reinforcing, and collaborative fashion. Agencies relentlessly pursue
cutthroat fundraising to finance their expanding mandates, stake out
territory, and pursue mission creep. (p. 7)

Some of my interviewees highlighted the increasing deterioration of the
UNESCO-World Bank relationship under M'Bow and the mismanagement in UNESCO,
which left a void that others filled. This position is consistent with Nicholas Burnett's
(2010) argument that the other international agencies involved in education have taken on
UNESCO's tasks because of its poor performance. To examine the reasons of the shift of
authority from UNESCO to the World Bank goes beyond the scope of this study, but
mismanagement alone cannot sufficiently explain a development in which the global
financial institutions were entrusted with ever more power, while "the UN organization
institutionally most directly responsive to the majority of its members" (Samoff, 1996, p.
267) has been disempowered. There seems to be a coincidence between the withdrawal of

the United States from UNESCO at a time when the organization lost out in the power struggle with the World Bank, an organization traditionally under American influence.

Towards *Education for All*

Federico Mayor became Director-General in 1987, defeating M'Bow who had run for a third term. Mayor was eager to stress UNESCO's profile as an intellectual leader. Mayor was a Spanish Catholic biochemist. He had held several high-level positions at Spanish universities and had served as Spain's Minister of Education and Science for a short period (1981-82). Jones and Coleman (2005) portray Mayor as "an urbane, sophisticated and charismatic figure who reveled in the glamour of the international life" (p. 66). Mayor introduced a "think big" perspective, and some of my interviewees heavily criticized him for depriving UNESCO of resources by spending without consideration of budget constraints. On the other hand, Mayor was "an ideas man, and a good leader in that sense" (Interview with Colin Power). He made an effort to raise UNESCO's intellectual profile by advocating against the spread of a market-driven view of education and by affirming the organization's role as a global standard-setter in education. Mayor's predilection for large-scale programs was exemplified by *Education for All* (EFA), a major global initiative for the promotion of basic education that was gearing up in the early years of his term. A series of circumstances played in favour of this initiative. The World Bank report *Education Policies for Sub-saharan Africa: Adjustment, Revitalization, and Expansion* (1987) asserted that "renewal of progress toward universal primary education is the new investment that will bring the highest economic and social returns in many countries" (p. 132). The World Bank had traditionally focused on technical and secondary education – its awakened interest in primary education arose from the influence of Georges Psacharopoulos (1981; 1985) who became head of the Education Department's Research Unit in 1981 (Jones, 1992, p. 227; Interview with Jacques Hallak). Psacharopoulos' studies, drawing on human capital theory and cost-benefit analysis of returns to education, touted primary education as the investment that brought the highest rate of return. The meetings of the International Working Group on Education (IWGE), chaired by Jacques Hallak, newly appointed Director of UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), frequently discussed this new

168

trend in favour of primary education. The IWGE emerged from the former Bellagio group of donors in education who had gathered at the initiative of the Ford and Rockefeller foundations in Bellagio, Italy (Champion Ward, 1974). Wadi Haddad, the new head of the World Bank's reorganized education policy and research division (Rauch, 1995, p. 74; Jones, 1992, p. 230) and Hallak were on very good terms and talked about the possibility of launching a major initiative for basic education at meetings of the IWGE and also informally (Interview with Jacques Hallak). Another favourable circumstance was that Jim Grant, UNICEF's Executive Director, and Federico Mayor were "kindred spirits" (Power, 2015, p. 46). They shared a critical attitude toward the structural adjustment policies of the World Bank and the IMF (p. 46). Grant spearheaded a major push for education (Jones, 2007a, pp. 526-527), and Mayor saw the initiative as a way of raising UNESCO's profile (Chabbott, 1998, p. 211). After their senior staff had prepared the ground, Grant and Mayor met in late 1988 to discuss a major campaign for basic education.[54] The World Bank and the UNDP came on board, later joined by the United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA), and a Steering Group formed to prepare the World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA), which took place in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990. While EFA 1990 was driven by the momentum of overall good relationships among the heads of the involved UN agencies and the common interest in mounting a major initiative to push for education on a large scale, notable differences related to the mandate and ideology of the respective organizations persisted. UNICEF focused on children and mothers, whereas the UNDP's main mandate was poverty, and the World Bank left no doubt as to its priority:

> At my first meeting with the Bank on EFA, I was given a set of
> documents outlining the Bank's position, and informed that all we need
> to do at the WCEFA is to endorse that position. For the Bank, EFA =
> UPE: education for all boiled down to universal primary education.
> (Power, 2015, p. 48)

Given its human rights mandate, UNESCO promoted a more comprehensive approach to education as represented by its focus on adult education and lifelong

---

[54] See Chabbott, 2003, pp. 129-133, for an account of the preparatory process that led up to the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien.

learning. It sought a broader definition of basic education that encompassed adult literacy, particularly because the WCEFA was technically an event held in the context of International Literacy Year 1990 (Rauch, 1995, p. 194). The Assistant Director-General for education and others believed that the focus on primary education would affect the quality of education as cuts to higher education would have a negative impact on teacher training (Power, 2015, pp. 48-49). Moreover, some UNESCO officials argued that the demand for primary education hinged on the supply of post-primary education (Hallak, 1991, p. 13). While in the long term the World Bank's narrow focus on primary education prevailed, at Jomtien UNESCO succeeded, at least at the level of rhetoric, in making EFA about basic education in a broader sense. Bhola (1998, p. 492) pointed to the "balanced attention to the education of children, youth and adults" originally foreseen in Jomtien. The outcome document of the WCEFA, the *World Declaration on Education for All,* presented "basic education as the foundation of lifelong learning and human development" (UNESCO, 1990, Article 1, point 4).

Challenges to Education on the Eve of the 21st Century

The interest in education as a driver of economic development had lost nothing of its vigour among international organizations. The OECD report *Education and the Economy in a Changing Society*, published in 1989, reflected the OECD's engagement with the "second generation of human capital theory" (Rubenson, 2015). Michael Apple (1992), while conceding that the report recognized the importance of education for broader social aims, made clear that he saw its main message in the shift of the use of education for an economic purpose:

> We have witnessed a slow, but now rapidly growing, transformation
> of not only how we practice education but of what we use education
> for. Education is increasingly only about the economy. Concerns for
> efficiency, productivity, and human capital have nearly evacuated all
> other questions about what purposes education, in general, and
> schooling, in particular, should serve. (p. 127)

At about the same time the principles of the Washington Consensus became the main economic framework applied to education in a development context (Held, 2005). The term was coined originally by Williamson in a background paper for a conference on

Latin American economic policy in 1989, in which he identified ten policy instruments that "pretty much coalesced on the sort of policies that had long been advocated by the OECD" (Williamson, 2004, p. 2). The Washington Consensus came to define a set of market-oriented standard economic principles to promote economic growth and stability that were applied by the U.S. treasury and the Washington-based financial organizations, the IMF and the World Bank, in developing countries in the form of economic stabilization measures and structural adjustment programs (Jones & Coleman, 2005, pp. 115-117). These principles included the reduction of the role of the state in regulating the economy, fiscal discipline, and the promotion of trade liberalization, deregulation and privatization (Stiglitz, 2003, pp. 229-230; Williamson, 2004, p. 3). The structural adjustment programs discouraged public spending for education in developing countries, leading to increasing dependence on external and private funding. The application of market principles to education prompted the World Bank, at least throughout the 1980s, to promote user fees for primary education (Tomasevski, 2005, pp. 234-235), which ran counter to UNESCO's human rights approach. These developments concerned UNESCO:

> The developing countries…before EFA were suffering under
> structural adjustment. You know their education system was crippled
> – and health systems were being demolished. They were deeply
> worried and deeply concerned and wanted action taken. (Interview
> with Colin Power)

Between the early 1980s and early 1990s, World Bank lending to education doubled, and the World Bank asserted itself as the leading international agency in education. As Rose (2003) put it, "the rise of human capital allowed the World Bank to justify its own involvement in education" (p. 71).

While the preparations for EFA were underway, the opening up of China and the demands of the countries that emerged from the collapse of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and Central Asia raised many issues about the future of education systems in those countries. UNESCO had numerous staff members from the Soviet Union and its ally countries (the Assistant Director-General for Education until 1988, Sema Tanguiane, was Russian), who were well aware of the educational challenges they faced. But education also stayed on the political agenda in the Western countries. Functional

illiteracy in industrialized countries emerged as a policy issue in the late 1980s, and the International Literacy Year 1990 created a momentum for literacy (Rauch, 1995; Elfert, 2013, pp. 276-277).

Given these transitions, "the looming 21st century" (Interview with Colin Power) and the challenge by the OECD and the World Bank to UNESCO's position as the UN lead agency for education, the world needed to be reminded of UNESCO's intellectual authority in education. The idea came up to initiate "debates on education for the XXIst century in Member States [which] could considerably contribute in the long-run to UNESCO's visibility and to the strengthening of its intellectual function and role" (UNESCO, n.d.c, p. 4). The idea of a new global report on the future of education was first discussed at an Education Symposium held in Beijing in 1989 (Power, 2015, p. 92). The Symposium had originally been scheduled for mid-1989, but UNESCO cancelled it after the military crackdown on Tiananmen Square. The re-scheduled gathering took place in November 1989, and during a symposium on education in the 21st century, the delegates recommended the establishment of a new Commission on the future of education, along the lines of the Faure Commission (Interview with Roberto Carneiro). Federico Mayor was one of the driving forces behind the idea (Delors et al., 1996, Preface). The Assistant Director-General for Education at the time, Colin Power, further explained the motivation for the report in my interview with him:

> It's been 20-odd years since we had the Faure commission, we've had
> no major intellectual input since then and, you know, we have to look
> to the future…Behind that of course were some major events taking
> place, the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the communist
> economic system, political system, meant that suddenly the whole
> world – the whole dynamic politically had changed. Major scientific
> and technological advances, the beginnings of, the very early days of
> the web and the technological advances taking place. The impact of
> globalization, particularly economic globalization, and the role that
> the IMF and Bank were playing in developing countries in terms of
> essentially well the impact of structural adjustment was pretty major
> as well, affecting member states…So these sorts of driving forces, a

number of particular countries very concerned about what the future
would bring.

Some in UNESCO worried that the project was too ambitious: "The project
is…on the border of the impossible. But…it will contribute to UNESCO's intellectual
role and place in the world" (UNESCO, n.d.c, p. 6).

Establishing the Delors Commission

In 1993, Mayor travelled to Brussels to convince Jacques Delors to take on the
presidency of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century
(Delors, 2004, p. 440). According to Colin Power, the question who could lead the
Commission "was discussed with member states and particularly with those not far
away" (Interview). The French National Commission had good contacts to Jacques
Delors and he seemed a very suitable candidate: "He was very interested in education and
training and being a former minister of finance…he was very interested in the problem of
building a united Europe and the role that education could play in that" (Interview with
Colin Power).

At UNESCO, many were surprised that Delors agreed to the Herculean task of
taking over the chairmanship of the education commission as he was still President of the
European Commission at the time. People were "amazed about the amount of time and
effort he put into it" (ibid.). As President of the European Commission from 1985 to
1995, Jacques Delors was the main architect of European integration. Another *Delors
report*, the *Report on European Economic and Monetary Union*, better known to the
wider public, represented a decisive step towards the economic and monetary union of
the European Community. Delors supported and advanced market liberalization in the
European Union, and he supported agendas that were pushed by European capitalists
such as the European Roundtable of Industrialists (ERI) who lobbied for the European
single market and had close ties to the European Commission, in particular through the
EC's Commissioner Étienne Davignon who was a close friend of Delors' (2004, p. 169;
about the ERI and Davignon, see Van Apeldoorn, 2000, p. 161). At the same time Delors
strongly advocated a social charter for Europe, and scholarly literature has commonly
interpreted his role as a counter-balance to the neoliberal influences on the European
Commission during his presidency (Buch-Hansen & Wigger, 2011, p. 80; Ross, 1995;

Wincott, 2004). For Delors, the market was not an end in itself, but "a first stage in a process that would lead to a social reconstruction of Europe" (Wincott, 2004, p. 361). The social rights he demanded as a key element of his vision for a unified Europe included "the extension to all workers of the right to lifelong education" (Delors, 1988, under *The social dimension*).

Delors had been an activist for *éducation permanente* all his life. As a young man, he had been involved in progressive Catholic youth and workers' movements, political clubs and trade unions, in particular the *Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens* (French Confederation of Christian Workers) (Ross, 1995, p. 16). Since 1953, he actively participated in the Catholic movement *La vie nouvelle*, which was inspired by the personalist philosophy of Emmanuel Mounier, founder of the influential French magazine *Esprit*. Personalism, which has often been associated with Catholic movements, holds that every person has a unique value and dignity, but also a responsibility to make her mark on the world. Personalism should not be confounded with individualism, which Delors tied to consumerism (Delors, 2004, p. 117). For Delors, personalism meant that every person, while being "unique and irreplaceable," should show solidarity with her community (Delors, 2004, p. 116). The French personalist movement associated with Mounier posited that people should engage with their communities and take an active role in shaping their world. Jacques Maritain was another proponent of personalism, and Delors referred to him as one of his strongest influences, "mon inspiration profonde" (CVCE, 2009, p. 4).

Delors was very much drawn towards the "climat fraternel" ("brotherly climate") (Delors, 2004, p. 40) in the *La vie nouvelle* movement. He became the editor of the *Cahiers Citoyen 60*, which published articles on political, economic and social issues, often written by Delors himself under the pseudonym Roger Jacques. Later, the *Citoyen 60* political clubs emerged as an offshoot of the magazine*,* which, at their highest point, achieved 5000 members across France (Delors, 2004, p. 39). Delors believed that politics constituted the arena in which individuals could make a difference. Under his pseudonym Roger Jacques, he wrote:

> Only politics, with its ambiguities, its double face of angel and devil,
> allows the human being to access the mastery of his/her destiny, to

fight against violence, to resolve contradictions, to bring supreme

mediation to the tensions of collective life. (Arnaud, Introduction to

Delors, 2004, p. 15; my translation)

Delors ascribed his interest and that of his entire generation in politics to Pierre

Mendès France who embodied a genuine and authentic activism for the concerns that

most preoccupied Delors' generation and the *Citoyen 60* clubs (Delors, 2004, p. 41): the

transformation of society towards democracy, participation and social rights, and

decolonization (with a particular French focus on Indo-China and Algeria). He

particularly admired Mendès France's Keynesian economic ideas. Despite his belief in

the importance of engagement in politics, Delors was also deeply suspicious of politics,

which is maybe exemplified best by his declining to run for French presidency in 1994,

although he was clearly leading in the polls, an incident that caused a stir in France and

that incited some observers to draw an analogy between Delors and Mendès France as

two untypical politicians who put aside their political ambitions for their ideals

(Rosanvallon, 1994). Some members of the International Commission on Education for

the Twenty-First Century expressed a certain frustration about Delors' decision to decline

the French Presidency (Interview with Roberto Carneiro; Mufti, 1995; Singh, 1994). The

explanation Delors gave for his move was that he could not have achieved his objectives

in cohabitation with a government that did not share his views (BFM politique, 2012).

Delors represented in many ways the UNESCO worldview in that he believed in

the richness of the human being ("C'est dans l'homme…que se joue l'essentiel") (Delors,

1994, p. 175), the power of ideas (Delors, 1994, p. 173) and international cooperation. He

asserted that "the internationalization of problems will sooner or later require the

internationalization of behavior and global awareness" (UNESCO, 1992a, p. 6). Like

Mayor, the Assistant Director-General for Education Colin Power and many others in

UNESCO, Delors was apprehensive of education being sucked in by a market-driven

ideology. In his address to UNESCO's 140th session of the Executive Board he somewhat

explained why he accepted the Presidency of the Education Commission by saying that

"looking at the future already amounts to changing it" (UNESCO, 1992b, p. 1). In his

Mémoires he referred to his "militant commitment to education in the past" (Delors,

2004, p. 440; my translation), a stance evidenced by his involvement in the 1971

continuing education law (*loi de la formation permanente*) while he worked for the government of Jacques Chaban-Delmas, French Prime Minister from 1969-1972. Chaban-Delmas often used the term *la société bloquée* coined by the French sociologist Michel Crozier to denote a society blocked in three aspects: a fragile economy, a heavily bureaucratic and immobile state, and archaic and conservative structures, such as the education system (Delors, 2004, p. 82). Chaban-Delmas promoted the agenda of the *nouvelle société* that would break up the encrusted structures. Greater welfare and higher wages constituted a part of his vision for a renewed society. Delors was responsible for the *loi de la formation permanente*, which built on the pioneering work on *éducation permanente* that I outlined in chapter four. Delors (1994) believed that "education was one of society's essential priorities" (p. 348; my translation) and he was driven by a "double faith": a "faith in education as a factor of improvement," and a "faith in the role of international organizations to convey into a universal conscience the most commendable ideas, which will be increasingly oriented towards the understanding of others" (UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 1995, p. 15).

The 26th session of UNESCO's General Conference, held in October/November 1991, decided to establish the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century. It was formally constituted by UNESCO in January 1993 and carried out the bulk of its work between 1993 and 1995. After broad consultation, including with Jacques Delors, Federico Mayor appointed fifteen members to the Commission.[55] It was double the size and more diverse in background than the Faure Commission, including five women. The secretary of the Commission, Alexandra Draxler, and Jacques Delors' main adviser, at least in the first half of the work of the Commission, Danièle Blondel, both chosen by Delors, were also women.

In his address to the 140th Executive Board, Delors pointed to "three current crises" that marked the world in which the Commission was situated: "the economic crisis, the crisis of the ideology of progress and a certain form of moral crisis"

---

[55] Ms In'am Al Mufti, Jordan; Mr Isao Amagi, Japan; Mr Roberto Carneiro, Portugal; Ms Fay Chung, Zimbabwe; Mr Bronislaw Geremek, Poland; Mr William Gorham, United States; Ms Aleksandra Kornhauser, Slovenia; Mr Michael Manley, Jamaica; Ms Marisela Padrón Quero, Venezuela; Ms Marie-Angélique Savané, Senegal; Mr Karan Singh, India; Mr Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Mexico; Mr Myong Won Suhr, Republic of Korea; Mr Zhou Nanzhao, China.

(UNESCO, 1992a, p. 2). In terms of the economic crisis, he challenged the "development model," which he perceived as inadequate, and he referred to the *Brundtland report*'s emphasis on sustainable growth. He was also worried about unemployment, high rates of illiteracy and children not attending school, and he called for education as a means of "equality of opportunity and solidarity" (p. 3). Given his Christian Catholic background, the term "solidarity," one of the key terms used in UNESCO since its inception and in the *Faure report*, had a special significance for him, as he saw it as the most important social value (Delors, 1994, p. 364). He deplored that only a ridiculous amount of global development aid (0.03 per cent) went into education (UNESCO, 1992a, p. 4). In terms of the ideology of progress, he questioned the Enlightenment view, which equated progress with "our increasing ability to control the natural world" (p. 4), the ethics of science and "pure economic efficiency" (p. 4). In terms of the moral crisis, he saw the need for "some form of world citizenship" and pointed to the role of the United Nations and UNESCO in solving the problem that "we do not understand the world and that we are all retreating into our separate corners," which led to "various forms of fundamentalism" (p. 4). Delors talked about the collapse of the Communist system and the upheavals that had followed it, as "the tragedy of Yugoslavia and other bloody conflicts" (UNESCO, 1993, Annex I, p. 2) had shown. He also referred to the war in Iraq and the peace process in the Middle East. In his view, the Commission was situated in an "uncertain context," which could "give grounds for hope or for despair and could lend weight to predictions either that the world was on the path of unification or was threatened with disintegration" (p. 2).

UNESCO's General Conference assigned the Commission with the task of responding to the question, "What kind of education is needed for what kind of society in the future?" (UNESCO, 1994a, p. 39). In responding to this question, the Commission consciously resorted to UNESCO's tradition of universal humanism, as a counter perspective to the "market-oriented view of education" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995a, p. 1). This humanistic stance owed much to Jacques Delors' critical position towards neoliberalism.

Delors' Social Agenda

The "market-oriented view of education" constituted a major dilemma for Delors and his Commission. Delors' opposition to the principles of neoliberalism is somewhat

exemplified in his relationship with Margaret Thatcher, whom he frequently referred to in his *Mémoires* (Delors, 2004). Asked about her in a 2011 interview, Delors responded, "I think for Madame Thatcher I was a curious personage: a Frenchman, a Catholic, an intellectual, a socialist" (Moore, 2011). He was right. In her autobiography *The Downing Street Years*, Margaret Thatcher (1993) wrote about Delors: "The French socialist is an extremely formidable animal. He is likely to be highly educated, entirely self-assured, a *dirigiste* by conviction from a political culture which is *dirigiste* by tradition. Such was M. Delors" (p. 547; italics in original). She referred to him as an "opponent" (p. 742), but she also expressed respect when she called him "one of the cleverest people I met in European politics" (Thatcher, 1993, p. 726). Jacques Delors symbolized a process that demanded that European states yield national sovereignty to the institution of the European Union, an idea Thatcher was strongly opposed to, to the point that an infamous 1990 cover of *The Sun* demonized Delors with the headline "Up Your Delors."[56] Delors had provoked Thatcher with his speech at the British Trade Unions Congress on September 8, 1988 in which he talked about a new model for European society, "a model based on a skillfull balance between society and the individual." He stated:

> It would be unacceptable for unfair practices to distort the interplay of
> economic forces. It would be unacceptable for Europe to become a
> source of social regression, while we are trying to rediscover together
> the road to prosperity and employment. (Delors, 1988)

> In a speech held 12 days later at Bruge, Thatcher seemed to be responding to

Delors' comment: "We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain, only to see them reimposed at a European level, with a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels" (Thatcher, 1988). Thatcher (1993) "was opposed roots and branch to the whole approach" (p. 750) of Delors' *Report on European Economic and Monetary Union*: "It confirmed our worst fears" (p. 708), she wrote – not only did it leave no way out of the path towards the economic and monetary union, it also included "plenty of material...about regional and social policy – costly, Delorsian socialism on a continental scale" (p. 708).

---

[56] November 1st, 1990. See
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/04_05_06_nn_up_yours.pdf

Thatcher's statement cited above about Delors being a "formidable animal" does not quite capture Delors' career. In many ways he did not correspond to the image of the typical "French socialist." He was not a product of the French elitist education system. He followed in the footsteps of his father who had worked at the Banque de France, and he obtained a university degree while working at the bank where he built his career in the foreign exchange department. He liked to present himself as an autodidact (Ross, 1995, p. 17) and as an atypical French politician who could not be easily situated in one of the French political traditions (Drake, 2000, p.14; Delors, 1994, p. 172). He was also an internationalist, strongly interested in the experiences of other countries and international affairs (p. 199). Although he self-identified as a socialist, he was less radical than many French leftists. He supported the free market, provided that it was organized and kept under control (p. 244). He often talked about the necessity of reconciling the political and the economic (pp. 157-160), a position that notably ran counter to the neoliberal belief in the separation of economics and politics. When asked by his interviewer about his "centre left" political positionality, he rejected that label and responded that it was a mix of pragmatism and utopian thinking that really defined him ("ce mélange de pragmatisme et d'utopie qui m'anime"; p. 171). As French Finance Minister in the Mitterrand government, he had the reputation of being a moderate counter-balance to some of the leftist ministers. This is the reputation that drove his appointment as President of the European Commission, approved even by Ms Thatcher (1993, p. 547). Influenced by his embracing Catholicism, social solidarity was at the heart of what he believed. His key concerns for "social dialogue," "solidarity" and the "right to initial or ongoing training throughout one's lifetime" were incorporated into the 1993 White Paper of the European Commission, *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment. The Challenges and Ways Forward into the 21st Century,* which Delors shaped during his time as President of the European Union (Commission of the European Communities, 1993).

While Delors assumed the role of President of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century with a long European experience of reconciling the free market and social agenda, he encountered challenges he might not have been prepared for, and that he addressed in his first chapter of the *Delors report*:

Our Commission had the perhaps impossible task of overcoming the
obstacles presented by the extraordinary diversity of situations in the
world and trying to arrive at analyses that are universally valid and
conclusions acceptable to everyone. (Delors et al., 1996, p. 14)

Just like Maritain more than 50 years before him, Delors and his Commission
grappled with the challenges of reconciling universality and diversity.

The Tension between Universality and Diversity: Learning to Live Together

The *Delors report* followed the *Faure report* by taking a philosophical and, one
could argue, French approach, to its task of developing a vision for education, which was
very much steered by Jacques Delors. At the first session of the Commission, Delors
asked, "What is modernity?," much to the discomfort of the Commissioners (Interview
with Alexandra Draxler). The report of the first session revealed that Delors intended to
bring out the tensions between tradition and modernity, a topic he has always been
interested in (Delors, 1994, pp. 351-365). His approach consisted in working out the
tensions which characterized the world on the eve of the new millennium, exacerbated by
globalization, such as the tension between the universal and the individual, tradition and
modernity and the spiritual and the material, before reflecting on the role of education in
addressing these tensions (Delors et al., 1996, pp. 16-18). This outlook, by the 1990s, was
arguably rather old fashioned, at a time when critical and "post-modern" approaches
based on questions of power, gender and race dominated the intellectual discourse.
Delors set the tone, and his approach reflected his own intellectual modernist and idealist
traditions, inspired by Maritain's metaphysical humanism that was concerned with the
nature of human beings and their purpose in the world. Many of the Commissioners,
while coming from very different cultural and religious backgrounds, took an equally
idealistic approach.

When speaking about his motivation for assuming the Chairmanship of the report,
Delors revealed his location in the UNESCO tradition of universal humanism and the
"unity in diversity" approach. He stated his aspiration of "making of education a
universal message in order to try, not to unify this world, but to bring together the
different parties in their diversity, which means to accept the difference and to respect the
other…" (Delors, 2004, p. 441; my translation). He further maintained that "we must

ponder the connections between education, freedom and equality, a theme which challenges all forms of particularism" (UNESCO, 1992b, p. 5). The question of whether education could convey a universal message was the first crucial issue discussed by the Commission (UNESCO, 1993, Annex I, p. 4; UNESCOPRESS, 1993, p. 1). Some of the Commissioners stressed "the universal values that will characterize the 21st century" (Fay Chang, in UNESCO Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995, p. 3). Karan Singh argued that "the whole point of global education is to help the human race to transcend barriers of race and religion, sex and nationality" (Singh, n.d.a, p. 1). Myong Won Suhr believed that "education should teach commonness rather than differences" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1994, p. 16). Some of the experts consulted in the hearings held by the Commission also stressed the importance of seeing diversity as an expression of "common humanity." Chief Emeka Anyaoku, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, hoped for a "revolution for the 21st century," aimed at "a world in which, through greater awareness of a common humanity, diversity and difference between peoples can be a cause of celebration and pride" (UNESCO, 1995, EDC-95/CONF.006/Annex I, p. 2). Education, he believed, should be concerned with fostering "universal values" such as democracy and human rights (p. 3). He contended that the local dimension was also important because societies should not be "alienated from their own cultural values, in particular local languages and cultural media" (p. 3)

Culture represented a key concept in the discussions of the Commission as it epitomized the dilemma of diversity and universality. Carneiro defined culture as "the expression of the drama of people, of their pilgrimage throughout history" (Interview with Roberto Carneiro). The Commission stressed the importance of culture as both the "foundation and one of the essential purposes" of education (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995b, p. 2), but it also made clear that culture could stand in the way of the generalization of education (for women and girls, for example), and that "the extension of education systems has led to the destruction of traditional or minority cultures in many countries" (p. 1). In the working group on the topic of "Education and Culture," the Commission pointed to the "deep-rooted link between education and culture" designated by the ancient Greeks in the concept of

Paedeia, which had already been evoked by the *Faure report*. The Commissioners grappled with questions such as:

> How can we define an education that takes into account the specific
> features of each group (especially those of minority groups) while
> laying stress on a set of shared values and knowledge…How can one
> proceed from the local to the global, from understanding of one's
> own culture to appreciation of the cultures of other peoples, with a
> view to universal understanding? (p. 2)

Delors' universalism was not meant as an imposition of one culture over the other. He specifically declared that the Commission was not interested in a "Euro-Western monoculture" (Henderson, 1993) and that it hoped to "strike a balance between global concepts and regional realities." Although it did not occupy much space in the final report, all Commissioners attached great importance to the teaching of history (Interview with Alexandra Draxler): "How…can we teach the history of other peoples or other civilizations without adopting a biased point of view and oversimplifying?" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995b, p. 2). Zhou Nanzhao argued that "education for multiculturalism is to seek the sameness of humanity in order to cultivate the differences" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1994, p. 16). In his comments on the first draft of the report, Nanzhou recommended that "humanism could be a central point running through the whole report" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995c). Echoing Rousseau, "the premise of our report is that human beings are good by nature and willing to learn." Carneiro defined "humanism" as "embracing the universal and diversity" (Carneiro, n.d., p. 3; my translation).

Similar to the approach taken by the post-war *Comité sur les principes philosophiques des droits de l'homme*, the members of the Commission claimed the universality of humanism. Karan Singh laid out the idea of a common humanity from his perspective grounded in Hindu philosophy. In a letter to Jacques Delors he argued that in order to tackle the transition of globalization (which he called "globalism"), humanity needed a global "dharma," a paradigm of thought that would stress "co-operation in place of competition, convergence in place of conflict, holism in place of hedonism." He

proposed five of the "universal concepts of the Vedanta," the school of Hindu philosophy. While the first concept – *Ishā vāsyamidam sarvam yat kincha jagatyām jagat* – put forward "the all pervasiveness of the divine," the second concept – *Ishwarah sarva bhootanam hriddeshē tishthati* – followed from the first that every human being possessed a dignity which derived from his or her divinity. Singh went on to argue that this concept formed "the basis for democracy, because that is the only form of political organization in which…every individual is recognized and honoured because of their individuality" (Singh, 1994, pp. 12-13). The third concept then followed that "if the divinity is inherent in each person…in essence the human race is an extended family" (p. 13). This concept, *Vasudhaiva kutumbakam*, which invoked "the essential unity of the human race," "should become the motto of the new global society" (p. 13). The notion of the "global village" in the *Delors report* has given a central place to this idea.[57] While the fourth concept denoted the unity of all religions, the fifth concept was that of "the welfare of the many," *Bahujana sukhāya bahujana hitāyacha*. Singh contended that against common views the *Rigveda* [an ancient Indian collection of Sanskrit texts] asserted that "our goal in life is two fold – liberation of our souls, and also the welfare of the world." These are two of the main principles underpinning UNESCO's humanism – self-fulfilment and the betterment of the world. Singh made a point of demonstrating that the concepts and principles from Indian philosophy perfectly resembled the alleged Western concepts of dignity and human rights on which UNESCO's and the Delors Commission's humanism drew.

However, as much as Delors and the Commissioners favoured a universal message of education, it took them a long time to find common ground: "We couldn't find a common philosophy" (Interview with Roberto Carneiro; see also Delors, 1994, p. 348). Fundamental differences came to the fore between "East" and "West," on issues such as "equality versus hierarchy," "individualism versus collectivism," "co-operation versus competition," "idealism versus pragmatism" (UNESCO, 1993, Annex I, p. 4).

---

[57] The term "global village" was coined by the books about the future of information and communication technology written by Marshall McLuhan's in the 1960s. It was thereafter often used to refer to the interrelatedness of countries through processes of globalization, for example in the report to the Club of Rome, *Reshaping the International Order* (Tinbergen et al., 1976, p. 23).

While the Asian and African members of the Commission stressed greater "emphasis on the group rather than the individual" (Commissioner Zhao Nanzhao, from China, in UNESCO, 1996, p. 3), some Western members were shaped by the "primacy of the entire person [proclaimed] by Christian humanism" (Carneiro, n. d., p. 2; my translation).[58] Carneiro (2015) gave an account of the challenges faced by the Commission:

> I recall our first meetings: lively discussions, with the most disparate approaches to life, values and philosophies, a deepening of irreconciliable perspectives...This medley of disharmony went on for several meetings. Whenever, under the inspired leadership of Jacques Delors, we were summoned to find one common understanding, one basic concept or one shared priority for future education, inevitable differences would shoot down what could theoretically provide a good basis for consensus: human rights declarations are western-oriented and individualistically biased; dignity of the human person is anthropocentric; democratic values are open to diverse emphasis and vary with subjective interpretation; even development goals could differ considerably according to regions and levels/notions of well-being...We ended up combining two approaches: region by region, we would try to grasp the local flavour by surveying issues and conducting hearings of large groups of representative personalities; alongside that, we would strive to arrive at common foundational concepts… (p. 103)

The direction taken by the Delors Commission recalled the "unity in diversity" approach of UNESCO's founding years. The Commission emphasized the diversity of local traditions in order to achieve a more perfect unity. By agreeing on the concept of "learning to live together," Commission members eventually overcame their differences (Interviews with Roberto Carneiro, Alexandra Draxler and Colin Power). "Learning to live together" became the "single unifying theme" (Interview with Colin Power). The

---

[58] An example of a controversial idea was Karan Singh's proposition to include a section on "learning to die." He observed that "learning to die, though this may sound curious to Western ears, should also become part of our intellectual and emotional equipment as we move into the twenty-first century" (Singh, n.d.b). Nanzhou asked for that paragraph to be removed as the issue of death was culturally controversial and "the first priority is how to learn to live together with dignity" (Nanzaho [sic], 1996, p. 2).

Commissioners regarded this concept as the most important among the "four pillars of education" that the report proposed and the guiding principle of the report (Delors et al., 1996, p. 22; see also Carneiro & Draxler, 2008). However, "the tension between the global and the local" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 17) remained. In her feedback to the first draft, Fay Chung felt that "the report should take more cognizance of the situation of Asia, Latin America and Africa" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995b). In a letter written to Karan Singh who had put forward similar objections, Delors argued:

> Without losing sight of the extraordinary diversity of the world, I
>
> have deliberately emphasized in this relatively succinct text, what
>
> can be considered to be common, both in terms of concerns and in
>
> terms of the analysis of problems. (Delors, 1995)

This statement reveals that Delors was the driving force behind the search for a unifying message, a point that my interviewees involved in the work of the Commission confirmed. Delors' reaction to Karan Singh shows that Delors insisted that the report took a universal perspective. Individual Commissioners would have likely left different imprints on the report, depending on their background. Some Commissioners, such as William Gorham, the founder of the Urban Institute, may have liked to see a more empirical approach to the report. Karan Singh may have preferred a more spiritual perspective, as indicated by his piece about "learning to die." Others wished to take regional differences into greater consideration. The Commission dealt with representing these diverging views by including short chapters by each Commissioner at the end of the report, in which they presented their individual perspectives. The first chapter of the report was written by Jacques Delors himself.

In many ways the *Delors report* followed in the UNESCO tradition of "unity in diversity." The wording of some of the comments made during the debates of the Delors Commission strongly resembles the "unifying" post-war discourse discussed in chapter 3 in that the Commissioners placed the emphasis on education as a means to achieving the unity of "humanity" and fostering a better understanding of the people as a condition for peace in a globalizing world. The *Delors report* constitutes another example of the consistency of the UNESCO worldview, which takes an explicitly anti-particularist and

anti-divisive stance. Moreover, the universal outlook had received a significant boost given the historical circumstances of the collapse of the communist system and the end of the Cold War. Notwithstanding, the report signalled a shift towards a multicultural politics of "learning to live together." The term "multiculturalism" emerged in some of the statements made by the Commissioners. In particular Rodolfo Stavenhagen, the Mexican sociologist, focussed his individual contribution to the report on "Education for a multicultural world." The vision of "learning to live together" would soon be challenged when in the post 9-11 world, under the battle cry of the "clash of civilizations" (Huntington, 1996), particularism and identity politics reached new heights.

The *Delors Report*'s Approach to Education

The approach to education that the Commission took also showed an extraordinary resemblance to the traditional UNESCO perspective and brings to mind the views of the UNESCO founders, such as Jacques Maritain, who considered education an end in itself and had argued that education should support the development of a person into a human being (1943). At its first meeting, the Commission defined the functions of education in seven points. The first point reminisces the post-war UNESCO discourse by stating the purpose of education as: "to contribute to the all-round development of individuals capable of reaching their full potential in a pluralist society" (UNESCO, 1993, Annex I, p. 5). At the Commission's sixth session held in Paris a working group convened on "The Right to Education: The Role of International Co-operation." The background paper for this working group stated:

> Viewing education as a right takes us beyond the positivist approach
> to education, whereby it is a means to an end (largely economic). It
> is, then, an end in itself, part of human freedoms and dignities and
> inextricably linked with individual and collective human
> development. (International Commission on Education for the
> Twenty-first Century (n.d.) [1994], p. 1)

While the *Faure report* used the concept of "lifelong education," the *Delors report* introduced "learning throughout life." This "subtle, but fundamental" difference was very well chosen (Interview with Roberto Carneiro). Beyond the temporal – some would say the vertical – dimension of "lifelong," it included the horizontal notion of

"lifewide," considering the learning that occurred in all spheres of life: "Life is your basic material of learning, your basic reflection, it is experiential" (Interview with Roberto Carneiro). Reiterating the views expressed in the *Faure report*, learning transcended the boundaries of specific life periods and age groups and needed to be seen as a "continuum" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 100). Learning throughout life encompassed the necessity of adapting to learning requirements as a "response to an economic demand," as well as the ability of human beings "to retain mastery of their own destinies" (p. 101). It needed to be guaranteed through "flexible types of education" that provided for the equality of opportunity of all learners – a point stressed as a necessary premise of democracy. Both "lifelong education" and "learning throughout life" constituted more than organizing principles of education – rather they depicted a worldview of a democratic society in which all citizens had equal learning opportunities which would enable them to unleash their full potential and participate in building the societies in which they lived.

The key rationale behind the shift between the *Faure report*'s "lifelong education" and "learning throughout life" may lie in the adaptation between English and French. The main shift between the two reports occurred in the use of *éducation tout au long de la vie* instead of *éducation permanente*. The Delors Commission moved away from *éducation permanente*, as that term had lost the transformative meaning it had held in the early 1970s. As already mentioned in chapter four, since the introduction of the *loi Delors*, the continuing education law in France in 1971, for which Jacques Delors had been responsible, the work-related term *formation permanente* moved to the fore and superseded the term *éducation permanente* (Forquin, 2004, p. 28). While initially *éducation permanente* denoted the introduction of an educational continuum between the different phases of life, such as school, work and leisure time, it was more and more reduced in its meaning to vocational education (Fernandez, 1995, p. 49), which furthered the emergence of a new term that would capture the holistic meaning of "lifelong education." Moreover, the term *éducation tout au long de la vie* had appeared in European policy and strategy papers which Delors as President of the European Commission had shaped. The 1993 White Paper of the European Commission, *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment. The Challenges and Ways Forward into the 21st Century*

signalled a semantic shift. The document used "lifelong education," "lifelong learning," and at one instance, the term "knowledge and know-how throughout life" (Commission of the European Communities, 1993, p. 6). Similarly, in the French version it mainly used *formation permanente*, which supports Fernandez's argument that *permanente* had shifted to a vocational meaning. But next to *formation permanente* it also used the new formula *éducation tout au long de la vie*. Another European policy document (related to the Leonardo and Socrates education programs), published a year after the White Paper, introduced *éducation tout au long de la vie* as "the new political concept of education" (Fernandez, 1995, p. 46). In English, *éducation tout au long de la vie* was then translated as "learning throughout life," putting the "life" at the end, which was closer to the French and avoided the notion of the "lifelong sentence" that had been problematized by the critics of lifelong education.

Staying with the semantics, scholars have frequently discussed the significance of the shift from education to learning (e.g. Biesta, 2015, p. 76; Boshier, 2012, pp. 41-42; Field, 2001, p. 12), but few have paid attention to the fact that the French version of the *Delors report* continued to use *éducation*, whereas in English, the term shifted to "learning." The reason for this inconsistency, I would argue, lies in the absence of a word for "learning" in French. One of my interviewees, Adama Ouane, explained that,

in French, 'apprentissage' doesn't correspond actually to learning. Because of an old, old pedagogical concept of apprenticeship. So 'apprentissage' entomologically is in fact apprenticeship. The best way of translating this in French will be really to use the verb, apprendre, for learning…but you also need to have a noun for this verb, apprendre.

In fact, in the French literature one often finds lifelong learning translated with the verb *apprendre à tout âge* (e.g. Guyot, Mainguet, & Van Haeperen, 2003, p. 163). The French title of a ministerial OECD meeting organized in 1996, *Lifelong learning for all*, was *Apprendre à tout âge*. According to Adama Ouane, the need for an equivalent noun furthered the use of *apprentissage*. Hence, the introduction of *apprentissage* for "learning" – that occurred after the *Delors report* – needs to be understood as a *rapprochement* between English and French that paved the way for today's use of

apprentissage for "learning." In the UNESCO context, *apprentissage tout au long de la vie* replaced *éducation tout au long de la vie* as the French equivalent of "lifelong learning" between the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V, held in 1997) and the Sixth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA VI, held in 2009). The shift was also implemented, despite some resistance, when in 2007 the UNESCO Institute for Education (Institut de l'UNESCO pour l'éducation) changed its name to UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (Institut de l'UNESCO pour l'apprentissage tout au long de vie).

Carneiro (2015) referred to "learning throughout life" as "the strategic proposition destined to combine tradition and modernity" (p. 106), and as "both a way of organizing education and a philosophy of education" (2011, p. 5). The concept was supposed to reintroduce the notion of an "educational continuum, coextensive with life and widened to take in the whole of society" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 100). The Commission wanted to go beyond "the adult and continuing education tag which was associated with lifelong learning" (Interview with Colin Power). It reiterated the utopian vision that lifelong education had had in the 1970s. In his *Mémoires*, Delors (2004) referred to "learning throughout life" as "une véritable révolution" (p. 442).

The report introduced four pillars around which education and learning should be organized: learning to know; learning to do; learning to live together; and learning to be (Delors et al.,1996, pp. 85-98). Carneiro (2015) pointed out that the learning-centred approach signalled a major paradigm shift, in that it turned away from teaching that "dominated the mechanistic ideal of a rote, repetitive, industrial society" (p. 105). The principle of "learning to be," which is the last of the four pillars of education presented by the *Delors report*, constitutes the common thread with its predecessor, the *Faure report*:

> Learning to be emerges, once again, as a timeless priority. Being and becoming a whole person – fully entitled to rights and duties, bearer of a human dignity beyond conditionalities – remain prime goals of every single educational endeavor. This pillar brings to life the road to self-fulfillment. (p. 105)

> Entrenched in this pillar is the Enlightenment idea of the fulfillment of the human

potential, an idea Delors and the Commissioners often reiterated:

> A broad, encompassing view of learning should aim to enable each
> individual to discover, unearth and enrich his or her creative potential, to
> reveal the treasure within each of us. This means going beyond an
> instrumental view of education, as a process one submits to in order to
> achieve specific aims (in terms of skills, capacities or economic potential),
> to one that emphasises the development of the complete person, in short,
> *learning to be.* (Delors et al., 1996, p. 86)

This section on the pillar "learning to be" recalls the concern about the instrumentalization of the human being expressed in the *Faure report*. "Learning to be" provided continuity with the *Faure report*, but at the same time it marked the main difference between the *Faure report* and the *Delors report*. While the *Faure report* chose "learning to be" and an emphasis on existentialist questions of what it means to be human as its main message, the *Delors report* chose to expand that perspective to the politics of "learning to live together." Asked about the key idea for education in the future, Delors responded: "Make human beings more aware of themselves and of what is around them" (Delors, 1994, p, 348; my translation). This statement reflects both aspects of "learning to be" and "learning to live together." In his *Mémoires*, Delors affirmed that "learning to live together" constituted "the strongest shock formula *("formule-choc")*, given the world in which we were going to live" (Delors, 2004, p. 442; my translation).[59] He referred to this concept as "a necessary utopia":

> Developing an understanding of others and their history, traditions and
> spiritual values and, on this basis, creating a new spirit which…would

---

[59] I have been wondering why Delors used the term "shock" when referring to his notion of "learning to live together." I was intrigued by the fact that Milton Friedman in his letter to Augusto Pinochet prior to the neoliberal experiment in Chile referred to the introduction of his economic measures such as privatization, deregulation and cuts in government spending as "shock treatment" (Friedman, 1975, p. 592). In her book *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism* Naomi Klein (2007) argued that neoliberalism has been installed in countries after experiences of shock. Klein defines "shock" as follows: "Shock is a response to an event that we can't assimilate, an event that seems to come out of nowhere and is a rupture in our story." She further argues, "shock is the gap that opens up between an event and our collective story, and our collective story is our history" (Klein, 2011). My interpretation of Delors' use of "shock" for the idea of "living together" is that it is such an unconceivable idea that it would constitute "a rupture in our story," but it constitutes the only response to the "shock doctrine" that is all around us.

induce people to implement common projects or to manage the

inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way. (Delors et al.,

1996, p. 22)

In Delors' view, the acceleration of the economy and scientific developments rendered obsolete the traditional approach to education, conceived as a system of adaptation of the new generations to the demands of society (as put forward, for example, by Durkheim at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century). In a note sent to Federico Mayor in 1992, in which he presented some of his ideas on education, he argued that the world of the next generation would not look much like the society they, Delors and Mayor, knew. Therefore education had to develop in young people the capacity to know themselves and to behave in an autonomous and respectful way towards others in a rapidly changing environment increasingly saturated with "brutal information" and "technical aggressions." Education must be oriented, so he argued, towards the creation of enlightened, autonomous and responsible citizens and towards building an intelligence that encompassed the capacity to feel as well as to reason. Another goal of education must be *l'égalité des chances*. While he acknowledged that his *"ambition humaniste"* for education sounded utopian, he maintained that this approach to education was indispensable in an environment that was becoming more and more complex, uncertain and often conflictual (Delors, 1992, p. 2; my translation).

The *Delors report* addressed many social issues, such as migration, social cohesion, economic inequality and the unequal distribution of knowledge. But in terms of its actual recommendations with regard to the education system, the report was even less programmatic than the *Faure report*. Two sections discussed in broad philosophic terms the "four pillars of education" and "learning throughout life." One section focused on teachers and covered recommendations as to how to increase the quality of teaching. As an example, the report emphasized that teacher organizations such as trade unions had an important role to play in enhancing the status of teachers (Delors et al., 1996, p. 144) – a clear message against the dismantling of trade unions under neoliberalism. The report underlined the important role of secondary education, which tended to be overlooked by the international education community, because it represented the phase in which "the fate of millions of boys and girls is decided" (p. 32). One section in particular discussed

the education system, "from basic education to university." It contained many common-place statements such as recommendations on how to increase access to schooling, but very little responses to the most burning questions of countries, for example how to finance education, an issue the World Bank offered a much more concrete response to. In terms of specific measures, the report mentioned the possibility of "study-time entitlements" given to students at the start of their education, which would allow them to pursue a certain number of years of education (p. 32) and "debt-for-education swaps" as a measure to counter the negative effects of adjustment policies (p. 33), but did not go into much detail about these measures. It further suggested the allocation of a minimum of 6% of GNP to education and a quarter of international aid to education.

The Delors Commission situated itself in the UNESCO tradition by defining the purpose of education as furthering the development of the potential and dignity of every human being and contributing to the betterment of society, just as the UNESCO founders had done. The new "normative vocabulary" was a way of reiterating the utopian meaning of lifelong learning. The Commission distanced itself from the continuing education dimension that *éducation permanente* and *lifelong learning* had taken and therefore introduced "learning throughout life" to reinvigorate the emancipatory dimension of lifelong learning. "Learning to be" continued to be a key pillar of the *Delors report*, but it heralded "learning to live together" as its main message, placing the emphasis on the aspect of community rather than on the individual. The report resituated education in relation to the political demand of solidarity. This change of perspective reflected the dilemma that some of the implications of globalization constituted for the Commission.

The Dilemmas of Globalization

The Commission frequently discussed the contradictions embedded in globalization. In line with the *Faure report*, it focused on the economization of education, in particular in its relation to development. On the one hand the Commissioners stressed the uniformity and unification brought about by globalization, since through "global communications…the values underlying the 'global village' were disseminated to all." On the other hand they were worried about an increasing "ethnic and religious conflict" and "religious fundamentalism" (UNESCO, 1993, p. 2). The report further referred to "the international market-place, with its increasingly technology-driven societies" and

"alienation from cultural values and traditions" (p. 2). It envisaged lifelong education "as a means of strengthening the bond between education and culture" (p. 3). Delors deemed it necessary "to build global economic development on solidarities and not on exploitations" (Delors, 1992, p. 2; my translation). The Commission also paid a great deal of attention to the role of new technologies in education and the need for continuous training for job-related purposes. While it stressed the possibilities these new technologies opened up for the democratization of knowledge, it also cautioned against their potential to further aggravate social inequalities.

At its sixth session, held in February 1995, the Commission discussed international cooperation in education as well as "promising avenues for the future" (UNESCO, 1995, p. 1). Overall, the consultations undertaken during that session reflected reasons for optimism, given that access to education had greatly expanded, also in light of the *Education for All* initiative. On the other hand, the Commissioners pointed to the importance of recognizing education as a long-term process. They criticized the export of the Western school and evaluation system to the developing countries, which were "overwhelmed by the pressure of numbers and the need to expand educational access" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1994, p. 7). In their view, evaluations focusing on "quantifiable measures of productivity" did not do justice to the "complex factors related to values and to long-term societal influences" (p. 2).

The Commissioners also called for the need to transform "assistance" into "partnership," because in many cases not only had expertise and material assistance been passed on, but also "prejudices, fashions, and errors" (p. 2). They observed the contradiction that while many bilateral and multilateral organizations (they mentioned the World Bank) placed greater emphasis on education, spending on education was declining (p. 2). They further criticized structural adjustment programs, which "forced countries into situations in which actions designed to produce long-term benefits became impossible" (UNESCO, 1993, p. 7), and they debated the possibility of exchange of debt as a way of supporting education "in spite of structural adjustment, in spite of the debt burden, in spite of economic crises of all orders" (UNESCO, 1994b, p. 13). In his contribution to the first session, Michael Manley (1993), former Prime Minister of

Jamaica, warned of the dangers of these programs. He proposed that an IMF compression program should include World Bank and Regional Bank finance for education and training. He also called for a bigger role for international organizations such as UNESCO, UNDP and UNCTAD in the system of international development. Fay Chung equally criticized structural adjustment as "a far too narrow and too purely an economist conceptualization of development" (UNESCO Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995, p. 3). She maintained that Africa needed to decide what it wanted the purpose of education to be, because "only when the purpose of education has been clearly defined can Africa decide what type of education is suitable for its development" (p. 3), and she assigned an important role for education "in creating and defining the values that will make Africa politically and culturally united, coherent, and forward-looking" (p. 3).

In the context of the discussions about development, the Commission took an interest in the role of the World Bank. Fay Chung pointed out that,

concerning the role of the World Bank, one should separate the
commercial aspects of its work from development aspects: these have
become mixed up. There is a tendency in the Bank to talk as if
commercial criteria were the same as developmental criteria.
(International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century,
1995d)

At its fourth session in Vancouver, the Commission held a working group with World Bank representatives. Nicholas Burnett[60]gave a presentation of the forthcoming World Bank education report, *Priorities and Strategies for Education* (published in 1995), which focused on poverty reduction and basic education (UNESCO, 1994b, pp. 8-9). Burnett recalls how "extremely interesting" he found his exchange with the Delors Commission: "I will never forget, of course I don't know the exact words but at the end Delors said, well he said something like 'well, that's changed my view of the World Bank'" (Interview with Nicholas Burnett). At its sixth session held in Paris in February 1995, the Commission looked at the draft of the World Bank report (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995d, p. 1), which points to the

---

[60] Nicholas Burnett later worked for UNESCO, where he served as Assistant Director-General for Education from 2007 to 2009.

great interest the Commission showed in it. Watson (1999) called *Priorities and Strategies for Education* an "antidote" to the *Delors report* (p. 9), and Mundy (1999, p. 46) asserted that the *Delors report* indirectly responded to it. Indeed, the two reports differed in important ways and exemplified how far the World Bank and UNESCO had moved away from each other. While the *Delors report* presented a utopian vision of education, the World Bank report took a practical approach. While the *Delors report* emphasized the role of education for the development of human potential, the World Bank report identified two main priorities for education: "it must meet economies' growing demands for adaptable workers who can readily acquire new skills, and it must support the continued expansion of knowledge" (World Bank, 1995, p. 1). While the former promoted a humanistic approach to education, the latter advocated a human capital approach, arguing that "human capital theory has no genuine rival of equal breadth and rigor" (p. 21). While the former emphasized that debates about education should be driven by ethical considerations, the latter posited that "educational priorities should be set with reference to outcomes, using economic analysis, standard setting, and measurement of achievement through learning assessments" (p. 8). It further stated:

> Economic analysis usually compares benefits (in labor productivity, as
> measured by wages) with costs, for individuals and for society. It
> identifies as priorities for public investment those investments for
> which the social rate of return is highest and the level of public
> subsidization is lowest. (p. 8)

The World Bank report contained no reflection about the nature and purpose of education and learning. It took a purely economic perspective and recommended educational planning on the basis of cost-benefit considerations. As Samoff (1996) concluded, "not values, not goals, not societal debate, but a particular diagnostic tool should be the starting point for setting priorities in public policy" (p. 252). Jones and Coleman (2005) called the strategy "nothing less than a celebration of 'Washington consensus' thinking on education" (p. 119) and observed that "for the first time, a bank education policy document on education was open and straightforward about the neo-liberal basis of the bank's work in education (p. 122).

Delors may have been impressed by Nicholas Burnett, and he emphasized the Commission's interest in talking to the other international agencies such as the IMF and the World Bank about "how they deal with education as capital" (Henderson, 1993). But Delors' interest in these exchanges was motivated by his desire to "rehabilitate" education as a value in itself in accordance with "the ideals at the foundation of Unesco and the whole UN system" (Henderson, 1993). Like Faure before him, Delors worried that education might be taken over by the economic agenda:

> I fear today the invasion of the education system by the pressure of the
> economy. A pressure exerted in parallel by politicians, the realm of
> business, by executives and engineers, which leads to underestimating
> the high mission of education. (Delors, 1994, p. 345; my translation)

He also came back to this issue later in his life. In a recent article, Delors called the dominant economic ideology a "disaster" (2013, p. 238). Protecting education from "utilitarian policies in a world of shrinking budgets" (Henderson, 1993) and "economic pressure" (Henderson, 1993; Delors, 1994, p. 345) constituted one of his major ambitions. Other Commissioners agreed with Delors on this point, such as Fay Chung who declared that "this Commission is an opportunity to shift away from a purely economic vision of education" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1995d).

The tension between the humanistic and the economic approach to education is another striking continuity between the *Faure report* and the *Delors report*. In principle, Delors had been a proponent of the connection between education and the economy and education and work all his life, and this perspective comes out strongly in the report. The total hegemony of the economic perspective, however, as epitomized in the World Bank report *Priorities and Strategies of Education*, worried the Commission, as well as the "exploitative" approach to development and the concern about the short-term quantitative perspective taken towards education, focusing on measurable results rather than considerations about the purpose of education. The Commission criticized the structural adjustment programs that the global financial institutions imposed on developing countries, which some of its members such as Michael Manley and Fay Chung, who had been Minister of Education in Zimbabwe, knew first-hand. Some central terms of the

Faure report reappeared such as "alienation," which the *Delors report* used in a slightly different way. Whereas in the *Faure report* alienation referred mainly to the instrumentalization of human beings through technology and "techno-bureaucracy," in the *Delors report* the term primarily denoted estrangement of human beings from their culture. Identity politics and fundamentalism emerged as major challenges for the Delors Commission.

Appraising the Influence of the *Delors Report*

Delors took over the Presidency of UNESCO's International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century with the intention of putting all his authority and good reputation behind "a battle of ideas to be fought and won," as he explained to Henderson (1993). He was out to rescue education from the clutches of the market and rehabilitate the idealistic origins of the UN system. All the more disappointed must he have been when he realized that by the time *Learning: The Treasure Within* was published UNESCO had lost interest in it. Delors had to be convinced to attend the launching event in 1996 (Interview with Roberto Carneiro). While the Executive Board had held a long discussion on the *Faure report* (UNESCO, 1973a, pp. 4-33), no such debate occurred in the case of the *Delors report*. UNESCO's programme strategy did not foresee any budget for activities to promote the report. Expressing his disappointment about the lack of attention UNESCO gave to the report towards one of my interviewees, Ulrika Peppler Barry, Delors said that the report had been like *"un coup d'épée dans l'eau"* ("a sword cutting through water"). In terms of the reasons for the shift in priorities, given Mayor's enthusiasm when he took charge, I can only offer my reading of what I gathered from my interviews. The secretariat had tried to gain more influence over the report, but Delors rejected these attempts. He did not even allow members of the secretariat to sit in the meetings of the Commission. Mayor lost interest because he could not claim any ownership of the report. He instead turned to other priorities, such as his "Culture of Peace" program, which is featured as his legacy on his Wikipedia page. A few years later, in 2000, a new Director-General, Koïchiro Matsuura, took office and focused his energies on *Education for All*, and the *Delors report* receded into the background.

In terms of the report's influence on countries, as in the case of the *Faure report*, this is not an easy question to answer. Insufficient research exists on the impact of the *Delors report* on educational policies. Tawil and Cougeureux (2010) observe that there has been "no systematic follow-up on the influence and impact of the Delors report" (p. 5). About a year after the report had come out, the Commission met in Paris and Alexandra Draxler tabled an analysis of press clippings and reactions to the report, which listed some of the activities planned to discuss the report, in particular seminars and panel discussions organized by UNESCO Commissions and regional offices, often in cooperation with national Ministries of Education (Task Force on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1997; see also Power, 2015, chapter 6). The strongest response came from Europe and North and Latin America. The Nordic countries organized a conference of the Nordic Council of Ministers that was directly inspired by the *Delors report* and attended by representatives from 18 countries (Nordic Council of Ministers, 1997). The Canadian National Commission developed a kit that could be used for events about the report (Canadian Commission for UNESCO, 1997). The report sparked the development of indicators for lifelong learning (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2010; Canadian Council on Learning, 2010), reflections on educational reform (see, for example De Lisle, 1996, for Latin America; Dohmen, 1996, for Germany) and pilot projects such as a lifelong learning model experiment in the German Laender (BLK, 2001). The *Delors report*'s four pillars of education became a catchphrase and they are still frequently cited today in policy reports and the scholarly literature (as the "four pillars of learning"). As Draxler noted, the "four pillars" constituted "without any question, the peg on which most comments are hung" (Task Force on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1997, p. 1). According to Carneiro and Draxler (2008), the *Delors report* generated initiatives in 50 countries, and it was translated into about 30 languages. But apart from the rhetorical and intellectual exercises, little evidence points to actual influence on policies around the world.

Given that lifelong education had emerged in the context of adult education, it is not surprising that adult education circles received the report favourably. Again, UNESCO's adult education institute – the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) – not

only provided background papers to the report,[61] but also played an important role in following up on it. Although some of the reviews criticized the *Delors report* for its lack of attention to adult education (Bhola, 1997), it strongly influenced the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V) and many of the conference documents referred to it (see, for example, UNESCO Institute for Education, 1997).[62] The Conference declaration also reiterated the call for the allocation of 6% of the GNP to education. From that platform, the *Delors report*, in particular its "four pillars of education," spread into many countries.

Lee (2007, pp. 18-19) argued that, as a consequence of the *Delors report*, the discourse in the European Commission's policy documents shifted between 1995 and 1997 from a focus on the economic purposes of education to a more balanced discourse that expressed an equal concern for the role of education for social purposes. The EC's *Memorandum on Lifelong Learning* of 2000 referred to "learning throughout life," which was the key concept in the *Delors report,* but which, as I have shown earlier, had already emerged in EC documents prior to the *Delors report*. The European Year of Lifelong Learning in 1996 further facilitated the absorption of lifelong learning into European policies (Field, 2001, pp. 8-9).

While the World Bank paid attention to the *Faure report* and mentioned it in several documents, it largely ignored the *Delors report*. Asked whether the report was an issue in the World Bank, Nicholas Burnett responded: "Issue, no. Generally ignored I would say. People were aware of it. That's interesting, that's not really our thing. I wouldn't think it was opposed but it wasn't considered very relevant" (Interview with Nicholas Burnett). The Commission gained a lot of legitimacy from Delors' position as President of the European Commission. Although diverse in its composition, it was led by two French intellectuals, Jacques Delors and – in the first half of the duration of the Commission – Delors' main adviser, the university professor Danièle Blondel. It was more of a "European affair" and not much noticed in the United States, which was not a member of UNESCO at the time.

---

[61] A selection of the background papers that informed the report have been published in UNESCO, 1998.

[62] 12 years later, Jacques Delors provided a video message on lifelong learning for CONFINTEA VI, held in 2009. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYDTIRzzRss

Developing countries were interested in the report but did not take it up as much as Western countries, as "part of the problem was the weak national commission and the overriding problems of just coping with poverty and coping with EFA was the main priority, I suspect" (Interview with Colin Power). The *Delors report* suffered the same fate as the *Faure report* in that critics did not consider it practical enough and criticized it for resorting to "the language of idealism and dreams" and presenting an argument qualified as "essentially normative rather than empirical" (McGinn, 1998, pp. 230-231; see also Watson, 1999, p. 10). Draxler's analysis of press clippings and reviews of the report concluded that the main criticisms tended to "fall into three categories: that the report is too general, that it is full of good sentiments but not practical enough, and that it has not developed enough the notion of learning throughout life" (Task Force on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1997, p. 2).

The *Delors report* constituted a major endeavour in terms of defining UNESCO's educational ideas and establishing its global legitimacy and intellectual authority in the field of education. Considerable resources went into it, not so much in terms of budget − the budget of the report was in fact lower than that of the *Faure report* ("We were by far the cheapest of any international commission ever," Interview with Alexandra Draxler) − but in terms of energy and resources. Fifteen Commissioners met at eight meetings held in different parts of the world between March 1993 and January 1996. A secretariat, headed by Alexandra Draxler, organized the work of the Commission. Numerous experts participated in the so-called "hearings" and working groups convened on different topics. Myriad "non-papers" were presented. External experts were mobilized and wrote background papers that informed the Commission. A large number of writers, editors and translators worked on the production of the reports and their translation into about 30 languages. Given UNESCO's extensive efforts, the report had surprisingly little, if any impact, on the *Education for All* initiative in which UNESCO played a key role (Elfert, 2014a). EFA, which was revitalized at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000, had far greater impact on the educational systems in developing countries and became the development agenda for the South (Mundy, 2006; Torres, 2002). As for the "developed world," the OECD's lifelong learning discourse won the day (Rubenson, 2009). Although OECD's variant of lifelong learning also included aspects of social cohesion and

citizenship, its dominant purpose was the acquisition of skills and competencies to meet labour market needs in the broader context of the competitive knowledge society. Hence, despite the appeal of its message, the *Delors report* was overshadowed by the pragmatic approach to EFA on the one hand and by the hegemony of a neoliberal lifelong learning discourse on the other.

The Disenchantment of the *Delors report*

Although the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* were only 24 years apart and shared many similarities, their view of the world was quite different. In the late 1960s, the student revolutions had called the existing order into question. The *Faure report* challenged traditional pillars of society, and one of its main messages concerned the role of the school, which "has its role to play…but it will be less and less in a position to claim the education function in society as its special prerogative" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 162). By the 1990s, Edgar Faure's "new social contract" clearly had not come about. Capitalism represented the unchallenged economic system, and Fukuyama (1993) went as far as to proclaim "the end of history." The *Delors report* did not question the foundations of society as much as the *Faure report*. While making a series of critical remarks about the school (e.g. Delors et al., 1996, p. 115), the *Delors report* fully embraced the school as the fundamental pillar of the education system.

While the Commissioners of the *Faure report* believed they were witnessing the birth of a new society and a new political system, the *Delors report* adopted a more pessimistic tone. Delors wrote that "the prevailing mood of disenchantment forms a sharp contrast with the hopes born in the years just after the Second World War" (p. 15). Both reports shared the concern about a too narrow economic view of education. But the *Faure report* was still situated in "the golden age of capitalism" (Evans, 1997, p. 68) as the experience of economic instability hit only after the report's publication, in the mid-1970s (pp. 68; 75-76). For the Delors Commission economic crisis was a reality, and the situation of the developing countries looked much more bleak than in the late 1960s. In the post-war years, many regarded democracy as the only possible political system that allowed for a balance between individual freedom and social cohesion, and equality constituted the axiomatic foundation of democracy. But the *Delors report* perceived a crisis of democracy and a loss of interest in its values in terms of the "widening gap

between those who govern and those who are governed" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 55) and pointed to "a crisis in social policies which is undermining the very foundations of a system of solidarity" (p. 56). It exhibited a subtle spirit of disenchantment in propagating education as a necessary condition for the ability of humans to stand against an "alienating," even "hostile" system (p. 95). The democratic and participatory society based on freedom, creativity and solidarity imagined in the *Faure report* had remained a dream. In that respect, the *Delors report* testified to a mood of crisis, while the *Faure report* exuded a much greater optimism in its belief that a societal transformation could happen. However, Delors also wanted to give the report a message of hope: "Underlying the grave nature of many of the problems facing humankind, the need was felt to find a message of hope" (UNESCO, 1993, p. 7). Also Carneiro stressed that "hope is the abiding philosophy" (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1994, p. 17).

The *Faure report* was framed in the perspective of the social democratic welfare state and took the role of the state for granted. It did not anticipate the role of the private sector, although it made a remark about encouraging "private initiative" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 15). The *Delors report* acknowledged that the education system could be "public, private or mixed" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 31), as long as the "public authorities …show the way…and regulate the system" (p. 31). Delors, who came from the French "dirigiste" tradition, believed in a strong role for the state as the institution that should have a long-term vision for social and economic planning as a counterweight to the current "shortsightedness, the obsession of the short term and of the surveys" (Delors, 1994, p. 101; my translation). Originally, the report included a longer section about the role of the state that Karan Singh objected to in his comments on the draft report. He argued that the report gave "too great importance and too predominant a role to the State. With almost 200 nation states on this planet, we must surely begin to transcend our obsession with the Nation State of the Westphalian model that has dominated our thinking for the last four centuries" (Singh, n.d., p. 1). Another Commissioner, Bronislaw Geremek, a national of Poland, pointed to "state power" in negative terms, exerted in social relations, such as "military power" and "compulsory schooling" (Geremek, 1996, p. 209). Michael Manley's view on the role of the state was shaped by his developing

country perspective as structural adjustment programs forced the state into a diminished role:

> The report is being presented at a time when the state itself is in substantial retreat in many countries. In addition to pressures exerted by the multilateral financial institutions, governments have become the targets of minimalist ideology or the victims of shrinking resources. For these reasons alone it is possible to predict a diminishing role for the state in education systems in much of the world. Something will have to take up the slack if individual societies are to hope to improve or maintain their position in the global market-place and solve the problems posed by increasingly bitter social division. (Manley, 1996, p. 223)

Ultimately, the *Delors report* did not specifically say much about the state, but like the *Faure report* it presupposed the state as the implementor of the lifelong learning vision. However, the Commission predicted that the role of the state in delivering education would be redefined and likely relinquished (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (n.d.) [1994], p. 3).

Conclusion

At the end of this chapter, I will focus on the continuity and the shifts between the *Delors report* and its predecessor, the *Faure report*, and I will reflect on some of the weaknesses of the *Delors report*. Like the Faure Commission 24 years earlier, the Delors Commission represented a site of dialogue and struggle in which its members entered into a dialectical relationship with UNESCO's humanistic tradition. The individuals involved shaped the message of the *Delors report* according to their beliefs and experiences, which were situated in a "wider web of beliefs" (Bevir, 1999, p. 29). Delors had been shaped by his activism in post-war French Catholic-intellectual workers' movements, and he had been highly involved in political developments in France, in particular in relation to education. *Éducation permanente* held a very similar meaning ("une véritable révolution") to Delors and to Faure, and their overlapping socialist-social democratic worldviews certainly explain to some extent why the *Delors report* reclaimed the utopian meaning of lifelong education that the *Faure report* and the lifelong learning

theorists of the 1960s and 1970s had put forward.

The *Faure report* constituted an important reference point for the Delors Commission, which used a working document presenting the main arguments of the *Faure report* and its contextual differences (Commission internationale sur l'éducation pour le vingt et unième siècle, 1993, p. 3). Delors laid out four elements that characterized the major contextual differences between the *Faure report* and the Delors Commission: 1) Globalization had increased and goods, information or people circulated more rapidly; 2) The exchanges between the North and the South had changed. There was no longer one "South" but several at different levels of development; 3) The end of the Cold War led to "a major ideological vacuum;" 4) The growing importance of information technology (UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 1995, p. 14). The *Delors report* reclaimed many of the issues and terms of the *Faure report*, such as the tension between the humanistic and economistic approach to education, the critical stance towards development, the emphasis on technology, the notion of "solidarity" and the cosmopolitanism ideal of UNESCO's early years, which was reflected in the concept of the "global village." The concept of the *cité éducative* has been taken up again in the notion of the "learning society."

Universalism constituted a salient feature of both reports. Like the drafters of UNESCO's constitution, the members of both Commissions believed in the unifying force of humanism. Zeev Sternhell's (2010) definition of the Enlightenment's "universal intellectual" could be applied to them:

> They wrote with the immediate application of their ideas in mind, but at
> the same time posed fundamental questions about human nature and the
> role of man in society. They had an idea of what they thought a 'good'
> society should be. They all tried to transcend the immediate context in
> which they lived and felt that they were stating 'eternal principles' and
> essential truths. (p. 39)

Exemplary of this universalism is a quote from one of the books by Henri Lopes (2003), the Congolese politician, diplomat and writer who served as a Commissioner of the *Faure report*, in which he took a strong stand against particularism and identity politics: "The distinctive cult of cultural, original, national or religious identity brings

about obscurantism, fundamentalism and the politics of exclusion" (p. 13; my translation). Delors' universalism constituted one of the main characteristics of his humanism, which he rendered powerfully in his first chapter of the report:

> It is…education's noble task to encourage each and every one, acting in accordance with their traditions and convictions and paying full respect to pluralism, to lift their minds and spirits to the plane of the universal and, in some measure, to transcend themselves. It is no exaggeration on the Commission's part to say that the survival of humanity depends thereon. (Delors et al., 1996, p. 18)

The main difference between the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* consists in the latter's focus on a collective perspective, epitomized in the notion of "learning to live together." In Delors' view, the *Faure report* had placed too much emphasis on the individual. In his address to the 140th session of the Executive Board (UNESCO, 1992b) he situated the *Faure report* in the context of the student revolution and the crisis of authority and stressed that it had focused on "the development of the person." He contended that "education can and must contribute not only to the advancement of the individual, as was said in the *Faure report*, but also to the emergence of common values, which the recent progress of democracy in the world entitles us to hope for, and also to a better understanding of others and the world we live in" (p. 5). In one of his books, he talked about the defunct totalitarian ideologies that had aspired at the formation of "a new man," which in his view meant the appropriation of the individual by society, which had provoked the counter-movement of excessive individualism. Given his roots in the Catholic "communitarian" movement, he emphasized the role of the individual as a member of society (Delors, 1994, pp. 152-153). Against this background it is no wonder the *Delors report* did not pick up on Faure's gender-biased notion of the "complete man." Although the *Delors report* embraced the *Faure report*'s emphasis on the realization of the individual's potential and saw the "central aim of education [as] the fulfillment of the individual as a social being" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 53), by chosing "learning to live together" as its main message, the Commission chose to place the focus on the community.

Relating Gadamer's hermeneutics to the Commissioners, they entered into a dialogue with UNESCO's humanism and took a conscious decision to affirm this tradition, as a reaction to dilemmas that confronted them. The humanism of the *Faure report* reacted to the dilemma of the educational crisis and also reflected the critical and utopian humanism of the post-war. Despite the emerging post-humanist movement, the humanist stance "was logical for us" ("ça a été pour nous quelque chose de logique"), as Henri Lopes stated in our interview. The Delors Commission reclaimed utopian humanism out of resistance against the subordination of education under neoliberalism and the particularism that came with globalization.[63]

The Delors Commission represented another example of UNESCO's "unity in diversity" approach. As Carneiro explained, the Commission made an effort to recognize regional cultural differences, in search of the universal principles that united all of them. The Delors Commission paid much more attention to the different spiritual and cultural backgrounds represented by their members than the Faure Commission, which consisted of a much smaller number of members who – despite their different nationalities – had more coherent backgrounds as they were all men and all educated in the West.

Delors' worldview was remarkably compatible with UNESCO's ideology. It is not by accident that he chose UNESCO as a platform to spread his message. He wanted to take a stand against the hegemony of the economic and get other international organizations – he mentioned in particular the IMF and the World Bank – to "share Unesco's idealism and concern with principle" (Henderson, 1993). He was eager to help restore credibility to UNESCO and to his religiously motivated idealism. For him, the Commission was not just about education, but about "the ideals at the foundation of Unesco and the whole UN system which must be rehabilitated" (ibid.). Delors had stepped up to win a battle, but he lost it. In an interview he gave in 2011 he referred to the loss of a battle in relation to his time as President of the European Commission. He deplored that the social dimension had been forgotten in the course of the European integration process: "It is not just a question of money. I said all these things, but I was not heard. I was beaten" (Moore, 2011).

In terms of the *Delors report*, why was he beaten? Many questions remain as to

---

[63] For a table comparing the *Faure report* and the *Delors report*, see Appendix 4.

why the report has been such a "non-event," as Kjell Rubenson likes to say. It did not offer a strong enough alternative to the very hands-on economic and practical approach taken by the World Bank report. Delors faught his battle with tools that remained caught up in French approaches to philosophy, exemplified by his opening question to the Commission, "what is modernity?" His statement "I was beaten" and the fact that he turned down the French Presidency could be interpreted as an indication that he had become tired of "Realpolitik." In that case, it may be that he was primarily interested in the UNESCO Commission because it offered him an intellectual playground, as a counter-balance to his "other" life in European politics? But even in taking a philosophical approach, he did not address some key issues that might have resonated with different political and educational circles. Maybe the biggest lapse of the report is that it did not define the role of the state in education. Although it posited several times that "policy-makers…cannot leave [education] to market forces" (Delors et al., 1996, p. 31) and that the state "must assume certain responsibilities to its citizens" (p. 160), a substantive discussion of what kind of state was needed to translate into action the "four pillars of education" might have enhanced the impact of the report on the realm of policy. As I mentioned before, Delors had originally planned to include a stronger statement on the state, but some of the Commissioners discouraged him to do so as they all had very different views on the state stemming from their divergent political traditions and backgrounds. This points to another difficulty: did the report suffer in the end from the differences between the Commissioners? And was Delors, the European integration expert with his strong stance in French and Continental intellectual traditions, the right person to bring all of these people together? Or is it maybe futile in the first place to assume that a unity can be achieved from that level of diversity (the old UNESCO dilemma)? The humanism of the *Delors report* had slightly different features than the Enlightenment humanism of UNESCO's early years and of the *Faure report*. It represented a shift from the individual towards the politics of the multicultural society, but it did not go all the way in mapping out what such politics would entail. In the end, the report did not offer an effective enough response to the four major challenges embedded in globalization that Delors had identified as the main contextual differences to the *Faure report*.

These considerations may be a part of the reasons why UNESCO's interest in the *Delors report* was short-lived, apart from the other explanations I have offered above (Mayor lost interest as he could not claim ownership of the report; priorities shifted towards *Education for All* with its focus on primary education; a new Director-General took over). While the report constituted an effort to revitalize UNESCO's tradition and the legitimacy of its founding message, it did not re-engage with this tradition in a radical way, and it did not have enough "bite" to effectively face the neoliberal pragmatism the World Bank promoted at the same time. However, the message of the *Delors report* continues to resonate, as the document is still widely cited in educational literature. Mark Bray, former Director of the IIEP, sent me a photo of Delors' "four pillars of learning" prominently featured at the entrance of a school in Cambodia, and Alexandra Draxler also mentioned the high interest the messages of the report has aroused in schools around the world to the present day. But at the level of education policies, the influence of the *Delors report* can be regarded as negligible. Field (2001) noted that of the different international organizations, "only the OECD's proposals appeared to have any concrete influence on governments" (p. 8). In contrast to the *Delors report*, the 1989 OECD report *Education and the Economy in a Changing Society* "became a bible for Ministers of Education" (Rubenson, 2008, p. 255). The relevance of the *Delors report* today rests in its challenge – albeit not convincing enough – to the prevailing instrumental view of education which has exacerbated in the past two decades. Since 1996, education moved further down the economic path, jeopardizing more and more UNESCO's utopia of a just society.

Chapter Seven
The Struggle of Ideologies

Introduction

In the previous chapters, I have traced how the concept of lifelong learning emerged from UNESCO's humanistic approach to education and how it evolved in the organization. The meaning of lifelong learning underwent slight shifts throughout the decades. In the post-war years, idealism and the focus on the dignity and "supreme value" of every human being prevailed. Given the educational demands of the returning soldiers who needed education and training in order to re-integrate into society and find work, and the need for "enlightened" citizens who could take responsibilities in a democratic system, UNESCO focused strongly on adult education. The UNESCO founders conceived education as a unifying movement, which would further peace through international understanding. The concept of *éducation permanente*, which emerged in the 1960s and reached a peak with the *Faure report* in the 1970s, blended the initial idealism with the critical and revolutionary spirit of that time. Educational reforms became an important part of the movement for societal transformation. Rather than being merely an educational strategy, *éducation permanente* represented more of a philosophy, which implied a critique of society, a call for democratization of education and a departure from the traditional "banking" model of education, based on a hierarchical teacher-student relationship. The concept was influenced by existentialist philosophy, in terms of its questioning of the established order, the focus on the "human condition" and the idea that human beings needed to take responsibility for their actions. Although an important aspect of *éducation permanente* was the improvement of connections between education and work, the concept did not have a strong economic dimension, in contrast to the human capital approach that guided the lifelong learning policies of other international organizations. In the 1990s, Jacques Delors and his Commissioners chose to affirm the humanistic approach as an act of resistance against developments that their predecessors of the 1970s had already warned against. The *Delors report* constituted the last expression of UNESCO's "maximalist" interpretation of lifelong learning, and it marked the end of an era. Since 1990, UNESCO has been implicated in the *Education for All*

(EFA) initiative that has led the organization to depart from its broad and philosophical approach to education. The humanist movement of lifelong learning has been consigned to the history books.

The purpose of this concluding chapter is to recapitulate the main findings from the previous chapters and relate them to my theoretical framework while responding to the questions: What has become of UNESCO's humanistic vision of lifelong learning and why has it lost out to an instrumental approach to education? I will reflect on these questions by taking into consideration the key factors that had an impact on UNESCO's lifelong learning movement: the changing political economy, internal and external pressure exerted on the organization, UNESCO's institutional behavior, and the shifting dynamics of global governance.

This chapter is roughly organized into five sections: I will start by presenting the EFA initiative with its focus on primary education, which ran somewhat counter to the "maximalist" lifelong learning movement as it took a much narrower and more technical rather than philosophical perspective. The second section will discuss the contemporary interpretation of lifelong learning in the global educational discourse, which differs strongly from the understanding that UNESCO's lifelong learning pioneers had of the idea. In particular, I will focus on how lifelong learning has been depoliticized and transformed by the dominant economic ideology of neoliberalism. The third section will address the "technical turn" that UNESCO had to take in order to compete with other organizations over the global authority for education and discuss the historical circumstances and institutional factors that led to UNESCO losing out in the "struggle of ideas." The fourth section will reflect on the reasons why the organization still today holds on to its humanistic tradition in an unfavourable environment and examine some contemporary expressions of UNESCO's humanism. The last section of this chapter will summarize what I believe constitute the main findings of this study.

EFA and The Push Towards "Accountability"

Ten years after the World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA), the international community organized a second EFA conference in order to revitalize the unachieved goals set in Jomtien. The World Education Forum, which took place in Dakar

in April 2000, set six education goals to be achieved by the year 2015. While UNESCO had succeeded in Jomtien in keeping a broader view of education on the agenda, the "expanded vision of basic Education for All" (UNESCO, 1990) narrowed in Dakar. Basic education, not lifelong learning, constituted the main organizing principle of EFA (Torres, 2001; 2002; 2011; King, 2011, p. 17). Although the six Dakar goals covered the education trajectory from early childhood education to adult education, "basic education" de facto turned out to mean universal primary education. The shift in focus from learning to poverty reduction converted the right to education into a development goal (Tomasevski, 2003, p. 3). The focus of EFA on primary schooling contributed to a false dichotomy between EFA for the South and lifelong learning for the North (Torres, 2002), where lifelong learning continued to spread as an educational paradigm. UNESCO's concept of lifelong learning, still present at the Jomtien conference, almost disappeared at Dakar. Apart from the *Delors report*'s notorious "four pillars of learning" mentioned in the *Dakar Framework for Action* (the outcome document of the conference) as well as in the report of the Arab preparatory meeting (The Arab States, 2000), none of the Dakar documents referred to the *Delors report*, and lifelong learning remained unmentioned in the final report of the conference.

EFA constituted a joint effort involving four international organizations other than UNESCO: UNICEF, UNDP, the World Bank, and UNFPA (the latter supposedly played a minor role). At the end of the day, the World Bank emerged as the organization with the highest leverage and prevailed with its narrow focus on expansion of primary schooling. Primary education was politically opportune and reinforced by the second Millennium Development Goal pertaining to universal primary education. Formally, UNESCO managed to take the lead of the coordination of EFA as the developing countries pushed for UNESCO, despite the resistance of the World Bank and influential development agencies such as the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). However, the World Bank as the main donor of education and the main creditor of developing countries took the leading role in the establishment of the Fast-Track-Initiative (FTI), which represented a mechanism to ensure donor commitment for universal primary education in the context of EFA on the basis of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) that the countries needed to present in order to obtain funding or

debt relief. At the same time, the EFA process required countries to produce national EFA strategies, which fell under the responsibility of UNESCO. These instruments brought about a much stronger emphasis on accountability than had been the case after the previous EFA conference held in Jomtien (Interview with Jacques Hallak). To keep up with the "technical turn," UNESCO built up its technical capacities. In 1999, the organization founded a statistics institute, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) in Montreal, in order to strengthen its statistical performance, and since 2002, it has published, with funding from DFID,[64] the *EFA Global Monitoring Report* as an instrument of monitoring the progress of EFA, which has contributed to regaining legitimacy for the organization (Edward, Okitsu, da Costa, & Kitamura, 2015).

Although the EFA initiative derived its justification rhetorically from the normative claim for education as a human right, it lost much of the philosophical underpinnings characteristic of this idea. As Adama Ouane said in our interview, "this pragmatic approach, it really led to losing sight of the deep and complex nature of education and training. We entered into benchmarks, into results, into numbers, into statistics, and…into goals." In the rush to get more children into schools, meet targets and, more recently, measure learning outcomes, the purpose of education that so concerned the lifelong education theorists has fallen by the wayside. Standardized tests that measure the learning performance of children often have counter-productive effects on their learning and fuel the "barbaric kind of selection that school failure constitutes" (Lengrand, 1994, p. 112, my translation). In the coming years these tests, which have already conquered the industrialized world, will be increasingly employed in developing countries (Mundy, 2007, p. 348; UNESCO-UIS & Brookings Institution, 2013). The UN Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh, pointed to the fact that the cuts imposed by structural adjustment programs on public services "have led to the push for an increase in private provision as a way to introduce market competition into the education space" (United Nations General Assembly, 2014, p. 6). He continued:

> The education sector in Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
> countries, for example, represents a market worth of a relatively

---

[64] In 2014, 17 different donors have contributed to funding the EFA Global Monitoring Report (Edward, Okitsu, da Costa, & Kitamura, 2015, p. 44).

stable $1,600 billion dollars…The world's largest education

multinational and largest testing company within this "industry,"

Pearson, made an income of $7 billion in 2011 and the top 20

education multinationals are worth a combined $36 billion. This

represents only a foot in the door to the larger market and there is

room for vigorous growth. (p. 7)

Black (2010) shows how the right to education served as a pretext for exporting the standardized Western school system into the developing world as essentially a source of profit, spreading the values of the consumer society and alienating children from their cultures and homes. Jacques Delors called the export of the Western school a failure, from an economic and cultural point of view (Delors, 1994, p. 348).

"Education as Cultural Imperialism"

UNESCO's idealism could not prevent these developments. It failed to offer concrete enough solutions to the urgent problems developing countries faced after they liberated themselves from colonial rule. Although the *Faure report* addressed issues of planning and contained a large amount of empirical data, "practical" considerations were embedded in a long philosophical treaty, which made the document inaccessible, as Peter Williams pointed out, to Ministry staff in developing countries who had burning problems on their hands. Developing countries were eager to leave their colonial pasts behind by engaging in planning and development on the basis of what Myrdal (1968) called "modernization ideals" (p. 76). The expansion of the school system was a part of that modernization as it held the promise of progress and social and economic benefits.

A more pragmatic approach than the one UNESCO had to offer would have arguably been more suitable for the developing countries, but unfortunately those pragmatic solutions came with a high level of "coercion" and conditions that threatened their economies and social systems (Stiglitz, 2002, chapter 1). EFA grew out of a pragmatic planning approach that basically offered a "one size fits all" model that left little room for diversity. It constituted a distortion of the "unity in diversity" approach as it imposed the Western culture on the rest of the world. As Jones (1992) argued,

all around the world, the variety and the dynamics of local culture

have collided with the steady transformation of societies along the

lines implied by modernization. It is when entering the classroom door

that this is most evident – the point at which so much of local culture

and custom is discarded in favour of the demands of technological

civilization. (p. xiii)

The Western-style school model and other Western achievements such as National Qualifications Frameworks (Allais, 2007) have been exported to developing countries without asking questions about their cultural relevance. It is surprising to see these practices of "education as cultural imperialism" (Carnoy, 1974) still prevailing, as they had already been criticized at the time of fundamental education. The argument that fundamental education imposed a Western way of thinking on developing countries provided a justification for abandoning the program (Watras, 2007). The same criticism could be applied to EFA, actually to a much greater extent. But in the current debates about the EFA post-2015 agenda this issue hardly ever comes up.

Given the narrow focus of EFA on primary schooling before and after Dakar and the push towards more accountability, data and standardization, UNESCO's lifelong learning approach did not hold much weight. The "piece-meal and 'quick fix' logic" (Jones & Coleman, 2005, p. 43) of EFA and its reliance on goals that linked development aid to the achievement of numerical targets, was incompatible with concepts such as the "learning society" based on the "enlightened" citizen or the Delors report's "four pillars of education," which are difficult to measure. The idea of changing human beings in order to transform society, as in the *Faure report*'s notion of the "complete man," lost traction. EFA paid no attention to the "human condition" – it aimed at producing a uniform individual that fit into society as it was and whose learning could be measured by standardized tests. As the lead agency for EFA, UNESCO had to demonstrate that it was up to the task and concentrate its efforts on its technical services which would help the organization gain trust and legitimacy. The new Director-General, Koïchiro Matsuura, who took office only a few months prior to the Dakar conference, focused his energies on EFA, and "the Delors report was pushed aside" (Interview with Colin Power).

In the latest normative document related to EFA, the *Incheon Declaration* launched by the third EFA conference, the World Education Forum held in Incheon in

May 2015, lifelong learning has appeared back on the agenda (World Education Forum, 2015). It also holds a prominent position in the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 on education, "Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all." Although schooling remains a key issue (the *Incheon Declaration* calls for "12 years of free, publicly funded, equitable quality primary and secondary education" (p. 2), while the Dakar conference in 2000 focused on compulsory primary education), the document explicitly mentions other forms of education such as technical and vocational education and non-formal and informal learning. While the reasons for the reappearance of lifelong learning would require more research, I would offer the tentative explanation that it constitutes a reaction to the heavy criticism EFA and the World Bank have been exposed to for their narrow focus on primary education. In recent years the World Bank has widened its attention towards secondary education and has distanced itself from its "rates of return" estimates (Jones, 2007b, pp. 225-230). While the use of the term lifelong learning denotes a widening of perspective, it remains to be seen whether it will actually result in more funding and attention to forms of education other than schooling.

Lifelong Learning Under Neoliberalism

Lifelong learning has become a common educational framework that constitutes an integral part of the educational discourse around the world. Many countries have made an effort to become "learning societies" that offer expanded continuing education opportunities to their citizens, along with mechanisms that allow the transition of learners through the education system, such as recognition of prior learning. Some exemplary cases such as China and the Republic of Korea are said to have built their rapid economic and technological development on the attention they have given to the expansion and development of their education systems under the label of lifelong learning (Lee, 2010; Huang & Shi, 2008; Wang & Morgan, 2012). However, lifelong learning policies display a predominantly economic and instrumental interpretation that focuses on the provision of skills for individuals to be able to find work, which has little to do with UNESCO's "maximalist" version of lifelong learning. Lifelong learning has become more and more deprived of its "revolutionary" dimension.

The instrumental shift of the meaning of lifelong learning can be explained by several factors. First, the concept has adapted to new forms of labour and the fluidity of the globalized labour market. The explosion of information and communication technologies paired with global trade and production constituted a tremendous social change, similar to the dawn of industrial production in the mid-nineteenth century. It demanded from the workforce ever greater mobility, "flexibility" (a catchword often used as a euphemism for "job insecurity") and constant adaptation to new jobs. The "leisure society" many educationists and economists in the 1960s and 1970s had predicted failed to materialize. Instead the boundaries between labour and leisure became blurred, culminating in the "global 24-7 workforce" (BusinessWeek, 2007). While in 1949 at CONFINTEA in Elsinore Johannes Novrup had talked about an education that allowed adults to remain "what they are" and enjoy "non-vocational" education, the adult of today is condemned to compete in the global labour market in an endless circle of training and the acquisition of skills to make a living. This is the "trap" of learning for life predicted by Ivan Illich.

UNESCO's utopian notion of lifelong learning assumed the welfare state and "an economy of full employment" (Field, 2001, p. 8). The threat of unemployment which rose under neoliberalism, had a mitigating effect on workers' demands for higher wages and better working conditions (Overbeek, 2003, p. 27). For Delors (1994) unemployment constituted one of the primary causes of social injustice (p. 151). As laid out in chapter four, the concept of *éducation permanente* in UNESCO resided in the political claims of the workers' movement. Workers' rights have been systematically dismantled under neoliberalism, "the first economic model in 200 years the upswing of which was premised on the suppression of wages and smashing the social power and resilience of the working class" (Mason, 2015, para.17). While in the post-war era up through the 1970s unemployment was seen as a structural problem, neoliberalism has redefined unemployment as the fault of the worker who has failed to make herself available to the labour market. This change of perspective has been captured by the term "employability." It is the worker's responsibility to equip herself with the skills she requires to find work. The role of the state, rather than to protect rights, is to facilitate such opportunities for upskilling (Overbeek, 2003, p. 27).

As discussed in the second chapter, neoliberalism stands for an economic model that leaves utmost freedom to the market. Under this paradigm, everything is subordinated to profitability and competition. The "skills" agenda exemplifies the neoliberal variant of lifelong learning. It applies the human capital approach to the relationship between the individual and education and defines the purpose of education as the acquisition of marketable skills (OECD, 2013). From a human capital point of view, a person amounts to the sum of her skills and competencies that she can sell on the labour market, and education represents merely an investment, similar to building bridges or roads. Esping-Andersen (2002) tends to employ arguments very similar to those used by the early human capital theorists when he argues for a sustainable social contract that will guarantee the survival of the welfare state. He shows how investments in education will pay off from a human capital point of view by employing, for example, the argument that investing in families and children will likely produce adults with a better education and better income. In the same vein, a push for gender equality makes sense to prevent labour shortages.

In an earlier paper, Esping-Andersen (1996, p. 260) had argued for the welfare state from a human rights perspective, but arguments on the basis of rights have become increasingly unpopular. The danger inherent in giving up on the notion of rights is obvious. If a human being's value on the labour market constitutes her primary capital, what happens if society considers some of its members "without value," as for example disabled people (Tomasevski, 2003, p. 33) or people who drop out of school or have a hard time fitting into the marketplace for different reasons. Moreover, if we let go of the rights perspective, what will be the consequences for the value of a human being in an economic system based on profit maximization and therefore labour redundancies? The skills agenda offers a way of selling to the people the positive notion that they are lifelong learners, but learning in this sense represents merely a tool for individuals to function in a society which they have not shaped. Walker (2015) refers to the skills agenda as "extraction education," which could be considered a modern form of Freire's "banking" education. Referring to the British Columbia government's *Skills for Jobs Blueprint* policy, she writes, "the Blueprint for Jobs promotes the ideas of an institution depositing skills into a student to be able to then extract a job-ready individual" (p. 377).

From the point of view of UNESCO's founders, the skills agenda, which centres on the role of education as a means to an end, namely employability, constitutes an attack on human dignity, which represents the cornerstone of UNESCO's humanistic and rights-based approach. It is a very different matter if the purpose of education is to provide people with skills "for a particular trade or a given job" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 69) or if it is to make a human being fully human: "The separation of its intellectual, physical, aesthetic, moral and social components is an indication of alienation, undervaluation and mutilation of the human person" (p. 69; see also Wain, 2004, pp. 9-11, who emphasizes this message in Ravindra Dave's and Paul Lengrand's writings and in the *Faure report*).

Biesta (2006) argues that "lifelong learning has ceased to be a right and has instead become the individual's duty" (p. 177). He points to the reversal of rights and responsibilities brought about by the individualization of lifelong learning:

> Whereas in the past lifelong learning was an individual's right which
> corresponded to the state's duty to provide resources and opportunities
> for lifelong learning, it seems that lifelong learning has increasingly
> become a duty for which individuals need to take responsibility, while
> it has become the right of the state to demand of all citizens that they
> continuously engage in learning so as to keep up with the demands of
> the global economy. (pp. 175-176)

Biesta (2006) further contends that the term lifelong learning indicates a shift towards individualization. While "'education' is a relational concept, 'learning' denotes something that one can do alone and by oneself" (p. 175). However, this is not the form of individualization I referred to in the early UNESCO debates, when it meant the focus on the dignity of every person. Biesta's use of "individualization" refers to a distortion of that meaning in terms of the capitalist notion of individuals being the creators of their own happiness, which implies their individual responsibility for their marketability on the labour market and for being effective contributors to the consumer society. This notion of individualization implies the idea of capitalist competition, whereas the previous meaning of individualization conveyed solidarity.

Biesta (2006) is concerned about "the emptying of public space" and the loss of democracy that the individualization of lifelong learning entails (p. 178). The concepts of

education and learning have been adapted to the market, the main *raison d'être* of neoliberalism. But ontologically, these two concepts – education and the market – are in tension with each other. While businesses operate in the marketplace with the aim of maximizing profits and therefore appropriating material wealth to the exclusion of others, education rests on principles of equality, sharing and participation. Education involves inner processes of understanding, the marketplace promotes consumerism. While for businesses education represents a commodity, for UNESCO it constitutes a human right. In the welfare states of the 1960s and 1970s the market served as a tool for society to use for the purposes of its well-being. Under neoliberalism, it has become the guiding principle of education. McMurtry (1991) has come to a very grim conclusion with regard to the contradictory ontologies of education and the market:

> Since…the logic of the market and of education are opposed, this economic determination of education must entail *ex hypothesi* the systematic negation of educational goals and standards. With education thus subserved to a universalized corporate circuit of producing consumer goods for profitable sale, what can remain of mental life beyond or outside of this circuit? Because an educational process is required by its nature to reflect upon and question presupposed patterns of being, its absorption into one of these patterns, the global market system, must leave society in a very real sense without its capacity to think. It becomes a kind of mass creature, a collective system of gratifying desires for private profit and consumption with no movement beyond itself towards understanding and consciousness as a human purpose in its own right. (p. 214)

Along similar lines, Jacques Delors, speaking about the relationship between education, work and employment, posited that "understanding is more important than skills," because "people who do not understand themselves, do not understand the environment in which they live, cannot be reliable participants in economic life, whether as labourers, workers, engineers or technicians" (UNESCO International Bureau of Education, 1995, p. 15). Today's version of lifelong learning has lost the notion of

citizenship that was embedded in UNESCO's often invoked concept of the "responsibility" of the individual to employ education for the sake of the betterment of society, and by the *Faure report*'s and *Delors report*'s notion of solidarity. Today's learners are first and foremost consumers and tax payers. As Forquin (2004) posited, lifelong learning under neoliberalism is "a loss, even a perversion of the utopia…a treachery of the hopes of the 1960s" (p. 34; my translation).

The Depoliticization of Lifelong Learning

In the second chapter I have described this study as an intellectual and conceptual history. Referring to Reinhart Koselleck's categorization of concepts, I have argued that lifelong learning belongs into the category of concepts whose meanings have substantially changed over time and whose usage in earlier periods can only be understood by reconstructing their meaning in historical documents. In this section, I will further elaborate on this point by arguing that the concept of lifelong learning has been deprived of the strong political dimension it held in UNESCO. Lifelong learning was a child of social democracy, but it got distorted by neoliberalism because the ambiguity of the concept allowed for its appropriation. Literacy is an example of a concept that was abandoned because it constituted too much of a challenge to neoliberalism. Literacy could not be directed enough towards the workplace, and many governments considered it too costly to raise literacy levels to an extent that the people become "useful" for the economy. The cuts to literacy funding in Canada under the Harper government (2006-2015) that led to the closure of most of the provincial literacy organizations illustrate the disregard for literacy, which the government has replaced by "essential skills" that are tied to job profiles (Elfert & Rubenson, 2013, pp. 242-243).

Some of the predictions made by the 1970s pioneers about the future of lifelong education have turned out to be strangely accurate, especially those by Bogdan Suchodolski, to whose prophecies I have already referred in previous chapters. Suchodolski (1979) anticipated the risk that "an educative direction of life is in fact an egotistic, even an egoistic orientation" (p. 49). He was doubtful as to whether the concept of lifelong education could be saved "in its entirety" (p. 48):

  The safest and most effective strategy would be to concentrate on

  vocational improvement and further education, on recurrent education

geared to the necessities devolving from the progress of science and technology and the demands of production. However, within these horizons there is no room for the ambitions and goals that are characteristic of lifelong education. (p. 48)

He further wrote about the future of lifelong education:

Some…believe in a future where the educative society will make it possible to overcome all obstacles by creating the conditions which will permit both full development of all individuals and their peaceful coexistence, and continuous general development of society. However, others are rather skeptical about these visions. They foresee for the rest of the 20th and the early 21st century a society not very different from the contemporary one, that is to say, a society concerned above all with material success, consumption, politics, the mass media and enjoyment of leisure, and not at all concerned about the idea of an education which is lifelong and comprehensive, dignified and noble, but demanding. (p. 36)

Suchodolski (1979) juxtaposed two types of lifelong education. The first aims at changing society; the second aims at making people fit into the society as it is. The latter type "does not open up far horizons, it does not promise substantial social change; …it does not tackle the big problems of our epoch, and…it evades the embarrassing questions of how to live…" (p. 42). The "educative society," as he called it, stood for a utopia of a harmonious society, as a counter-model of "a civilization in which the masses will be enslaved, manipulated and exploited by an elite group controlling knowledge and power" and "centring on consumption, expansion of the entertainment industry and development of mass culture" (p. 39). He illustrated this point by referring to the conversation between Christ and the Grand Inquisitor in Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazow*, one of the masterpieces of existentialist literature. In this scene, the Grand Inquisitor criticizes Christ for his vision of education, which "asks too much of ordinary people, weighs them down with the burden of liberty which is too heavy for them to carry, and calls for a spiritual life when all they want is bread" (p. 41). The Grand Inquisitor takes pride in offering an education which is appropriate for the "'docile herd' called Humanity": "We

will force them to work, but outside working hours we will arrange for them a life resembling children's playtime…we will even permit them to sin" (p. 41). This conversation recalls the Swiss response to the *Faure report*, which expressed doubt as to whether a "large majority of the people would chose lifelong education over 'bread and games'" (Commission nationale Suisse pour l'UNESCO, 1973, p. 8).

Suchodolski's statements confirm my earlier observations in relation to the *Faure report* − that during the 1970s, when lifelong education reached its fullest humanistic expression, theorists genuinely believed in the possibility of a new and better society, although they already anticipated that their hopes might not be fulfilled and that society would develop in a more consumerist and materialistic direction, in which the "maximalist" (Cropley, 1979, p. 105) version of lifelong learning would become obsolete.

Lifelong learning has undergone a process that Gramsci (1971) called "trasformismo" (p. 58, cited in Overbeek, 2010, p. 698). He used this notion to depict the process of convergence between the left and the right spectrum of political parties that dissolved the difference between them. In the process, radical ideas became "encapsulated" and "emaciated" (Overbeek, 2010, p. 698). Agamben (2000) makes a similar point:

> Terms such as sovereignty, right, nation, people, democracy…by
> now refer to a reality that no longer has anything to do with what
> these concepts used to designate−and those who continue to use
> these concepts uncritically literally do not know what they are
> talking about...Contemporary politics is this devastating experiment
> that disarticulates and empties institutions and beliefs, ideologies and
> religions, identities and communities all throughout the planet, so as
> then to rehash and reinstate their definitively nullified form. (p. 110)

In this quote, Agamben performs what the conceptual historian Kosellek has called the "effect of alienation" ("Verfremdungseffekt"), the questioning of the use of present-day vocabulary. According to Palonen (2002), this questioning constitutes an indirect mode of political theorizing, "which helps us to distance ourselves from thinking in terms of contemporary paradigms, unquestioned conventions, given constellations of

alternatives or implicit value judgements" (p. 102). I apply Agamben's critique of the uncritical use of concepts to the contemporary use of lifelong learning, which has very little to do with the meaning its early theorists attached to it. Lifelong learning began as a radical idea with a strong political dimension, which asked questions about justice and equality, the distribution of resources and the exercise of power. In the decades to follow, the political project of lifelong learning was de-politicized and "transformed" to make it fit in the agenda of the marketplace, turning it into a euphemistic label for a neoliberal worldview, in which the individual is held responsible to invest in her human capital, in the name of a false notion of freedom.

The "Post-political"

Lifelong education constituted a political idea in that it was linked to the shaping and transformation of society. Arendt (1958, p. 25) defined the "political" as the capacity of human beings to change their society for the better, the Aristotelian *bios politikos*, constituted by *praxis* (action) and *lexis* (speech). Arendt (1951/2001) argued that "our political life rests on the assumption that we can produce equality through organization, because man can act in and change and build a common world" (p. 301). For most of the individuals who have shaped the concept of lifelong learning in UNESCO, such as René Maheu, Edgar Faure, Paul Lengrand and Jacques Delors, criticism of society represented the source of their main motivation. For Sternhell (1996), "criticism…is the distinctive feature of modernity" (p. 12), and it is criticism that "produced the theory of the rights of man" (p. 12) – criticism of inequality, of a social order that did not prevent people from living in poverty and misery while others lived in prosperity and that subordinated the well-being of human beings to the rationales and interests of an authoritarian or even totalitarian state. The "political" stands for an emancipatory claim to justice.

The *Faure report* that advocated for the "complete man" as "agent of development and change" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 158) emphasized the importance of "political education" as a precondition for democracy. Education aimed at "free reflection" (p. 150) and "political consciousness" (p. 151), so that human beings "understand the structures of the world they have to live in" (p. 151) and "where necessary [show] a personal commitment in the struggle to reform them" (p. 151). Both the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* constituted political statements and aimed at

political debate whereas EFA, I would argue, is "post-political." The concept of the "post-political" has risen to some prominence in recent years among political theorists, who primarily apply it to global governance and the role of the state (Overbeek, 2010; Swyngedouw, 2011; 2014). Flinders and Wood (2013), who have mapped the meaning of "depoliticization" show that scholars employ the concept to refer to the neoliberal practice of governments delegating their social functions from the public to the private sphere, and thereby turning social issues into matters of private and consumer choice (p. 5). This phenomenon can be observed in relation to education and learning. Low literacy levels or school dropouts are not anymore ascribed to structural societal problems, but to a personal life choice. In this logic, the state or the government assumes no responsibility for the education of its citizens – a worldview incompatible with the notion of the social contract, which underpinned lifelong education. The "post-political" further takes a technocratic and managerial approach that avoids political debate: "The ultimate sign of post-politics…is the growth of a managerial approach to government: government is reconceived as a managerial function, deprived of its proper political dimension" (Žižek, 2002, p. 303, cited in Swyngedouw, 2011, p. 373). Klees and Qargha (2014), in their study about UNICEF's approach to equity in education, provide an example of how the system of development de-politicizes political matters. They show how the strategies and policies of girls' education are being kept "apolitical" although girls' education constitutes a political issue that should be tied "to the larger struggle of a women's movement in a country" (p. 6). In a similar vein, Heyneman (2009) deplored that EFA "has changed the rationale of education from being the infrastructure necessary for a democracy to being little more than a charitable handout for rural girls" (p. 8).

Item 5 of the *Dakar Framework for Action*, the outcome document of the EFA conference in Dakar, stated that "inequalities between countries and within societies will widen" without Education for All. But the document goes no further in terms of reflecting on the political dimension of justice. Between Jomtien and Dakar the world had undergone dramatic changes, which are not reflected in the Dakar documents (Torres, 2001, p. 7). Mundy (2007) suggests that EFA stands for "a global consensus that actively avoids an understanding of development focused on global structural inequalities" (p. 25).

"We need action on the ground – country by country by country," said Maria Minna, Canadian Minister of International Cooperation, at one of the plenary sessions of the Dakar conference (cited in Torres, 2001, note 11). "The time for action is now," declared James Wolfensohn, World Bank President (UNESCO, 2000b, p. 25). What is meant here is "action" in terms of efficiency, achieved by means of goals, EFA national action plans and monitoring procedures. Žižek (2001), who distinguishes between the false activity of actions and the true activity of acts, defines the "act" as "simply something that changes the very horizon in which it takes place" (p. 11). The "act" is political, whereas "action" is apolitical. Žižek (2009) has also emphasized the importance of utopian thinking, which always goes hand in hand with a denunciation of the existing order and the opening up of a space in which another vision of society becomes possible. While not using the term utopia, Stephen Ball (1995) thought along these lines when he argued in favour of more theory in education as "a vehicle for 'thinking otherwise'" (p. 266) and moving away from the utilitarian approach to education. He observed the depoliticization of educational studies in terms of a "transition from intellectual intelligence to technical rationalism" (p. 267), an issue that had preoccupied Edgar Faure.

The Struggle Over the Authority for Education

While in the past two sections I have discussed the instrumental and apolitical "transformation" of the meaning of lifelong learning, I will now turn to some of the factors that have contributed to the decline of UNESCO's humanistic vision. From the outset, UNESCO's authority as the lead agency of the UN for education was challenged, and the struggle with other international organizations has hampered UNESCO's capacity to assert its educational ideas. As UNESCO relied on membership fees, it had to form alliances with better resourced organizations. Moreover, given its constitutional flaw, UNESCO could not interfere in internal matters of countries and continuously faced member states' threats not to pay their membership dues if they did not agree with decisions the organization took. The United States "being a rather fickle supporter" (Interview with Sir John Daniel) offers a case in point. In the context of the drive for economic growth during the Cold War and the economic crisis of the 1970s which ushered in a phase of government retrenchment of workers' rights and welfare, UNESCO's message of universal literacy and lifelong learning did not stand a chance

against the human capital approach applied by the World Bank and the OECD. The World Bank gained influence through coercion, as the developing countries needed its loans:

> The countries wanting World Bank loans, they will get resources if they invest in primary education…They were somehow thrown into this by studies which for many years were saying that there is a return on primary education, there is no return in literacy. (Interview with Adama Ouane)

The OECD, on the other hand, positioned itself as the master of persuasion. As Rubenson (2008) argued:

> The OECD has achieved hegemony over educational discourse through its capacity to manufacture the 'common sense' of society. The OECD is able to set agendas that become taken for granted and govern national policy actors' approach to educational reforms. (p. 242)

According to Rubenson (2008), the OECD's force of persuasion rests on two pillars: The linking of the production of ideas to the production of knowledge (exemplified by the PISA and PIAAC performance studies);[65] and close working relationships with national authorities (p. 244). In contrast to UNESCO, which has kept a relatively consistent ideology, the OECD has adapted its educational beliefs to changes in "the dominant political economy and economics of education theory" (p. 254). The OECD's concept of lifelong learning "achieved a total symbiosis between learning and production," which is why even business groups such as the European Round Table of Industrialists promoted the idea (pp. 256-257).

Not only were UNESCO's humanistic ideas not implemented, but it became increasingly difficult to find funding for them. UNESCO had no other way than to build up its technical expertise, a domain in which it had lost out to the World Bank. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and the *EFA Global Monitoring Report* constitute examples of successful "technical" services for which UNESCO managed to find

---

[65] PISA stands for Programme for International Student Assessment; PIAAC for Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies.

funding. But a concept such as lifelong learning has many dimensions that are difficult to measure, such as self-awareness and participation in society.

The capacity of UNESCO to shape the global educational agenda has been hampered by its competition with other international organizations over the global authority for education and continuous challenging of its intellectual mandate. Some of my interviewees corrected me when I used the word "competition" during our interview, as they thought it did not do justice to the realities. Ulrika Peppler Barry stated: "I do not believe the problem with UNESCO is competition, but rather, as the current DG correctly analyzed in her first campaign, that UNESCO is insular and has been too isolated from the UN." Others argued that UNESCO's mismanagement offered strategic opportunities for other organizations to take over its tasks. It is certainly true that a high level of mismanagement and inefficiency prevailed in UNESCO, as well as "politicization," which stems from the organization's "one country one vote" system. However, the struggles over territory that René Maheu and other DG's frequently referred to suggest that "competition" played a role, fuelled by the confusion over mandates and "mission creeping" among UN organizations. It is noteworthy that both leading organizations in education today, the OECD and the World Bank, have no reference to education in their charters.[66] Nicholas Burnett argued that "there is an urgent need to come to an agreement among particularly UNESCO, OECD, the World Bank and UNICEF on who does what" (p. 98), a point raised also by Henri Lopes in the previous chapter. This argument was supported also by Adama Ouane who declared that "the international community itself created a lot of mess" with all of its different frameworks and responsibilities. According to Ouane, a deeper rationale explained the weakening of UNESCO:

> Because everything which could be critical, which could be ethical,
> which could just push on the conscience of some of the people who
> are deciding world affairs is not welcome…So no organization is
> wanted who could really lead things more on the value, on the
> conscience, on the ethics…

---

[66] Technically, the OECD has a Convention, and the procedures of the World Bank are governed by Articles of Agreement.

The "technical turn" in UNESCO was further exacerbated by the two reforms of the Executive Board, which entailed the replacement of individual experts by member states representatives. UNESCO undertook the first reform in 1954, after the USSR joined the organization, giving in to the pressure exerted by the United States and the United Kingdom, which wanted to ensure greater control of what was going on in UNESCO (Morel, 2010, p. 129; Jones, 1988, p. 100; Coate, 1992, p. 162).[67] A second reform in 1993, which "aimed at improving the efficiency of the work of the Executive Board" (UNESCO, 1992c), followed an initiative by the Japanese government. The Executive Board was no longer composed of autonomous experts whom governments appointed, but of directly elected member states. As a consequence, frequently fluctuating technocrats instead of experts assumed the seats in the Executive Board and the committees. These changes were conducive to the often invoked "politicization" of the organization.

In the 1980s, UNESCO fully lost the support of the United States, and no international organization can do well without the world's greatest power. Although U.S.-UNESCO relations were already strained because UNESCO failed to act as a body that furthered American interests (Coates, 1992), in the early years American influence in UNESCO was strong, and René Maheu was clever enough to keep up an overall good relationship with the John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson administrations. The fact that Philip Coombs, former Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Kennedy administration, became the first Director of UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), founded in 1963, and that Frederick Champion Ward served as a Commissioner of the *Faure report*, testifies to the connections between UNESCO and the United States. According to Coate (1992) the year 1969 marked a turning point in the U.S.-UNESCO relationship when U.S. representation in the Executive Board became less coherent and "oriented toward damage limitation" rather than being constructive and future-oriented (p. 163). The withdrawal of the U.S. from UNESCO in 1984 and the smear campaign that heralded it devastated the organization. It is beyond the scope of this study to go into detail about the story of the

---

[67] A further argument put forward was that independent experts were impossible to find in the USSR (E-mail Klaus Hüfner, October 22, 2015).

U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO, which is one of the best researched episodes in UNESCO's history (e.g. Coate, 1992; Preston, Herman, & Schiller, 1989; Singh, 1988). One of the most important reasons that led to the U.S. bailing out of UNESCO, was that in the process of decolonization the power dynamics in UNESCO had shifted from the Western countries to the Third World. The shift in power dynamics also induced the U.S. to withdraw from the International Labour Organization (ILO) – another international organization, in which the Third World countries called for influence in terms of more controlled economic planning – seven years earlier, in 1977, also decrying "politicization" and the "confrontational tactics" of the Group of 77 (Melanson, 1979, p. 43). Given UNESCO's human rights mandate and its "one country one vote" system the Third World countries could make their voice heard in the organization, and the Senegalese Director-General M'Bow encouraged their claims. The scholarly literature often refers to the period when the hegemony of the West was challenged by the demands of the developing countries for a fairer economic and communication system as "politicization," a term some of my interviewees reacted to with a slight irritation. As Alexandra Draxler put it: "Who are the people who said UNESCO's political? [Those] feeling sad for the days when the West dominated." Peter Williams suggested that the Western countries preferred to work with the OECD and the World Bank because "the UN and UNESCO and the Commonwealth, where developing countries are in the majority and increasingly sort of vocal have less and less attraction to the developed world as institutions through which to do business." During the Cold War, UNESCO had some importance as, "for three decades, Western states considered that UNESCO was needed…because it was the only place where the East and the West could meet" (Interview with Jacques Hallak; see also Elfert, 2013, pp. 270; 274). Once the Cold War ended, UNESCO's role in the diplomatic arena diminished.

UNESCO was forced into a technical turn as it lost backing for its high-flown and universalist projects. The decline of intellectuals in its governing bodies and the loss of American support further weakened the organization. The frequent attacks on UNESCO for being "politicized," Williams' remark about "doing business" and Ouane's comment about the "ethical" dimension support my argument about a trend to depoliticize

education, which has made it difficult for the organization to keep up its intellectual mandate. Neoliberal bureaucratic practices further undermined its normative work.

Isomorphic Processes

The "retreat into the technical" (Hoggart, 1978, p. 93) has been further advanced by the introduction of "results-based" management practices into UNESCO that stem from the neoliberal restructuring of the state with its focus on measurability and accountability. Neo-institutional scholars have examined how institutions adopt hegemonic norms and procedures in order to "stay in the game." DiMaggio and Powell (1983), building on Weber's concept of the "iron cage," argued that institutions introduce certain bureaucratic and administrative practices because they are considered legitimate in their environment. These "isomorphic processes" prompt organizations to rationalize formal procedures and structures which sometimes conflict with their work (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). The adopted practices make organizations more homogeneous and aim at greater efficiency. But homogenization, which DiMaggio and Powell (1983) call "institutional isomorphism," can have detrimental effects on organizations. Excessive routinization can take such rigid forms that rules become ends in themselves and the mandate of the organization gets subordinated to the rules. "Results-based management," a neoliberal management strategy, constitutes an example of such "institutional isomorphism." UNESCO has introduced results-based management into its administrative practice because governments and organizations around the world currently consider it normative, without asking whether it actually fits into the organizational culture. Chabbott (1998), who applied DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) concept of isomorphism to EFA, identified its "coercive" effects: the "normative" coercion, given that the support to formal schooling constitutes a global cultural norm (Chabbott, 1998, p. 212); and the coercion exerted by the dependency of developing countries on World Bank funding.

Hulme (2007) deplored that two "unlikely intellectual bedfellows," "human development" and "results-based management," shaped the Millennium Development Goals (p. 2). He further maintained that the "focus on 'measurable' led to a reduced interest in difficult to measure goals, such as human rights, participation and democracy"

(p. 2). Williams (2015) raised this concern also with regard to the process of formulating the post-2015 education goals.

Results-based management with its focus on measurable results further eclipsed UNESCO's intellectual and political function. Laves' (1951) was right when he predicted that the dichotomy between the intellectual and technical interpretations of UNESCO's role would have consequences on "appraisals of the organization's effectiveness" (p. 165). In the 2012 reports on their development activities, Australia and the United Kingdom gave UNESCO disastrous evaluations (AusAID, 2012; DFID, 2012). The Australian report observed that it was "difficult to define and measure results in most areas of UNESCO's work" (AusAID, 2012, p. 219) and therefore gave it one of the poorest ratings among the 42 agencies covered (p. xii) and categorized UNESCO among those organizations for which "further analysis [was] required before decisions are made on core funding levels" (p. xvi). In its response to the UK Multilateral Aid Review, UNESCO addressed the challenge of "conceptual difficulties related to the assessment of results/impact of normative work" (UNESCO, 2012, p. 3). One of my interviewees referred to the difficulty of assessing UNESCO's activities:

> I think we actually did a pretty reasonable job of trying to get
> everyone on the same page and letting a little air into some of the
> rather narrow views of the World Bank but it didn't make for crisp
> evaluation when people at DFID came along to look at what the
> result had been… (Interview with Sir John Daniel)

The UNESCO Draft Medium-term strategy for the years 2014-2021, the 37 C/4 (UNESCO, 2013), responded indirectly to this critique. In this document the organization, in order to regain trust, committed itself to establishing a "results culture":

> Developing a results culture is fundamental to building the
> Organization's credibility and accountability vis-à-vis its Member
> States, partners and investors. UNESCO will work to institutionalize
> a results-delivery culture throughout its activities, by improving
> results-based management, monitoring, evaluation and results
> reporting. (p. 44)

The authors of the Draft 37 C/4 tried hard to adapt to the narrow view of

UNESCO by committing to a "results" and "value for money" culture. Post-war observers have often referred to UNESCO's function as "symbolic": "The Organization has met the condition of being a symbol to the peoples of the world of 'what is now desirable and what may become an actuality in the future.' As such it has a standing in its own right" (Sathyamurthy, 1964, p. 51/52; see also Laves & Thomson, 1957, p. 350). UNESCO has been reduced from a symbolic organization that was founded in the name of high-flown ideals such as keeping peace and promoting normative values to an organization legitimized by "value for money." At the same time, the Director-General, in her introduction to the 37 C/4, insisted on "the humanist mandate of UNESCO" (UNESCO, 2013, p. 9), which will "continue to be guided by a rights-based and holistic approach to education" (p. 21). The functional approach runs counter to the original idea that UNESCO represented, as one of my interviewees formulated:

> This whole idea of having an international organization around
> universal values to get people…to say okay this can be put on top of
> personal, regional, country consideration. And for which we could
> really fight together, pool our energy, our creativity, our good name,
> and try to iron the differences or put them aside – this is gone. It was
> gone from the moment that the layer of representation has been that
> of functionalism. (Interview with Adama Ouane)

Isomorphic processes led to UNESCO adopting results-based management procedures regardless of the detrimental effects they may have on the organization. Numerous theorists have described the alienating and deskilling effect of heavy bureaucracies (e.g. Apple, 1980/81; Arendt, 1994, p. 748; Burawoy, 1979), also with regard to international organizations (Barnett & Finnemore, 2004). As Benavot (2011) asserted, "only by altering the way work activities are performed internally, and the conservative bureaucracy that sustains these patterns, can UNESCO find the perspective and wherewithal to help realize progressive educational transformations externally" (p. 558). Edgar Faure (1973) feared the dehumanizing effects of the "techno-bureaucratie" (p. 36). The perfect bureaucracy constitutes the "rule of nobody" (Arendt, 1994, p. 748), which is at odds with UNESCO's emphasis on the potential of every individual and the strong role of individuals who spread its missionary message. It also leads to

"deskilling," as organizations favour bureaucratic employees, mere "button pushers," over real experts who may resist the bureaucracy (Apple, 1980/81, pp. 10-11). One of my interviewees, Ulrika Peppler Barry, considered "the uncontrolled growth of bureaucracy, where the admin thinks the program is there to serve it, rather than the other way around" one of the reasons for UNESCO's decline.

Organizations pursue processes of rationalization because they strive for legitimacy. As Meyer and Rowan (1977) argued, "the myths generated by particular organizational practices and diffused through relational networks have legitimacy based on the supposition that they are rationally effective" (p. 347). But it is debatable whether UNESCO's legitimacy lies in "rational effectiveness." UNESCO is faced with a serious dilemma in that the practices and norms it has adopted to survive in the changing environment of global governance are incompatible with the humanistic worldview that it still retains. "Results-based management" is in conflict with UNESCO's ontology. The organization has no way of resolving this contradiction. The best for UNESCO would be to straightout state the incompatibility of these two approaches, something that the organization has tried to address subtly in its response to DFID's negative evaluation. But the pressure to conform to the mainstream is too high and UNESCO continues to walk the tightrope between its tradition and the external pressures placed on the organization. Why does UNESCO hold on to its humanistic tradition when the political climate has not favoured it for so long?

Tradition and Legitimacy

On what does UNESCO's legitimacy rest? Since UNESCO's founding, this has been a contested issue, and the contestation is wired into its constitution as we have seen in the disputes between UNESCO's founders, with Julian Huxley as the proponent of a broad political mandate and Reinhold Niebuhr as the advocate of a limited technical mandate representing the two sides of the spectrum. While most of my interviewees would have argued that UNESCO's legitimacy relies heavily on its humanistic and human rights-oriented founding mandate, others – such as the donors mentioned above – make clear that their support of the organization is linked to its "rationally effective" performance. Neo-institutional scholars emphasize the role of international organizations

as "teachers of norms" that exist primarily "for reasons of legitimacy and normative fit rather than efficient output" (Barnett & Finnemore, 1999, p. 703). Donors, as shown above, link legitimacy to measurable results, a task UNESCO is not good at, given its idealistic worldview. Some of my interviewees referred to UNESCO's constitution as the principal source of the organization's legitimacy: "It has a noble mission, it has a great constitution, and I am sure that the world today still needs such an organization" (Interview with Stamenka Uvalić –Trumpić). Others pointed to the support and reputation the organization enjoys among the developing world, which still perceives UNESCO as an ethical partner that can be trusted. As Henri Lopes put it, "for an entire generation, UNESCO was famous in Africa because it had shown solidarity." After the Republic of Congo, Lopes' native country, gained independence in 1960, UNESCO ran, with UNDP funding, the "Écoles Normales Supérieures d'Enseignement" (High Training Teachers College), colleges to train secondary school teachers, which the country lacked because all the French secondary school teachers left the country. The developing countries have not forgotten UNESCO's support of the Third World, the NIEO, and the NWICO. Sir John Daniel said: "There is this faith in UNESCO…I was constantly surprised…by how much importance the developing countries in particular attached to certain UNESCO declarations…". Others referred to UNESCO as "the consciousness of the United Nations" (Interview with Roberto Carneiro) and as a counter-organization to the World Bank, in that it has no hidden agenda. As Jacques Hallak (who spent part of his career at the World Bank) stated:

> [The] World Bank is a bank…the people feel UNESCO is not a
> development bank, has no agenda.…We were regarded as friends…
> Even friendly donors are donors. UNESCO is not a donor. UNESCO
> is supposed to help countries talking to donors…we have no other
> agenda…we are not selling money, we are not selling contracts.
> UNESCO is further considered "the most democratic of the agencies"

(Interview with Sir John Daniel) in which the developing countries have some influence:

> In a way I see that as its virtue and if you like the reason that it will be
> almost impossible to abolish UNESCO is because the larger world

sees it as their thing in which they can have an influence, I mean no

one is under illusions who controls the World Bank, but in UNESCO,

if enough African countries decide that they want something to

happen they can make it happen. (ibid.)

UNESCO is today caught in the contradiction between its donors' views of what constitutes the organization's legitimacy and its humanistic tradition. When UNESCO's current Director-General Irina Bokova invoked the notion of the "new humanism" in her inaugural speech (UNESCO, 2011a, p. 36), she claimed legitimacy by relying on a concept that holds a long tradition in the organization (Bosch-Gimpera, 1948) and associating herself with UNESCO's "unity in diversity" approach by appealing to understanding, co-existence and equality between the people of the world, while celebrating their diversity (UNESCO, 2009). Since then, the organization has tried to fill the "new humanism" with life. In 2011, the *UNESCO Courier* devoted an entire issue to "Humanism, a new idea" (UNESCO, 2011b). A recent volume of the *International Review of Education*, edited by the UIL, addressed the question, "What humanism for the 21st century?" A *Rethinking Education* Commission launched the report *Rethinking Education. Towards a Global Common Good?* in the tradition of the *Faure report* and the *Delors report*, reaffirming UNESCO's humanistic and universal vision of education in the context of the current post-2015 EFA debates (UNESCO, 2015a):

Sustaining and enhancing the dignity, capacity and welfare of the

human person, in relation to others and to nature, should be the

fundamental purpose of education in the twenty-first century. Such

an aspiration may be designated *humanism*, which it should be

UNESCO's mission to develop both conceptually and in practice. (p.

21)

This most recent humanistic manifesto launched by UNESCO pays tribute to the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* and reclaims many of their concepts, such as lifelong learning, citizenship, and solidarity. However, its key idea is the *common good*, a term that crystallizes the contemporary variant of UNESCO's humanism in the context of the knowledge society. It follows UNESCO's tradition in that it represents yet another expression of the "view from everywhere," the engagement with different cultural values

and perspectives, emphasizes the intrinsic value of education and rejects its commodification. What is new is the emphasis on knowledge, which the authors of the document linked to education "as global common goods… inspired by the values of solidarity and social justice grounded in our common humanity" (p. 11). The use of the notion of the *common good* is timely as private monopolies have reached an unprecedented size and the "sharing economy" has emerged as a new phenomenon, which some commentators ascribe to "postcapitalism" (Mason, 2015). Like lifelong learning, the *common good* represents a typical UNESCO concept as all cultures can relate to it. *Rethinking Education* distances itself from "scientific humanism," which constituted one of the guiding principles of the *Faure report*. In paying tribute to "spiritual dimensions," (UNESCO, 2015a, p. 38), the document follows the *Delors report* in putting greater emphasis on "non-scientific" traditions such as alternative approaches to development.

 Rethinking Education is currently being presented at events organized by National UNESCO Commissions around the world, but I doubt that the document had any impact on the post-2015 education debates or the formulation of the SDGs. The current main framework for educational development is the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), which emerged from the World Bank's Fast Track Initiative. In the process of drafting, financing and implementing the post-2015 SDGs, which were adopted at the UN Sustainable Development Summit in September 25–27, 2015, UNESCO played a minor role at best. It suffices to look at some of the strategic key documents in the post-2015 SDGs process to see which are the influential organizations in global educational governance today. For example, the acknowledgements of a preparatory document for the recent Third Conference on Financing for Development, held in Addis Ababa from 13-16 July 2015, lists philanthropic foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, banks and financial services companies, international aid agencies, NGOs, and think tanks, the World Bank and the OECD – but not UNESCO (Sachs & Schmidt-Traub, 2015, p. 7).

 I have recently observed, however, slight indications for renewed interest in a humanistic approach among the academic circles of the international education community. The motto of the 2015 Conference of the Comparative and International

Education Society (CIES), "Ubuntu! Imagining a humanist education globally" celebrated a humanistic perspective on education. The issue of the *UNESCO Courier* I referred to above and an article invoking an African perspective on a universal humanism written by a former UNESCO executive and one of my interviewees, Adama Ouane (2014) in the above-mentioned issue of the *International Review of Education*, also featured the concept of *Ubuntu*. It further appeared prominently in a message by the President of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies, Carlos Alberto Torres, to societies' members, alongside other familiar concepts such as *enlightenment* and *solidarity* (Torres, 2015a). The same distinguished scholar currently helps with spreading UNESCO's message into the academic world, as he speaks about the *common good* and another concept recently revived by UNESCO, *global citizenship* (Torres, 2015b; Tawil, 2013). Other academics and former UNESCO officials are also trying to revitalize UNESCO's humanistic tradition (Elfert, 2015; Nesbit & Welton, 2013; Power, 2015). Even donor agencies make a point of bringing the humanistic perspective back on the global agenda of education. Recently, the Swedish development agency SIDA allocated funding to UNESCO in order "to strengthen UNESCO's intellectual leadership role in guiding the global normative debate on a humanistic vision on educational policy and practice in a context of societal transformation" (UNESCO, 2015b). The new trend of blending non-Western concepts such as *Ubuntu* and *Sumak Kawsay,* the Quechua word for *buen vivir* (UNESCO, 2015a, p. 18), with more traditional humanistic notions points to an evolution of UNESCO's humanism towards more social justice and multicultural resonances that were already noticeable in the *Delors report*'s focus on "learning to live together." The reappearance of lifelong learning in the most recent global educational norm-setting documents could also be read as a signal that many stakeholders are tired of the narrow technical approach that has prevailed in the past decades under the influence of neoliberalism.

Maybe UNESCO needs to radically rethink its tradition, if it really wants to offer an appealing alternative to the dominant economic ideology. Some of my interviewees hinted at the possibility that a strong tradition can overshadow and hinder the development of an organization. Jacques Hallak referred to the case of the International Bureau of Education (IBE), the oldest UNESCO Institute, which "cannot ignore the

legacies of [its] founding father, Jean Piaget." Does the strong attachment of the UNESCO secretariat to its constitution lock the organization permanently in its tradition? Is this tradition a repressive element that hinders the organization from opening up towards the future, or is it the essence without which the organization has no identity and no *raison d'être*? Do we have to face the possibility that UNESCO's faithfulness to modernity's idea of progress and making the world a better place has no meaning anymore today and that UNESCO's focus on the human being as the centre of the world is out of date? If we follow the arguments of the "post-humanists," the human being is not the master of the universe, but just one of many transitory life-forms that will sooner or later disappear.[68]

Some of my interviewees were indebted to the founding principles of UNESCO and resented the changing political economy of global governance and its impact on education. Others felt they had devoted their time and energy to a lost cause: "I went in thinking that I was serving a noble cause, fighting for the good and helping the good to come about, I see now that my time was totally wasted" (Interview with Arthur Cropley). Others again showed openness to new ideas and had to confront resistance among UNESCO staff when uttering and putting into practice new ways of thinking, which constituted a threat to the tradition. For example Sir John Daniel talked about a certain ideological animosity in UNESCO against the privatization of education and against the World Bank. Stamenka Uvalić–Trumpić said:

> In UNESCO there is a tendency to avoid mentioning certain things
> just because they appear to be negative, instead of looking at reality

---

[68] Ironically, Claude Lévi-Strauss, one of UNESCO's icons, contended that the organization might be wrong to uphold its universal worldview. In 1971, 20 years after the publication of his famous article "Race and history," commissioned and published by UNESCO, he returned to UNESCO to hold a lecture titled "Race and Culture." Much to the dismay of the audience, Lévi-Strauss moved away from his position taken in "Race and history" maintaining that no biological basis existed for the concept of race and supporting UNESCO's "unity in diversity" approach. Instead he challenged the idea of multiculturalism by arguing that every culture had the right to close itself off towards other cultures. Lévi-Strauss brushed aside the celebration of difference as a precondition to the unity of humanity, which lay at the heart of UNESCO's identity: "As a result, for Lévi-Strauss the UNESCO project became partially ineffectual, as one cannot hope to change unalterable human nature by action taken on its social element, through education and the fight against prejudice" (Stoczkowski, 2008, p. 7; see also Gastaut, 2007, pp. 204-205).

and analyzing the issues from different perspectives…At the

beginning of 2001, for instance, there was a frenzy around GATS…so

everybody was going crazy about education becoming a commodity.

Today, however, this is a forgotten issue.

When asked about the future of UNESCO, many of my interviewees said that they were short-term pessimistic, but long-term optimistic. Ravindra Dave gave me a lesson in long-term historical thinking, when he suggested that the humanist perspective would eventually come back:

This is a sort of struggle. And such struggles have always happened

in history….The struggle at the moment is between the economic

angle of life – and the humanistic angle of life. The economic angle

has grown in the past decades in such a manner that the economists

have taken the hold of education…they have developed what is

called 'economics of education'…But it is a temporary

phenomenon…

UNESCO's utopia could experience a renaissance when the situation becomes so unbearable that a new space needs to be invented, because there is no way "to resolve it within the coordinates of the possible" (Žižek, 2005, cited in Swyngedouw, 2008, p. 6).

The Struggle Over Ideas

In chapter two I outlined the constructivist-ideational theoretical perspective this study takes on explaining historical developments and change. Ideational scholars stress the role of ideologies in interpreting historical and political developments against materialist and power-based explanations (Goldstein & Keohane, 1993). I would argue that UNESCO's role in educational global governance declined also because the ideological imaginary UNESCO stands for, humanism, lost out in the "struggle of ideas." As I have asserted in chapter five, the 1960s and 1970s constituted a defining moment in that struggle. Several "ideas" and worldviews competed with each other: The social-democratic versus the neoliberal ideology that swept over the Atlantic (Jones, 2012, p. 136); idealism versus utilitarianism; French "dirigisme" versus Anglo-American liberalism. The post-modernist movement further challenged the humanistic approach, which did not fit into the post-modern mood as it ultimately stood for a teleological

worldview. One of my interviewees referred to "lifelong learning" as an "evangelical message" (Interview with Arthur Cropley). In a similar vein, Haines (n.d.) noted the "positively biblical tone" of the *Faure report* (p. 69). Stoczkowski (2009) called UNESCO's unifying aspirations a "secular soteriology" and identified the organization as "one of the main guardians of those soteriological expectations" (p. 11). UNESCO's humanism can be regarded as a secular "doctrine of salvation," substituting religion as the remedy against the fragility and finiteness of the human condition. The *Faure report* represented a "statement of dogma" that "spread the good news of lifelong learning…in an evangelical environment" (Interview with Arthur Cropley).

Significantly, Nietzsche, who is often referred to as the first post-modern philosopher (Ferry, 2011, p. 143), called "ideals" "idols" because they implied a value greater than life itself (p. 147). But the post-modernist movement with its critique of essentialist notions of humanness and "dignity," could do little to halt the ascent of another "idol," the economic principle and the market, which represented yet another challenge to UNESCO's humanism. The human capital approach which, despite all the shifts in priorities and different experiments undertaken by the World Bank and the OECD, "has remained consistently resilient to change" (Rose, 2003, p. 68), was endowed with greater legitimacy by more powerful institutions. Influential economic paradigms such as the Washington Consensus conflicted with UNESCO's ideology. UNESCO was unable to assert its ambitions of a universal literacy campaign, which lost out to primary education.

In the "battle of ideas," the attack of the neoliberal "counter-revolution" on the Third World's NIEO, the demands of the workers and the ideals of the welfare state was launched through "economic warfare" as well as the military race (Overbeek & Van der Pijl, 1993, p. 22). UNESCO's humanism was further weakened by the overall crisis of the UN system, which has lost – if it ever had it – the support of states that preferred to rely upon bilateral actions (Mazower, 2008). UNESCO's mandate of securing peace has lost traction in a world in which war has become a normality and economic necessity.

The history of lifelong learning in UNESCO illustrates the strong influence of French intellectuals in UNESCO, which has always led to tensions with the "Anglo-Saxon" group. Wain (1993) insinuated that the demise of the "maximalist" view of

lifelong learning may be related to its alienness to the Anglo-Saxon worldview. While Paul Lengrand equated lifelong education to "notions such as liberty, justice, and the rights of man" (cited by Wain, 1993, p. 87), scholars such as Bagnall (1990) and Lawson (1982) had "problems with the notion of a 'learning society,' which is outside the dominant tradition of liberal educational theory which focuses on the individual" (Wain, 1993, p. 94). In his review of the *Faure report*, the Australian adult educator Nicolas Haines (n.d.) admitted that his

> Anglo-Saxon neurons are irritated by this title [Learning to be]; the
> Celtic brain-bits are sympathetic. Generations of philosophers have
> been kept in business by the whiles and whims of the verb 'to be'; but
> empiricists and analysts of the last century were supposed to have
> tidied these up…On the other hand my Celtic part is seduced by such
> Gallic fancies. I recognize the notion of 'becoming' and recall certain
> spasms of response of what is loosely called 'existentialism.' The
> empiricists, the analysts after all do not claim to say anything about
> our human situation. (p. 69)

One of my interviewees, Sir John Daniel, spoke about the "culture clash" in the organization, which "was basically a French/English thing. I mean it's a metaphor for the sort of fundamental cultural tension between a sort of Gallic idealistic statist …against Anglo-Saxon pragmatism…". He further referred to the French influence on UNESCO: "My theory is that all UN agencies take the colour of the country in which they are located. So UNESCO has a distinctively statist sort of view of life." (ibid.). From this perspective, taking into consideration geopolitical power dynamics, it is not surprising that a "French" organization that has transported "French" ideas lost out to U.S. backed organizations in an age of American hegemony.

A Matter of Ideology

Although the "depoliticization" of its concepts resulted in UNESCO taking a technocratic turn, as in the EFA initiative, the organization continues to launch humanistic manifestos such as *Rethinking Education*. Why does UNESCO retain its humanistic tradition if other agencies have been more successful with different,

competing ideologies? Why does the organization not simply change its ways? To put it simply: It is a matter of ideology. The neo-institutionalists offer a meaningful theoretical approach to these questions by considering organizations as social entities that develop a life of their own. As Jacques Hallak explained, the ideological attachment to UNESCO's humanism that prevails in the organization must not be ascribed to the member states. It is the secretariat, meaning the staff, that defends UNESCO's tradition. Jacques Hallak and others pointed to the "strong secretariat" as the safeguard of the UNESCO "culture." Although there are always "Trojan Horses" (Interview with Adama Ouane) in the organization, for the most part the secretariat is composed of staff members who have an "ideology" (Interview with Jacques Hallak) that matches the UNESCO tradition.

UNESCO attracted individuals who abided by its humanistic ideology, such as Jacques Delors who decided to engage with the organization because it offered him an intellectual climate that corresponded to his beliefs and the messages he hoped to get across. In the "battle of ideas" UNESCO has gathered quite a consistent group of "soldiers" (a term used by Ravindra Dave who self-identified as a "soldier of UNESCO"), who represented – in broad terms – a left-leaning, social-democratic, idealistic and cosmopolitan worldview.

However, the change of the composition of the Executive Board in 1993 and the results culture has led to a decline of people involved in UNESCO who work to "universalise the 'Idea' inaugurated in the original event" (Swyngedouw, 2014, p. 132). The changing political economy in which UNESCO operates will likely also affect the humanistic tradition of education. UNESCO increasingly enters into alliances with corporate and philanthropic partners; partnerships which are not regulated by UNESCO's constitution (Elfert, 2014b). How will the organization defend its humanistic ethos now that corporations such as Pearson Education sit on the boards of the global education mechanisms such as the Global Partnership for Education? Pearson stated the primary motivation for its engagement with education in its 2012 Annual Report: "We think education will turn out to be the great growth industry of the 21st century" (cited in Hogan, Sellar, & Lingard, in press). This statement constitutes a challenge for UNESCO's humanism, which considers education an end in itself. According to Harvey (2005, p. 181), "under a regime of endless capital accumulation and economic growth no

matter what the social, ecological or political consequences," enforcing social and economic rights such as education would pose "a serious challenge" (p. 182).

Despite the growing presence of the private sector and philanthropic foundations in global educational governance (Ball, 2012; Ball & Olmedo, 2012) and partnerships UNESCO has forged with the private sector (UNESCO, 2014a), the ideological "life of its own" that UNESCO exhibits sometimes comes through as an act of resistance. A recent position paper on the post-2015 agenda put forward by UNESCO's Executive Board at its 194th session (UNESCO, 2014b) touts the state as the "custodian of education as a public good" (p. 2), and the word "private" does not appear in the list of the "other stakeholders" or elsewhere in the document. After review by the EFA Steering Committee and the Task Force for the post-2015 Education agenda, the above paragraph remains untouched in the revised document (UNESCO, 2014c, p. 3), but the term "private" appears in a footnote (p. 7) and in a list of "a broad coalition of partners for education beyond 2015" towards the end of the document (p. 10). Both – the total absence of the term "private" in the Executive Board draft, and the rather marginal mention of the private sector in the revised document – are remarkable given the explosion of private sector involvement in education. Elsewhere, I have attributed this peculiarity to "staff members…committed to UNESCO's humanistic approach to education which is laid down in UNESCO's constitution" (Elfert, 2014b, para. 8).

Another and much bolder example of an "act" (in Žižek's understanding of the term) of resistance at the level of the member states was the adoption of Palestine as a member of UNESCO in 2011. As Henri Lopes emphasized, the "Palestinian Affair," which observers such as Dumont (2013) referred to as a "crisis," has been "caused by a sovereign decision taken by a majority of member states" (my translation). From a financial point of view, some of my interviewees considered this incident a low point in the history of the organization. From an ethical and "symbolic" perspective, others regarded it as a high point. As Sir John Daniel put it, "they're ahead of the game really."

The "life of its own" that UNESCO is known to manifest has greatly shaped the organization's educational initiatives and ideas, such as lifelong learning. Individuals like Paul Lengrand and intellectuals whom the organization consulted as experts, such as the members of the Faure and Delors Commissions, found favourable conditions to theorize

and philosophize because the secretariat considered these activities consistent with its ideology. Given the strength of the secretariat, which used to "run the show" (Interview with Jacques Hallak) – according to my interviewees a characteristic feature of UNESCO in contrast to the UN – the member states went along with these initiatives, but they did not always enthusiastically embrace UNESCO's intellectual outputs, as I have shown in chapters five and six of this study. However, some of my interviewees reported a shift in the power relationship between the secretariat and its governing bodies in that the Executive Board increasingly "micromanages" the organization (Interview with Stamenka Uvalić–Trumpić). This development, which arose from a number of factors, such as the change of the composition of the Executive Board and the financial pressure on the organization, will likely further contribute to weakening UNESCO's intellectual capacity.

UNESCO is an interesting case because its humanistic ontology is deeply entrenched in its institutional structures as a collective mindset, which is quite resilient to outside pressure and has remained relatively consistent despite the two major existential crises the organization went through (one of them not over yet) and changes in intellectual climate, political economy and global governance that were unfavourable to UNESCO's "cause." Despite an undeniable decline of UNESCO's influence in the multilateral arena, UNESCO's humanism still has sympathizers, especially among the "underdogs," such as the African and Arab countries, who still consider the organization legitimate and who continue to use UNESCO as a platform to deliver messages of resistance against hegemonic power, of which the adoption of Palestine constitutes the latest example.

Conclusion

This last section will offer the main lessons I have drawn from my effort to trace the intellectual history of the concept of lifelong learning in UNESCO. First, this story tells us about the power of ideology, exemplified in the capacity of an international organization to construct and hang on to what I refer to as a "tradition" (in reference to Gadamer), even under unfavourable circumstances. It shows the influence of beliefs and ideologies on the behavior of an international organization. Phillip Jones, the scholar with

the most consistent and substantial record of research about UNESCO (and the World Bank), has captured UNESCO's ideology as follows:

> Broadly speaking, it is what is universal among people that provides the inspiration for Unesco's work; it is humanism which provides the rationale for action; and it is the ideology of human rights which compels the organisation to action. (1988, p. 102)

I was interested in the tension between the allegiance to a strong ideology and the impossibility of bringing it to life. As "the organization could not afford its view of itself" (Jones, 1988, p. 37), it became implicated in activities which forced it to depart from its visions, while still maintaining a claim of continuity. The conceptual groundwork on lifelong learning that UNESCO carried out lies at the heart of the tension between those for whom UNESCO constituted "an agency of intellectual cooperation and solidarity" (Interview with Colin Power) and those who favoured a technical role for the organization. Given its contested legitimacy, UNESCO's approach to lifelong learning was characterized by sporadic experiments rather than a consistent strategy.

This story also addressed the question discussed in much scholarly literature about intellectual history, ideas and institutions, who actually shapes institutional ideologies. My answer, which is very much in line with Mark Bevir, would be that individuals who are driven and motivated by their beliefs, which are situated in a "wider web of beliefs," try to use the institutional structures to leave their imprint on the world as a reaction to the dilemmas they face. It is noteworthy that the UNESCO constitution itself propagates the view that human beings construct their world with their ideas: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." The dilemma of the Second World War and the Holocaust represented the major driver of change for the drafters of the UDHR and the UNESCO constitution in terms of the normative claim for a more egalitarian and democratic society and approach to education. The individuals who shaped lifelong education, such as the initiators and members of UNESCO's two major education commissions, responded to new dilemmas. In the case of the *Faure report* the political climate of societal transformation characteristic of the 1960s called for a new society, which entailed a change of perspective on education. The claims of the welfare state, the 1968 student

revolts and the emergence of the Third World as a counter-force to the Western UNESCO founding members influenced the concept of lifelong education, which educationists saw as a "revolution" itself, because it marked a break with the tradition of restricting education to certain life and age phases and formal institutional settings. For Jacques Delors and the members of the Delors Commission the rise of neoliberalism and the divisive nature of globalization constituted major dilemmas. The *Delors report* reclaimed UNESCO's humanistic tradition, but slightly reinterpreted it, which resulted in shifts of what Skinner called the "normative vocabulary." The *Delors report* emphasized a collective and multicultural perspective, whereas the *Faure report* placed the focus on the individual and the "human condition."[69]

Second, UNESCO undoubtedly made the strongest theoretical and conceptual contributions to the idea of lifelong learning, which has a long history.[70]In the face of the subordination of education under the principle of profit and the impoverishment of the philosophical and ethical foundations of education, I believe it is important to look back at what the pioneers of lifelong learning had in mind even if they were not successful in establishing an alternative to the economic thinking promoted by other international organizations and only a "truncated" (a word used by Ravindra Dave) and limited functional version of lifelong learning found its way into education policies around the world.

---

[69] For a table summarizing the shifts in the meaning of lifelong learning in UNESCO, see Appendix 5.

[70] All cultures have claimed the idea of lifelong learning, and many of its main proponents, especially in UNESCO, have emphasized the ancientness of the concept (Wain, 1987, chapter 3; 2004, p. 2). One of my interviewees, Ravindra Dave, referred to lifelong learning as "a very old concept in the Indian culture." Knoll (2012) traced the Jewish origins of lifelong learning and referred to respective passages from the Tora and the Talmud. Also references to Chinese culture and Confucius are common (Zhang, 2008). In the lifelong learning literature, there are many references to the *Paideia* of the Ancient Greeks, who devoted their lives to education (Faure et al., 1972, p. 5, note 1; Goodman, in UNESCO, 1975, p. 18). In Ancient Greece lifelong learning was reserved to a small élite of society, who relied on slaves to do the work, whereas the modern idea of lifelong learning is universal and built on the premise that the increasing use of machines and the consequence of leisure time for the workers would make education accessible to all throughout life. Suchodolski (1979, pp. 38-39) named Comenius as the author of the first modern treatise devoted to lifelong learning, and Comenius is often evoked in the UNESCO context (see Piaget, 1999).

Third, the history of lifelong learning in UNESCO is part of a much bigger story of a struggle of ideologies. Following Zeev Sternhell's (2010) account of modernity I suggest to interpret the story of UNESCO as a struggle between a humanistic-emancipatory and a technocratic-rationalist worldview. Since its inception, divergent viewpoints on the organization's role in the world order stemmed from different ideological "camps." Reinhold Niebuhr as a forerunner of pragmatic power politics opposed Huxley's "one world" idealism. UNESCO attracted individuals who reclaimed and re-negotiated UNESCO's humanism in a dialectical relationship with competing ideas. The organization provided the arena for such struggles, attracting staff members and intellectuals who brought with them certain ideological predispositions. What they had in common was a belief in the principles of what Sternhell (2010) calls the "Franco-Kantian Enlightenment." They were modernists and humanists, as opposed to the "ideological camp" Faure (1971) referred to as "modernists without being humanists" (p. 213). They believed in universalization, as epitomized in the "unity in diversity" approach, and individualization, as expressed in the notion of "dignity."

During the Cold War, development became an important sphere of influence for the United States and the Western countries in their fight against communism, and the priorities of educational planning and economic growth yielded the "human capital" approach to education that seriously challenged UNESCO's humanistic worldview. While idealism had prevailed in the immediate post-war years, pragmatism became the guiding principle, and the *Faure report* did not fit into that new culture. UNESCO's *éducation permanente* was more of a philosophy and "strategy for social action" (Kallen, 1979, p. 51), underpinned by existentialist philosophy and its interest in the "human condition."

UNESCO's lifelong learning theorists worried about the challenge represented by the economic dimension. Their main concern was the tension between functionality and human freedom – an existentialist theme, and one of the great themes of modernity. UNESCO somewhat represents an old-fashioned curiosity as still today, well into the second decade of the third millennium, it stands for a teleological worldview, which stems from the Aristotelian philosophy based on the essence and dignity of the human being. UNESCO's utopianism runs counter to the powerful utilitarian and pragmatic

ideologies that have taken hold of the global order. Jacques Maritain attacked pragmatism for reducing human existence to what was empirically measurable and so did his disciples, such as Jacques Delors. Maheu (1972) posited that "pragmatism…cannot suffice to sustain an organization whose Constitution proclaims that it is to achieve the purpose of its being in the minds of men" (pp. 283-284). I would argue that the influence of pragmatists such as John Dewey on UNESCO was limited (Interview with Arthur Cropley). This could be related to the French resistance to American influences discussed earlier. However, as Wain (1987) pointed out, a considerable convergence exists between Dewey's educational philosophy and UNESCO's philosophy of lifelong education (chapter 6). Wain pointed to the fact that Dewey was one of the signatories of the *Humanist Manifesto* (p. 177). Pragmatists reject metaphysics and adhere to the empirically verifiable, but they can very well be humanists. Given its commitment to "scientific humanism," the *Faure report* "was well in accord with the spirit of pragmatism" (p. 179).[71] However, as I argued above, all in all the UNESCO approach constitutes more of a teleological worldview. That may explain why during the 12 years I worked for UNESCO, I had never heard of John Dewey, while I had heard many times of Jacques Maritain, which made me feel very ignorant when I moved to Canada, where Dewey's influence on educators is significant.

Fourth, I believe this study shows that it requires greater historical awareness of the concept of lifelong learning to avoid an anachronistic use of the term, which I frequently find in the scholarly literature and in policy documents, where authors associate the concept with neoliberalism and the market, although in its origins it stood for a notion of resistance. My confusion about the mismatch between the contemporary interpretation of lifelong learning and the meaning it holds in UNESCO formed the point of departure for me to conduct this study, which I hope has demonstrated how easily meanings of concepts can shift from their original intentions. While lifelong learning in UNESCO started out as a metaphor for the mood of "resistance" or "critique"

---

[71] The *Faure report* mentioned John Dewey twice: In a footnote citing Paul Goodman who had referred to Dewey's statement that "the essence of all philosophy is the philosophy of education" (Faure et al., 1972, p. 5) and in a list of educators who viewed education as liberation, among names such as Maria Montessori and Paulo Freire (p. 139). John Dewey had also contributed an essay on democracy to a collection of essays published by UNESCO in 1951 (UNESCO, 1951c).

characteristic of modernity, it changed its meaning to the responsibility of the individual to acquire education as a commodity after its usurpation by the principle of the market order. Lifelong learning was very much shaped by a concern about the appropriation of education by totalitarian tendencies. Ironically, we are now at a stage where education has again been appropriated to an alarming extent by an external force, the "market." Lifelong learning in terms of the right of individuals to develop their potential has been reversed to their responsibility to sell themselves as commodities in the marketplace. Other terms have changed radically too, such as the meaning of adult education, which developed from "non vocational education" to a purely work-oriented concept, or the notion of "choice" used by Paul Lengrand to denote greater freedom of the individual and which today has become a "battle word" of consumerism. The story of lifelong learning is relevant because it not only shows how shifting concepts reflect changing social and economic realities, but also their susceptibility to contestation and appropriation by different power agendas. The meaning of concepts can never be taken for granted and their use needs to be critically examined. Terms that carry democratic and participatory connotations are often abused by hegemonic forces to achieve consent for issues that are actually contrary to what people understand these terms to mean.

Fifth, this study aims to advocate for the hermeneutic approach with its focus on "understanding" that has been ousted by the current priority attached to measurable results. The hermeneutic approach is well suited to reconcile the often competing tendencies in UNESCO's "unity in diversity" paradigm. The *Faure report* and the *Delors report* asked questions and left processes open, instead of providing standardized recipes. Although the reports have been criticized for not offering enough practical solutions and their impact on policies was very limited, I have argued that their approach shows more respect for diversity. The pioneers of lifelong learning represented the spirit of inquiry, while the instrumental approach represents a spirit of control, something the Enlightenment critics such as Horkheimer and Adorno were very conscious about: "Instrumental reason is not driven by a need to inquire but is driven by a need to dominate and conquer" (Wheatland, 2009, p. 163). However, as I have pointed out in the first chapter, UNESCO's "unity and diversity" approach bore two risks: to produce recommendations that remained at a level too general to have any impact, and to impose

norms on countries that were proclaimed as "universal." While the *Faure report* and the *Delors report* are examples of the former problem, EFA represents an example of the latter. Despite the favourable general acceptance of the change of perspective on education reflected in the concept of lifelong learning, which the lifelong learning pioneers celebrated as a "revolution," the great "gift" that the West ultimately brought to the developing world consisted of primary schooling, which holds a long record of cultural homogenization. I admit that I am simplifying things here, but as an intellectual historian I am interested in detecting the patterns of the big picture that emerge behind the historical details.

I do not claim to have exhausted the subject. Many questions remain, which I hope will be addressed by future research. I still have questions about the dynamics of the multilateral system and why UNESCO could not live up to the many hopes that accompanied its foundation. Why did the World Bank take over the tasks of UNESCO, instead of keeping with its mandate as a bank? I am aware that I touch on many issues that require closer investigation, for example my argument that literacy lost out because of its association with Paulo Freire and socialism. The same holds for the organization's work on literacy. Up until the 1980s, Jones (1988) has superbly analyzed UNESCO's activities in the area of literacy, but the more recent history needs more attention.[72] Another question that deserves further investigation is why so few women have played influential roles in UNESCO.[73] In the course of my research I also noticed that very few women have actually conducted research on UNESCO and even less on lifelong learning[74]– a phenomenon I have no immediate answer for. But most importantly, the impact of the work of UNESCO and the other international agencies on country policies and on the educational realities on the ground is markedly understudied. I am aware that I criticize EFA without offering alternatives. I would be very interested in conducting further research on how EFA actually played out in schools, in funding and accountability mechanisms and in the developments and reforms of the education

---

[72] Exceptions are Leslie Limage's insider accounts (Limage, 1999, 2007, and 2009); see also Wagner, 2011.

[73] See Breines & d'Orville (2006) for a UNESCO publication that suggests otherwise.

[74] Karen Mundy is the exception when it comes to research on UNESCO; Judith Chapman, and to a lesser extent, Rosa Maria Torres, come to mind in terms of research on lifelong learning.

systems in selected countries. Another question that remains underresearched is whether the expansion of primary schooling in developing countries has led to noticeable decrease in socio-economic disparities.

Coming back to lifelong learning, I was intrigued by the title of John Field's (2006) article, "Has 'lifelong learning' had its day?" I concur with his negative response to this question. Lifelong learning will continue to be an essential part of the "human condition." But the reasons for learning have changed and will continue to change, along with societies, the economy and forms of labour. The vision of the learning society touted by the lifelong learning pioneers who appeared in this study was shaped by their experience of the biggest crisis of mankind in modernity. They dreamt of a learning society as a place where human beings could thrive and live in dignity in a peaceful world. In contemporary societies, learning is touted for the sake of economic growth and profit at the level of societies and economic well-being at the level of the individual. Why will people learn in the future? Catastrophic climate change, explosive population growth and wars may force more and more people into learning for survival. The *Faure report*'s fears of enslavement and alienation are looking quite realistic today. Will UNESCO still have a role to play in the thinking about the future of lifelong learning? In the short term, that seems highly unlikely. A century from now, people may be governed by gigantic corporations or religious organizations in fully digitized and automated societies. They may have to find a new living environment and found a new civilization on Mars. UNESCO's utopias might be nothing more than a romantic memory, but they may also see a revival, as Ravindra Dave suggested. However, that may take another existential crisis that brings humankind to the brink of destruction.

It seems to me that the message of the Enlightenment that people must criticize and doubt what is presented to them as hegemonic truth, remains as relevant as ever, as does Gadamer's theory of the hermeneutical task of asking questions and entering into dialogue with traditions. I agree with Sternhell (2010) who argues that turning away from the focus on the dignity of the human being is fundamentally dangerous, because it can lead to totalitarianism and indoctrination. Maritain (1943) made the same point in his *Education at the Crossroads*: "For the preface to Fascism and Nazism is a thorough disregard of the spiritual dignity of man" (p. 114). This is one of the reasons why the

lifelong learning pioneers insisted that education must be considered an end in itself. The main message that the story of lifelong learning in UNESCO holds for me is that of modernity's hope that human beings can change their world for the better.

References

Agamben, G. (2000). *Means without end. Notes on politics*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Allais, S. M. (2007). Why the South African NQF failed: Lessons for countries wanting to introduce national qualification frameworks. *European Journal of Education, 42*(4), 523-547.

Appiah, K. A. (2008). Education for global citizenship. In D. Coulter, G. D. Fenstermacher, & J. R. Wiens (Eds). *Why do we educate? Renewing the conversation*. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (vol. 1) (pp. 83-100). Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Apple, M. (1980/81). The other side of the hidden curriculum: Correspondence theories and the labour process. *Interchange, 11*(3), 5-22.

Apple, M. (1992). Review of "Education and the economy in a changing society." *Comparative Education Review, 36*(1). (Special Issue on Education in a Changing Europe), 127-129.

Arendt, H. (1951/2001). *The origins of totalitarianism*. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt.

Arendt, H. (1958/2006). The concept of history. In *Between past and future*. London and New York: Penguin Books.

Arendt, H. (1994). Some questions of moral philosophy. *Social Research, 61*(4), 739-764.

Arnove, R. F., & Graff, H. J. (Eds.). (1987). *National literacy campaigns. Historical and comparative perspectives*. New York and London: Plenum Press.

Asher, C. S. (1950). The development of UNESCO's program. *International Organization, 4*(1), 12-26.

Astre, G. A. (1985a, October). L'offensive de la droite américaine contre les Nations unies. *Le Monde diplomatique*.

Astre, G. A. (1985b, Décembre). L'isolement de Mme Margaret Thatcher. Après la vingt-troisième Conférence générale de l'UNESCO. *Le Monde diplomatique*.

AusAID (2012). *Australian Multilateral Assessment*. Australian Government. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/ama-report-section-5.pdf

Bagnall, R. G. (1990). Lifelong education: The institutionalization of an illiberal and regressive ideology? *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 22*(1), 1-7.

Bagnall, R. G. (2000). Lifelong learning and the limitations of economic determinism. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 19*(1), 20-35.

Ball, S. J. (1995). Intellectuals or technicians? The urgent role of theory in education studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 43*(3), 255–271.

Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global Education Inc. New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Ball, S. J., & Olmedo, A. (2012). Global social capitalism: Using enterprise to solve the problems of the world. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education, 10*(2-3), 83-90.

Balogh, T. (1964). The economics of educational planning: Sense and nonsense. *Comparative Education, 1*(1), 5-17.

Barré, J.-L. (2005). *Jacques and Raïssa Maritain*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (1999). The politics, power and pathologies of international organizations. *International Organization, 53*(4), 699-732.

Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the world. International organizations in global politics.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Becker, G. S. (1964/1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Beeby, C. E. (1997). The biography of an idea: Beeby on education. Paper on the accompanying CD to the UNESCO publication *50 Years of Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Benavot, A. (2011). Imagining a transformed UNESCO with learning at its core. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(3), 558-561.

Berrêdo Carneiro, P. E. de (1976). René Maheu; international co-operation and the struggle for development. *UNESCO Courier*, *XXIX*(10)*, 23-30.*

Bertelsmann Stiftung (2010). *Making Lifelong Learning tangible. The European ELLI-Index 2010.* Guetersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Bevir, M. (1999). *The logic of the history of ideas.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2006). *Governance stories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bevir, M., Rhodes, R. A. W., & Weller, P. (2003). Traditions of governance: Interpreting the changing role of the public sector. *Public Administration, 81*(1), 1-17.

BFM politique (2012). *L'interview de Jacques Delors par Oliver Mazerolle et Thierry Arnaud.* Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgLgti8tVIM (last viewed December 14, 2015).

Bhola, H. S. (1984). *Campaigning for literacy. Eight national experiences of the twentieth century, with a memorandum to decision-makers*. Paris: UNESCO.

Bhola, H. S. (1997). Adult education policy projections in the Delors report. *Prospects, XXVII*(2), 207-222.

Bhola, H. S. (1998). World trends and issues in adult education on the eve of the twenty-first century. *International Review of Education, 44*(5–6), 485–506.

Biddle, J., & Holden, L. (2014). *Walter Heller and the introduction of human capital theory into education policy.* Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from https://www.utexas.edu/cola/_files/ms37643/Holden-Biddle_for_Hamerama.pdf

Biesta, G. J. J. (2006). What's the point of lifelong learning if lifelong learning has no point? On the democratic deficit of policies for lifelong learing. *European Educational Research Journal, 5*(3-4), 169-180.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2011). *Learning democracy in school and society. Education, lifelong learning, and the politics of citizenship*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2015). What is education for? On good education, teacher judgement, and educational professionalism. *European Journal of Education, 50*(1), 75-87.

Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2010). *Philanthrocapitalism. How giving can save the world.* (2nd ed.). London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Black, C. (2010). *Schooling the world: The white man's last burden.* Lost people films.

BLK−Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung. (2001). Lebenslanges Lernen. Programmbeschreibung und Darstellung der Länderprojekte. Deutsches Institut für Erwachsenenbildung (DIE). *Materialien zur Bildungsplanung und zur Forschungsförderung. Heft 88.* Bonn: BLK. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.blk-bonn.de/papers/heft88.pdf

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002). Towards a multicultural conception of human rights. In B. Hernández-Truyol. (Ed.). *Moral imperialism. A critical anthology.* New York: New York University Press.

Bonnot, G. (1972). UNESCO. La faillite de l'école. *L'Express*, *2-8 octobre 1972*. ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

Booth, K. (1999). Three tyrannies. In T. Dunne, & N. J. Wheeler (Eds.). *Human rights in global politics* (pp. 31-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bosch-Gimpera, P. (1948). Philosopher calls for new humanism. In *UNESCO Courier, I*(4), 7.

Boshier, R. (2004). Meanings and manifestations of anarchist-utopian ethos in adult education. *45th Annual Adult Education Research Conference (AERC)*, Victoria, B.C. (pp. 53-58). Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/2004/papers/Boshier.PDF

Boshier, R. (2012). Lifelong learning as a flag of convenience. In D.N. Aspin et al. (Eds.). Second International Handbook of Lifelong Learning. *Springer International Handbooks of Education, 26* (pp. 701-719). Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.

Bowers, J. (1948). Fundamental education. *UNESCO Courier, I*(1), 4. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0007/000736/073649eo.pdf#73649

Boyd, W. L., & Rawson, W. T. R. (1965). *The story of the new education.* London: Heinemann.

Braune, J. (2014). *Fromm's revolutionary hope. Prophetic messianism as a critical theory of the future.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Brehony, K. J. (2004). A new education for a new era: The Contribution of the conferences of the New Education Fellowship to the disciplinary field of education 1921-1938. *Paedagogica Historica,40*(5/6), 733-755.

Breines, I., & d'Orville, H. (2006). *60 women contributing to the 60 years of UNESCO.* Paris: UNESCO.

Brickman, W. W. (1968). The great October Socialist revolution and problems of rearing the new man. *Soviet Education, 11*(2), 20-57.

Brown, P., Halsey, A. H., Lauder, H., & Wells, A. S. (1997). The transformation of education and society: An introduction. In A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. S. Wells (Eds.). *Education, culture, economy and society* (pp. 1-44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buch-Hansen, H., & Wigger, A. (2011). The politics of European competition regulation. A critical political economy perspective. *Routledge/RIPE Studies in Global Political Economy.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Burawoy, M. (1979). Toward a Marxist theory of the labor process. *Politics and Society, 8*(3-4), 247-312.

Burnett, N. (2010). How to develop the UNESCO the world needs: The challenges of reform. *CICE Hiroshima University, Journal of International Cooperation in Education, 13*(2), 89-99.

BusinessWeek (2007). The future of work: How we will master technology, manage companies, and build careers in the era of the global 24-7 workforce? August 20-27.

Büttner, W. (2004). *Die Menschenrechte im Comité sur les principes philosophiques des droits de l'homme der Unesco (1947/48).* [Human rights in the *Comité sur les principes philosophiques des droits de l'homme der Unesco (1947/48)*]. Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag.

Canadian Commission for UNESCO (1997). *Learning together throughout our lives. Discussion kit on the report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the 21ˢᵗ Century.* Ottawa: Canadian Commission for UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.unesco.ca/en/home-accueil/resources-ressources/~/media/PDF/UNESCO/LearningTogether.ashx

Canadian Council on Learning (CCL). (2010). *The 2010 Composite Learning Index (CLI). Five years of measuring Canada's progress in lifelong learning.* Ottawa: Canadian Council on Learning.

Carneiro, R. (n.d.). *Pour une éducation inspirée par l'humanism.* Background paper. ED/EDC/5. UNESCO Archives.

Carneiro, R. (2015). Learning: The treasure within – Prospects for education in the 21ˢᵗ century. *European Journal of Education, 50*(1*),* 101-112.

Carneiro, R., & Draxler , A. (2008) Education for the 21st century: Lessons and challenges. *European Journal of Education, 43*, 149–160.

Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism.* New York: David McKay Co.

Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) (1973). *Recurrent education. A strategy for lifelong learning.* Paris: OECD.

Chabbott, C. (1998). Constructing educational consensus: International development professionals and the world conference on education for all. *International Journal of Educational Development, 18*(3), 207-218.

Chabbott, C. (2003). *Constructing education for development. International organizations and Education for All.* New York and London: Routledge.

Champion Ward, F. (Ed.). (1974). *Education and development reconsidered. The Bellagio conference papers.* New York and London: Praeger Publishers and Ford Foundation.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London: Sage.

City of Vancouver (2008, January). Culture plan for Vancouver, 2008-2018. Creative City. Vancouver: Creative City Task Force.

Coate, R. A. (1992). Changing patterns of conflict. The United States and UNESCO. In M. P. Karns, & K. A. Mingst (Eds.). *The United States and multilateral institutions. Patterns of changing instrumentality and influence* (pp. 159-180). New York: Routledge.

Commission of the European Communities (1973). For a Community policy on education (the 'Janne' report). *Bulletin of the European Communities, supplement 10/73.*

Commission of the European Communities (1993, December 5). *Commission, Growth, competitiveness, employment. The challenges and ways forward into the 21st century.* White paper. COM(93)700. Bulletin of the European Communities. Supplement 6/93.

Commission of the European Communities (2000). Memorandum on lifelong learning. Brussels. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://arhiv.acs.si/dokumenti/Memorandum_on_Lifelong_Learning.pdf

Commission internationale sur le développement de l'éducation (1971). Quatrième session de la Commission internationale sur le développement de l'éducation. Compte rendu des séances des jeudi 7 octobre (après-midi) et vendredi 8 octobre (matin) 1971. ADG/ED/13.1 UNESCO Archives (Rue Miollis).

Commission internationale sur l'éducation pour le vingt et unième siècle (1993). 2ième session. Dakar, 18 – 22 septembre, 1993. Note de travail No. 1. ED/EDC/2. UNESCO Archives.

Commission nationale Suisse pour l'UNESCO (1973, août). Discussion du rapport de la Commission internationale pour le développement de l'éducation, "Apprendre à être". ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

Conseil de l'Europe (1972). Letter S. Sforza to René Maheu. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

Coombs, P. H. (1964). *The fourth dimension of foreign policy: Educational and cultural affairs.* Council on Foreign Relations and Harper & Row.

Coombs, P. H. (1968). *The world educational crisis: A systems analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Condren, C. (1997). Political theory and the problem of anachronism. In A. Vincent (Ed.). *Political theory. Tradition and diversity* (pp. 45-66). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education, 54*(2), 99-112.

Council of Europe (1970). *Permanent education: A compendium of studies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Cowell, F. R. (1966). Planning the organization of UNESCO, 1942-1946. A Personal Record. *Journal of World History, 10*, 210-256. Reprinted in UNESCO (2006). *What UNESCO for the future? Forum of reflexion* (pp. I-XXXIII). Paris: UNESCO.

Cropley, A. J. (1978). Some guidelines for the reform of school curricula in the perspective of lifelong education. *International Review of Education, 24*(1), 21-33.

Cropley, A. J. (Ed.). (1979). *Lifelong education: A stocktaking*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Crouch, C. (2011). *The strange non-death of neoliberalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

CVCE - Transcription Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe (2009). Transcription de l'interview de Jacques Delors – Partie 2 – le parcours de Jacques Delors avant sa présidence à la Commission européenne (Paris, 16 décembre 2009). Retrieved (December 15, 2015) from http://www.cvce.eu/education/unit-content/-/unit/da53c3f9-6a19-4c52-8802-26206906f253/c9f69671-5d35-4fff-bb4e-417f45c2716a

Danish National Commission for UNESCO (n.d.). Observations on "Learning to be".
ADG/EG/13.2. UNESCO Archives.

Dave, R. (1973). Lifelong education and school curriculum. *UIE Monographs 1*.
Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Davies, T. (1997). *Humanism* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Debeauvais, M. (1973). Problems of cost and opportunities. *Prospects, III*(3), 307-316.

Délégation permanente du Japon auprès de l'UNESCO (1973, August 29). Letter Ken
Ikebe to René Maheu. ADG/EG/13.2. UNESCO Archives.

Délégation permanente de la République socialiste Tchécoslovaque auprès de l'UNESCO
(1973, 2 auot [sic]). Letter Michel Greguš to René Maheu. ADG/EG/13.2.
UNESCO Archives.

Deleon, A. (n.d.) Note pour le dossier. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

Deléon, A. (1972a, March 20). Letter to Ambassador Martin. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO
Archives.

Deléon, A. (1972b, July 4). Letter to M. Arthur V. Petrovski [sic]. CDE. 2.
ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

Deleon, A. (1974). Reading and misreading *Learning to Be*. *Prospects, IV*(2), 181-188.

Deleon, A. (1996). 'Learning to be' in retrospect. In *UNESCO Courier*, April, 12-14.

De Lisle, J. (1998). The Delors report within the American context. The major project of
education in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Bulletin, 45* (April 1998) (pp. 32-
46). Santiago, Chile: Regional Office for Education in Latin America and the
Caribbean. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001131/113160e.pdf

Delors, J. (1988, September 8). It is necessary to work together. Speech to Trades Union
Congress, Bournemouth. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.pro-
europa.eu/index.php/en/library/the-struggle-for-the-union-of-europe/107-delors,-
jacques-it-is-necessary-to-work-together

Delors, J. (1992). Education XXIième siècle. Note sent by J. Delors to Director General.
Attached to UNESCO Memo ED/UCE/HWR/SC. 24 September 1992, signed by
H. W. Rissom. ED/EDC/1. UNESCO Archives.

Delors, J. (1994). *L'unité d'un homme. Entretiens avec Dominique Wolton*. Paris:
Éditions Odile Jacob.

Delors, J. (1995, September 1). Letter to Dr. Karan Singh. International Commission on
Education for the Twenty-first Century. ED/EDC/6. UNESCO Archives.

Delors, J., et al . (1996) *Learning: the treasure within*. Report to UNESCO of the
International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first century. Paris:
UNESCO.

Delors, J. (avec Arnaud, J.-L.) (2004). *Mémoires.* Paris: Plon.

Delors, J. (2013). The treasure within: Learning to know, learning to do, learning to live
together and learning to be. What is the value of that treasure 15 years after its
publication? *International Review of Education, 59*(3), 319-330.

Denison, E.F. (1962). The sources of economic growth in the United States and the
alternatives before us. Committee for Economic Development, Supplementary
Paper No. 13, New York.

Denison, E.F. (1964). *The residual factor in economic growth*. Paris: Organisation for
Economic Co-operation and Development.

Department of Higher Education and Training South Africa (2011). National skills development strategy III. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.dhet.gov.za/booklets/NSDSIII.pdf

Der Spiegel (1983, March 21). Vor einem sozialliberalen Zeitalter? Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-14021261.html

DFID (Department for International Development) (2012). *The multilateral aid review*. London: National Audit Office. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.nao.org.uk/report/dfid-the-multilateral-aid-review/

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Dohmen, G. (1996). *Lifelong learning. Guidelines for a modern education policy*. Bonn: Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Technology.

Donnelly, J. (1993). Third generation rights. In C. Brölmann, R. Lefeber, & M. Zieck (Eds.). *Peoples and minorities in international law*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Dorn, C., & Ghodsee, K. (2012). The Cold War politicization of literacy: Communism, UNESCO and the World Bank. *Diplomatic History, 36*(2), 373-398.

Drake, H. (2000). *Jacques Delors. Perspectives on a European leader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Draxler, A. (2015). Public-private partnerships and international education policies. In S. McGrath & Q. Gu (Eds.). *Handbook on international education and development*. London: Routledge.

Drucker, P. (1968). *The age of discontinuity*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row Publishers.

Duedahl, P. (2007). *UNESCO Man. Changing the concept of race*. Unpublished manuscript (based on dissertation From SUPERman to UNESCOman: A conceptual and historical analysis of the transition from a biological to a cultural view of man in the 20th Century, only available in Danish).

Duedahl, P. (2011). Selling mankind: UNESCO and the invention of Global History. *Journal of World History, 22*(1), 101-133.

Dumont, M. (2013, August 2). L'UNESCO en phase terminale? *Le Huffington Post, Québec*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://quebec.huffingtonpost.ca/martin-dumont/unesco-budget-compressions_b_3684549.html

Ebenstein, L. (2015). *Chicagonomics: The evolution of Chicago free market economics*. New York: St. Martin's.

ECO/Conf/6 (1945, November 3rd). *Commission préparatoire Londres-Paris. 1945-1946, volume 1, Documents*. UNESCO Archives.

ECO/Conf./15 (1945, November 14). United Nations conference for the establishment of an educational and cultural organisation. Resolution regarding adult education submitted by the United States Delegation. Conference for the establishment of UNESCO, London, 1-16 November 1945. UNESCO Archives.

Edward, B., Okitsu, T., da Costa, R., & Kitamura, Y. (2015). *UNESCO in the 2000s: EFA coordination, GMR production, and organizational legitimacy in the global educational policy field*. 13th International Conference on Education and

Development. Learning for Sustainable Futures: Making the Connection. September 15-17, 2015. University of Oxford.

Elfert, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Towards an open learning world*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Elfert, M. (2013). Six decades of educational multilateralism in a globalising world: The history of the UNESCO Institute in Hamburg. *International Review of Education, 59*(2), 263-287. doi: 10.1007/s11159-013-9361-5

Elfert, M. (2014a). The post-EFA agenda: The role of UNESCO. *NORRAG NewsBite*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://norrag.wordpress.com/2014/05/09/the-post-2015-efa-agenda-the-role-of-unesco/

Elfert, M. (2014b). The post-2015 EFA agenda: UNESCO and the new global education network. *NORRAG NewsBite*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://norrag.wordpress.com/2014/09/22/the-post-2015-efa-agenda-unesco-and-the-new-global-education-network/

Elfert, M. (2015). UNESCO, the *Faure report*, the *Delors report*, and the political utopia of lifelong learning. *European Journal of Education, 50*(1), 88-100. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12104

Elfert, M., & Bochynek, B. (2002). Erwachsenenbildung ist ein Kind der Demokratie – 50 *Jahre UNESCO-Institut für Pädagogik* [Adult education is a child of democracy – the UNESCO Institute for Education turns 50]. *UNESCO heute, no. 3* (Journal of the German UNESCO Commission).

Elfert, M., & Rubenson, K. (2013). Adult education policies in Canada: Skills without humanity. In T. Nesbit, N. Taber, S. Brigham, & T. Gibb (Eds.). *Building on critical traditions: Adult education and learning in Canada* (pp. 238-248). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development. The making and unmaking of the third world.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1996). Positive-sum solutions in a world of trade offs? In Esping-Andersen, G. (Ed.). *Welfare states in transition: National adaptations in global economies* (pp. 256-267). Oxford: Pergamon.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2002). Towards the good society, once again? In G. Esping-Andersen, D. Gallie, & A. Hemerijk. *Why we need a new welfare state* (pp. 1-25). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Etzioni, A. (1968). *The active society. A theory of social and political processes*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Evans, P. (1997). The eclipse of the state? Reflections on stateness in an era of globalization. *World Politics, 50*(1), 62-87.

Faure, E. (1971). *Ce que je crois.* Paris: Éditions Bernard Grasset.

Faure, E. (1973). *Pour un nouveau contrat social.* Paris: Seuil.

Faure, E., et al. (1972). *Learning to be. The world of education today and tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO/Harrap.

Fernandez, J. A. (1995). L'Éducation permanente. « Une redécouverte ». *Recherche et Formation, 18,* 45-55.

Fernig, L. (1993). The International Bureau of Education in Geneva. A Centre of the Progressive/New Education Movement. Paper on the accompanying CD to the

UNESCO publication *50 Years of Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Ferry, L. (2011). *A brief history of thought. A philosophical guide to living.* New York & London: Harper Perennial.

Ferry, L., & Renaut, A. (1990). *French philosophy of the Sixties. An essay on antihumanism.* Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Field, J. (2000). Governing the ungovernable. Why lifelong learning policies promise so much yet deliver so little. *Educational Management & Administration, 28*(3), 249-261.

Field, J. (2001). Lifelong education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20*(1-2), 3-15.

Field, J. (2006, April). Has 'lifelong learning' had its day? *Adults Learning*, 16-17.

Finger, M., & Asún, J. M. (2001). *Adult education at the crossroads. Learning our way out.* London & New York: Zed Books.

Finnemore, M. (1993). International organizations as teachers of norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and science policy. *International Organization, 47*(4), 565-597.

Finnemore, M. (1996). *National interests in international society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Flinders, M., & Wood, M. (2014). Depoliticisation, governance and the state. *Policy & Politics, 42*(2), 135-149.

Flood, C., & Bell, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Political ideologies in contemporary France*. London and Washington: Pinter.

Forquin, J.-C. (2004). L'idée d'éducation permanente et son expression internationale depuis les années 1960. *Savoirs, 3*(6), 9-44.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things. An archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Vintage Books. Random House.

Fourcade, M.. (2007). Coopérer dans un monde divisé : l'apport de Maritain à la philosophie de l'UNESCO. *60 ans d'histoire de l'UNESCO* (pp. 143-147). Paris: UNESCO.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy. Reading the word & the world.* Critical Studies in Education Series. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Friedman, M. (1975, April 21). Milton Friedman's letter to General Augusto Pinochet. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://wwww.naomiklein.org/files/resources/pdfs/friedman-pinochet-letters.pdf

Friedrich, T., & Lee, M. (2011). Technocratic and aesthetic-democratic being in UNESCO's lifelong learning policy discourse: An ideological analysis. *Journal for the Philosophical Study of Education*, I, 153-173.

Friesen, J. K. (1963). A world agenda for adult education. Twelfth General Conference of UNESCO. Reprint from *Continuous Learning* (March-April). Coolie Verner Memorial Reading Room, University of British Columbia.

Fromm, E. (1969). Introduction. In I. Illich. *Celebration of awareness. A call for institutional revolution* (pp. 7-11). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.

Fukuyama, F. (1993). *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Avon Books.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1975/2013). *Truth and method*. London & New York: Bloomsbury Acadamic.

Garrett, D. (1972). Adult education in the context of lifelong education: The Third World Conference on Adult Education, UNESCO: Tokyo 1972. *Continuing Education in New Zealand, 4*(2), 4-9.

Gastaut, Y. (2007). L'UNESCO, les « races » et le racisme. *60 ans d'histoire de l'UNESCO* (pp. 197-210). Paris: UNESCO.

Geremek, B. (1996). Cohesion, solidarity and exclusion. In J. Delors, et al. *Learning: the treasure within*. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first century (pp. 209-213). Paris: UNESCO.

Giere, U. (1994). Lifelong learning in the literature: A bibliographical survey. *International Review of Education, 40*(3-5), 383-393.

Gillette, A. (1987). The Experimental World Literacy Program. A unique international effort revisited. In R. F. Arnove, & H. J. Graff (Eds.) (1987). *National literacy campaigns. Historical and comparative perspectives* (pp. 197-219). New York and London: Plenum Press.

Glendon, M. A. (2001). *A world made new. Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: Random House.

Goldstein, J., & Keohane, R. O. (1993). (Eds.). *Ideas and foreign policy. Beliefs, institutions, and political change*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Grattan, H. C. (1955). *In quest of knowledge: A historical perspective on adult education.* New York: Arno Press.

Griffin, C. (1999). Lifelong learning and social democracy. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 18*(5), 329-342.

Griffin, C. (2001). Ettore Gelpi. In P. Jarvis (Ed.). *Twentieth century thinkers in adult and continuing education (2nd ed.).* (pp. 274-289). London: Kogan Page.

Guigou, J. (1975). Les coûts de l'éducation permanente: un été chez Illich (août 1974). *L'homme de la société, 35-36. Marxisme critique et idéologique*, 225-237.

Gutek, G. L. (2005). Jacques Maritain and John Dewey on education: A reconsideration. *Educational Horizons, 83*(4), 247-263.

Guyot, J.-L., Mainguet, C., & Van Haeperen, B. (Eds.). (2003). *La formation professionelle continue. L'individu au coeur des dispositifs*. Bruxelles: Éditions De Boeck Université.

Habermas, J. (2012). The concept of human dignity and the realistic utopia of human rights. In C. Corradetti (Ed.). *Philosophical dimensions of human rights: Some contemporary views* (pp. 63-79). Dordrecht: Springer.

Haines, N. (n.d.) [1973?]. Learning to be adults? Some implications of the Faure report. Article published in an unidentified journal or report, pp. 69-81. Coolie Verner Memorial Reading Room, University of British Columbia.

Hake, B. J. (1999). Lifelong learning policies in the European Union: Developments and issues. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 29*(1), 53-69.

Hallak, J. (1991). Education for All: High expectations or false hopes? *IIEP Contributions, 3*. Paris: UNESCO-International Institute for Educational Planning.

Hancock, D. (1987). The Greek concept of *Paideia* and modern continuing education. *Research Annual. Texas Association for Community Service and Continuing Education, 3*(1).

Hanemann, U. (2015). The evolution and impact of literacy campaigns and programmes 2000-2014. *UIL Research Series, no. 1*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Havet, J. (1948). Distinguished world thinkers study bases of human rights. *UNESCO Courier, 1*(7), 8.

Heikkinen, A., & Kraus, K. (Eds.). (2009). Reworking vocational education. Policies, practices and concepts. *Studies in Vocational and Continuing Education, 7*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Held, D. (2005). At the global crossroads: The end of the Washington Consensus and the rise of global social democracy? *Globalizations, 2*(1), 95-113.

Henderson, E. (1993, March 12). Unesco group's task is rehabilitation. *The TimesHigher*.

Hessel, S. (2011). *Time for outrage [Indignez-vous]!* Reprinted in *The Nation*, March 7/14, 2011.

Heyneman, S. P. (2009). The failure of Education for All as political strategy. *Prospects, 39*(1), 5-10, doi 10.1007/s11125-009-9107-0

Hill, D. (2009). (Ed.). *The rich world and the impoverishment of education. Diminishing democracy, equity and workers' rights*. New York and London: Routledge.

Hobsbawm, E. (1996). *The age of extremes. A history of the world*, 1914-1991. New York: Vintage Books.

Hogan, A., Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (in press). Corporate social responsibility and neo-social accountability in education: The case of Pearson plc. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, C. Lubienski, & T. Verger (Eds.). *World Yearbook in Education 2016*. London: Routledge.

Hoggart, R. (1978). *An idea and its servants. UNESCO from within.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1973). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. London: Allen Lane.

Huang, J., & Shi, W. (2008): Policies and practices of lifelong learning in China. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 27*(5), p. 499-508.

Hüfner, K. (Ed.). (1970). Bildungsinvestitionen und Wirtschaftswachstum [Educational investments and economic growth]. Stuttgart: Klett Verlag.

Hüfner, K. (2011). *Multilaterale Bildungsfinanzierung durch das UNO-System* [Multilateral education financing through the UN system]. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Hüfner, K. (2013). *Wer rettet die UNESCO* [What will save UNESCO?]. Berlin: Frank & Timme (English translation published in 2015).

Hulme, D. (2007). The making of the Millennium Development Goals: Human development meets results-based management in an imperfect world. *BWPI Working Paper 16*. Brooks World Poverty Institute. ISBN: 978-1-906518-15-8.

Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from
http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/773bwpi-wp-1607.pdf

Humphrey, J. P. (1984). *Human rights and the United Nations: A great adventure*. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Transnational Publishers.

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Husén, T. (1974). *The learning society*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Hutchins, R. (1968). *The learning society*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Huxley, J. (1946). *UNESCO: Its purpose and its philosophy*. Paris: UNESCO Preparatory Commission.

Huxley, J. (1947a, April 2nd). Letter to Aldous Huxley. File *342.7 (100): 1A02*. UNESCO Archives.

Huxley, J. (1947b). Letter to Compton. File *342.7 (100): 1A02*. UNESCO Archives.

Huxley, J. (1964). Education and humanism. In J. Huxley. *Essays of a humanist* (pp. 120-150). New York: Harper & Row.

Huxley, J. (1973). *Memories II.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society.* New York: Harper & Row.

Illich, I., & Verne, E. (1976). *Imprisoned in the global classroom*. London: Writers & Readers.

ILO (1972, September 27). Letter Wilfred Jenks, Director-General to René Maheu. UNESCO. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (n.d.) [1994]. Sixth Session. Working Group: The right to education – the role of international cooperation. Draft. ED/EDC/4. UNESCO Archives.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1994). 12-15 April 1994, Vancouver. 13 April morning session. ED/EDC/3. UNESCO Archives.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1995a). Sixth session. 6 February 1995, 15:00 – 16:30 (notes of discussion). ED/EDC/4. UNESCO Archives.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1995b, March 21). Sixth session on outline of final report. Notes of comments by Zhou Nanzhao. ED/EDC/7. UNESCO Archives.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1995c). Seventh session. Tunis, Tunisia, 22 to 25 September 1995. Education and Culture. EDC-95/CONF.007/Rev. 29 August 1995. ED/EDC/4. UNESCO Archives.

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1995d). Sixth session discussion on outline of final report. Notes of Comments by Fay Chung. ED/EDC/5. UNESCO Archives.

Ireland, T. D. (1979). Gelpi's view of lifelong education. *Manchester Monographs, 14.* University of Manchester: Department of Adult and Higher Education.

Ireland, T. D., & Spezia, C. H. (2014). *Adult education in retrospective. 60 years of CONFINTEA*. UNESCO Brazil Office and Ministry of Education, Brazil.

Iriye, A. (2002). *Global community. The role of international organizations in the making of the contemporary world.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, U.S.A: University of California Press.

Jackson, R. H. (1993). The weight of ideas in decolonization: Normative change in

international relations. In J. Goldstein, & R. O. Keohane (Eds.). *Ideas and foreign policy. Beliefs, institutions, and political change* (pp. 3-31). Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Jakobi, A. P. (2009). International organizations and lifelong learning. From global agendas to policy diffusion. *Transformation of the State Series*. UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Janne, H. (1970). Éducation permanente, facteur de mutation. *Éducation permanente.* Strassbourg: Conseil de l'Europe, 11-46.

Jarvis, P. (2014). From adult education to lifelong learning and beyond. *Comparative Education, 50*(1), 45-57.

Jessup, F. W. (Ed.). (1953). Adult education towards social and political responsibility. International conference held from the 8th to the 13th September, 1952. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Jessup, F.W. (1969). The idea of lifelong learning. In F.W. Jessup (Ed.). *Lifelong learning. A symposium on continuing education* (pp. 14-31). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Johnson, G., & Symonides, J. (1994). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 45th anniversary, 1948-1993.* Paris: UNESCO.

Jolly, R., Emmerij, L., Ghai, D., & Lapeyre, F. (2004). UN contributions to development thinking and practice. *United Nations Intellectual History Project Series.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jones, D. S. (2012). *Masters of the the universe. Hayek, Friedman, and the birth of neoliberal politics.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Jones, P. W. (1988). *International policies for Third World Education: UNESCO, literacy and development.* London & New York: Routledge.

Jones, P. W. (1992). *World Bank financing of education. Lending, learning and development.* London and New York: Routledge.

Jones, P. W. (2007a). WCEFA: A moment in the history of multilateral education. *International Perspectives on Education and Society, 8*, 521-538. Education for All: Global promises, national challenges (special issue).

Jones, P. W. (2007b). *World Bank financing of education. Lending, learning and development* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Jones, P. W., & Coleman, D. (2005). *The United Nations and education. Multilateralism, development and globalisation.* London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kallen, D. (1979). Recurrent education and lifelong learning: Definitions and distinctions. In T. Schuller, & J. Megarry (Eds.). Recurrent education and lifelong learning. *World Yearbook of education 1979* (pp. 45-57). London: Kogan Page, and New York: Nichols Publishing.

Kallen, D. (1996). Éducation permanente, une retrospective. *Formation professionnelle, n° 8/9* (mai-décembre), p. 16-22.

Kant, I. (1785/2005). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals*. Edited by J. F. Bennett. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/kant1785.pdf

Kanz, H. (1993). Immanuel Kant. *Prospects, XXIII*, 3-4, 789-806.

Karp, B. (1951). *The development of the philosophy of UNESCO*. PhD Dissertation: University of Chicago.

Kidd, J. R. (1966). The implications of continuous learning. *Lectures delivered under the Quance Lectures in Canadian education.* Toronto: W.J. Gage Ltd.

Kidd, J. R. (1969). *Education for perspective.* Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Ltd.

Kidd, J. R. (1974). Tale of three cities, Elsinore–Montreal–Tokyo. The influence of three UNESCO world conferences upon the development of adult education. *Landmarks and New Horizons in Continuing Education Series No. 3.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education.

King, K. (2006, May). Education and training out of poverty? A status report. *NORRAG News, 37.*

King, K. (2011). Skills and education for all from Jomtien (1990) to the GMR of 2012: A policy history. *International Journal of Training Research, 9*, 16–34.

Kirkendall, A. J. (2010). *Paulo Freire & the Cold War politics of literacy.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kirpal, P. N. (1976). Historical studies and the foundations of lifelong education. In R. Dave (Ed.). *Foundations of lifelong education.* Pergamon Press & UNESCO Institute for Education.

Klees, S. J., & Qargha, O. (2014). Equity in education: The case of UNICEF and the need for participative debate. *Prospects, 44*, 321-333.

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism.* Toronto: A. A. Knopf Canada.

Klein, N. (2011). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism.* Presentation by Naomi Klein. pdxjustice Media Productions (uploaded April 24, 2011). Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hA736oK9FPg (last viewed December 14, 2015).

Knoll, J. (1996). Vom *Faure-Bericht* zum Bericht der Internationalen Kommission *Bildung fuer das 21. Jahrhundert.* In K. Hüfner, & W. Reuther (Eds.). *UNESCO-Handbuch.* Neuwied, Kriftel, Berlin: Luchterhand.

Knoll, J. (2007). The history of the UNESCO international conferences on adult education – from Helsingör (1949) to Hamburg (1997). International education policy through people and programmes. *Convergence, XL*(3-4), 21-41.

Knoll, J. (2012). Ein neuer Begriff fuer eine alte Sache? Eine historische Spurensuche zum 'Lebenslangen Lernen' [A new term for an old thing? A historical inquiry into 'lifelong learning]. In J. A. Diekmann (Ed.). *"…und handle mit Vernunft". Beitraege zur europaeisch-juedischen Beziehungsgeschichte* (pp. 530-547). Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Krakovitch, R. (2006). *Edgar Faure. Le virtuose de la politique.* Paris: Economica.

Krill de Capello, H. H. (1970). The creation of UNESCO. *International Organization, 24*(1), 1-30.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962/1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews. Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd edition). USA: Sage.

Laot, F. F. (2000). Le rapport à l'école en formation d'adultes dans les années 60. L'exemple du CUCES-INFA de Nancy. *Recherche et Formation, 35*, 195-208.

Larrabee, E., & Meyersohn, R. (1958). *Mass leisure.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Latapi, P. (1973). Education and international justice. *Prospects, III*(3), 317-325.

Laves, W. H. C. (1951). UNESCO and the achievement of peace. *The Political Quarterly, 22*(2), 163-174.

Laves, W. H. C., & Thomson, C. A. (1957). *UNESCO: Purpose, progress, prospects*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lawson, K. (1982). Lifelong education: Concept or policy? *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 1*(2), 97-108.

Le Canard Enchaîné (1972, septembre 13). Lettres ou pas lettres. Apprendre à dépenser. ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

Lee, M. (2007). Opening up the ideologies in "Learning: The treasure within." *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 4*(2), 17-36.

Lee, J. E. (2010). Implementation of lifelong learning policies in South Korea: A world society perspective. *Proceedings of the Adult Education Research Conference (AERC).* Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/2010/proceedings/lee.pdf

Lee, M., & Friedrich, T. (2011). Continuously reaffirmed, subtly accommodated, obviously missing and fallaciously critiqued: Ideologies in UNESCO's lifelong learning policy. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 30*(2), 151-169.

Le Monde (1970, January 1). M. René Maheu: les grandes crises de l'éducation ont toujours coincide avec des mutations profondes de la société et de la civilization. Archives *Le Monde.*

Lengrand, P. (1953). Adult education in France. In F. W. Jessup (Ed.). (1953). *Adult education towards social and political responsibility. International conference held from the 8th to the 13th September, 1952* (pp. 21-33). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Lengrand, P. (1970). *An introduction to lifelong education.* Paris: UNESCO.

Lengrand, P. (1975/1994). L'homme de la réponse et l'homme de la question. *International Review of Education, 40*(3-5) (Special issue on lifelong education), 339-342.

Lengrand, P. (1986). *Areas of learning basic to lifelong education*. Pergamon Press and UNESCO Institute for Education.

Lengrand, P. (1994). Le métier de vivre. *Collection Histoires de vie, Série Histoire de vie d'acteurs.* Paris: Peuple et Culture – Éducation permanente.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1953). Race and history. In UNESCO (1961). The race question in modern science. A collection of pamphlets published by UNESCO, 1951-1953. Paris: UNESCO.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1955/1976). *Tristes Tropiques*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Limage, L. J. (1999). Literacy practices and literacy policies: Where has UNESCO been and where might it be going? *International Journal of Educational Development, 19,* 75-89.

Limage, L. J. (2007) Organizational challenges to international cooperation for literacy in UNESCO. *Comparative Education, 43*(3) (Special issue on "Global Governance, Social Policy and Multilateral Education"), 451-468.

Limage, L. J. (2009). Multilateral cooperation for literacy promotion under stress: Governance and management issues. *Literacy & Numeracy Studies, 17*(2), 5-33.

Lopes. H. (2003). *Ma grand-mère bantoue et mes ancêtres les Gaulois. Simples discours.* Paris: Éditions Gallimard. Continents noirs.

Lowe, J. (1975). *The education of adults: A world perspective*. Toronto: OISE and Paris: UNESCO.

Maheu, R. (1972). Serving the mind as a force in history. In UNESCO. *In the minds of men. UNESCO 1946 to 1971* (pp. 281-319). Paris: UNESCO.

Maheu, R. (1974). Crisis or change of international aid? *Prospects, IV*(2), 191-197.

Manley, M. (1993, February 28). Notes for Paris conference on education. ED/EDC/1. UNESCO Archives.

Manley, M. (1996). Education, empowerment and social healing. In Delors et al. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within* (pp. 221-224). Paris: UNESCO.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. New York: The Free Press.

Marek, Y. (2010). Edgar Faure. L'optimiste. *La documentation française*. Paris: Assemblée nationale.

Marginson, S. (1997). *Markets in education*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Maritain, J. (1943). *Education at the crossroads.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Mason, P. (2015, July 17). The end of capitalism has begun. *The Guardian*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun?CMP=share_btn_fb

Matheson, D., & Matheson, C. (1996). Lifelong learning and lifelong education: A critique. *Research in Post-compulsory Education, 1*(2), 219-236.

Mathy, J.-P. (1995). The resistance to French theory in the United States: A cross-cultural inquiry. *French Historical Studies, 19*(2), 331-347.

Mazower, M. (2004). The strange triumph of human rights, 1933-1950. *The Historical Journal, 47*(2). 379-398.

Mazower, M. (2008). *No enchanted palace. The end of Empire and the ideological origins of the United Nations*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Mazower, M. (2011). The end of civilization and the rise of human rights. The mid-twentieth-century disjuncture. In Hoffmann, S.-L. (Ed.). *Human rights in the twentieth century* (pp. 29-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazower, M. (2012). *Governing the world: The history of an idea.* New York: The Penguin Press.

M'Bow, A.-M. (1977). *The spirit of Nairobi. UNESCO and the solidarity of nations.* Paris: UNESCO.

McGhee, P. (1959). *The learning society*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

McGinn, N. F. (1998). Review of Learning: The Treasure within: Report to Unesco of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century by Jacques Delors. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(2), 230-233.

McKeon, R. (1948). A philosophy for UNESCO. *Philosophy and phenomenological research, 8*(4), 573-586.

McMurtry, J. (1991). Education and the market model. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 25*(2), 209-217.

Melanson, R. A. (1979). Human rights and the American withdrawal from the ILO. *Universal Human Rights, 1*(1), 43-61.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.

Mikecz, R. (2012). Interviewing elites: Addressing methodological issues. *Qualitative Inquiry, 18*(6), 482-493.

Ministry of Education Finland (1973, August). Observations on "Learning to be". ADG/EG/13.2. UNESCO Archives.

Mitoma, G. (2015). The acorn and the oak: The right to education and education for human rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Paper presented at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the History of Education Society. St. Louis, Missouri, November 5-8, 2015.

Mojab, S. (2006). Adult education without borders. In T. Fenwick, T. Nesbit, & B. Spencer (Eds.). *Contexts of adult education. Canadian perspectives* (pp. 347-357*)*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Montessori, M. (1951). Speech at the governing board of the UNESCO Institute for Education. In M. Elfert (Ed.) (2002). *Towards an open learning world* (pp. 32-34). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Moore, C. (2011, December 2). Jacques Delors interview: Euro would still be strong if it had been built to my plan. *The Telegraph*. Available at http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/financialcrisis/8932640/Jacques-Delors-interview-Euro-would-still-be-strong-if-it-had-been-built-to-my-plan.html

Morel, C. (2010). *Histoire de l'UNESCO. Les trente premières années. 1945-1974*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Morel, C. (2013). Internationalization and decentring of UNESCO: Representation and influence of "Non-Western" countries, 1945-1987. In K. Dykmann, & K. Naumann (Eds.). Changes from the "margins". Non-European actors, ideas, and strategies in international organizations. *Comparativ. Zeitschrift fuer Globalgeschichte und Vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung, 23*(4/5). Leipzig: Leipziger Universitaetsverlag.

Morsink, J. (2000). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Origins, drafting, and intent.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moyn. S. (2010). *The last utopia: Human rights in history.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Moyn, S. (2013). *The political origins of global justice*. Lecture at the Center for the Humanities, Wesleyan University. 16 September, 2013. Available at https://itunes.apple.com/us/institution/wesleyan-university/id427785946 (last viewed December 14, 2015).

Mufti, I. (1995, January 30). Fax In'am Mufti to Jacques Delors. ED/EDC/5, UNESCO Archives.

Mundy, K. (1999). Educational multilateralism in a changing world order: Unesco and the limits of the possible. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19,* 27-52.

Mundy, K. (2006). Education for all and the new development compact. *International Review of Education, 52*(1-2), 23–48.

Mundy, K. (2007). The political dimensions of international cooperation in education: Mechanisms of global governance to promote *Education for All*. In D. Baker, &

A. W. Wiseman (Eds.). Education for All: Global promises, national challenges. *International Perspectives on Education and Society, 8*, 1-30.

Myrdal, G. (1968). *Asian drama. An inquiry in to the poverty of nations*. Volumes I-III. New York: Pantheon.

Myrdal, G. (1972). *Asian drama. An inquiry in to the poverty of nations*. New York: Vintage Books.

Nanzaho [sic], Z. (1996, January 28). Fax to Mme Alexandra Draxler, Secretary, the Delors' Commission. From Zhou Nanzaho [sic]. ED/EDC/7. UNESCO Archives.

Nesbit, T., & Welton, M. (2013). (Eds.) Adult education and learning in a precarious age: The Hamburg Declaration revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Niebuhr, R. (1950). The theory and practice of UNESCO. *International Organization, 4*(1), 3-11.

Nielsen, B. (2011). UNESCO and the 'right' kind of culture: Bureaucratic production and articulation. *Critique of Anthropology, 31*(4), 273-292.

Niemi, J. A. (1974). *The meaning of lifelong learning*. Burnaby, B.C.: Association for Continuing Education.

Nordic Council of Ministers (1997). *Lifelong learning – From idea to reality.* Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.

Normand, R., & Zaidi, S. (2008). *Human rights at the UN. The political history of universal justice.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Novrup, J. (1953). Opening address. In F. W. Jessup (Ed.). (1953). Adult education towards social and political responsibility. International conference held from the 8th to the 13th September, 1952. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Nussbaum, M. (1992). Human functioning and social justice. In defense of Aristotelian essentialism. *Political Theory, 20*(2), 202-246.

OECD. (1961). *Ability and educational opportunity*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (1972a, March 6). Letter Edwin M. Martin, OECD to Daniel (sic) Deléon, UNESCO. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

OECD (1972b, March 16). Letter Edwin M. Martin, OECD to Daniel (sic) Deléon, UNESCO. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

OECD (1973). *Recurrent education: A strategy for lifelong learning*. Paris: OECD/CERI.

OECD (1989). *Education and the economy in a changing society*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

OECD (2013) *Skilled for Life? Key findings for the survey of adult skills*. OECD Publishing.

Ohliger, J. (1974). Is lifelong adult education a guarantee of permanent inadequacy? *Convergence, VII*(2), 47-60.

Ouane, A. (2014). Vers un nouvel humanisme : la perspective africaine. *International Review of Education, 60*(3), 379-389.

Overbeek, H., & Van der Pijl (1993). Restructuring capital and restructuring hegemony: Neo-liberalism and the unmaking of the post-war order. In Overbeek, H. (Ed.). *Restructuring hegemony in the global political economy: The rise of transnational neo-liberalism in the 1980s* (pp. 1-28). London and New York: Routledge.

Overbeek, H. (2003). Globalization, neo-liberalism and the employment question. In *The political economy of European employment. European integration and the*

transnationalization of the (un)employment question. (pp. 13-28). London and New York: Routledge.

Overbeek, H. (2010). Global governance: From radical transformation to neoliberal management. *International Studies Review, 12*, 679-702.

Oxfam (2014).Working for the few. Political capture and economic inequality. *178 Oxfam Briefing Paper*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/unga14/oxfam.pdf

Palonen, K. (2000). Logic or rhetoric in the history of political thought? Comments on Mark Bevir. *Rethinking History, 4*(3), 301-310.

Palonen, K. (2002). The history of concepts as a style of political theorizing. Quentin Skinner's and Reinhard Koselleck's subversion of normative political theory. *European Journal of Political Theory, 1*(1), 91-106.

Pavone, V. (2007). From intergovernmental to global: UNESCO's response to globalization. *The Review of International Organizations*, *2*(1), 77-95.

Pavone, V. (2008). *From the labyrinth of the world to the paradise of the heart. Science and humanism in UNESCO's approach to globalization*. Lexington Books.

Peuple et Culture (1945). *Un people, une culture. Manifeste de Peuple et Culture*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.peuple-et-culture.org/IMG/pdf/manifeste_peuple_et_culture.pdf

Piaget, J. (1950). Le droit à l'éducation dans le monde actuel. In UNESCO. *Les droits de l'esprit. Six études sur les aspects culturels de la déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme, réunies par l'Unesco*. Liège: Éditions Séances et Lettres, S. A. and Paris: Librairie des Receuils Sirey, S. A.

Piaget, J. (1999). Jan Amos Comenius. *Prospects, XXIII*, 1-2 173-196.

Pollack, E. (1993). Isaac Leon Kandel (1881-1965). *Prospects, 23*(3/4), 775-187.

Powell, J. (2006). *Jacques Derrida: A Biography*. London and New York: Continuum.

Power, C. (2015). *The power of education. Education for All, development, globalisation and UNESCO*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Preston, W., Herman, E. S., & Schiller, H. I. (1989). *Hope and folly: The United States and UNESCO 1945-1985*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1981). Returns to education: An updated international comparison. *Comparative Education, 17*(3), 321-341.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1985). Returns to education: A further international update and implications. *The Journal of Human Resources, 20*(4), 583-604.

Rahnema, M. (1987). Learning to be. An interview with Roger Boshier. Vancouver: UBC Access Television.

Rahnema, M., & Bawtree V. (Eds.). (1997). *The post-development reader*. London & New York: Zed Books.

Rancière, J. (1974/2011). *Althusser's lesson*. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing.

Rauch, S. P. (1995). *The quest for universal literacy: Who got what from international literacy year, why and how*. Doctoral dissertation. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Reimer, E. (1971). *School is dead: Alternatives in education*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.

Renoliet, J.-J. (1999). *L'UNESCO oubliée. La Société des Nations et la coopération intellectuelle (1919-1946)*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.

Reus-Smit, C. (2008). Reading history through constructivist eyes. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies, 37*, 395-414. doi:10.1177/0305829808097647

Richmond, W. K. (1974). Foreword. In T. Husén. *The learning society* (pp. vii-xiii). London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Richter, M. (2012). Introduction: Translation, the history of concepts and the history of political thought. In M. J. Burke, & M. Richter (Eds.). Why concepts matter. Translating social and political thought. *Studies in the History of Political Thought, 6.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Koniklijke Brill.

Rosanvallon, P. (1994, December 2015). Jacques Delors, les infortunes de la virtue. Libération. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.liberation.fr/tribune/1994/12/15/jacques-delors-les-infortunes-de-la-vertu_117374

Rose, P. (2003). From the Washington to the Post-Washington consensus: The influence of international agendas on education policy and practice in Malawi. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 1*(1), 67-86.

Rosenau, J. N., & Czempiel, E. O. (Eds.). (1992). *Governance without government: Order and change in world politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, G. (1995). *Jacques Delors and European integration*. Cambridge: Polity.

Rovan, J. (1999). *Mémoires d'un Français qui se souvient d'avoir été Allemand*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Rowley, H. (2006). *Tête-à-tête: The lives and loves of Simone de Beauvoir and Jean-Paul Sartre.* London: Vintage.

Rubenson, K. (1994). Recurrent education policy in Sweden: A moving target. *International Review of Education, 40*(3/5), 245-256.

Rubenson, K. (2006). Constructing the lifelong learning paradigm: Competing visions from the OECD and UNESCO. In S. Ellers (Ed.) *Milestones in Adult Education* (pp. 63-78). Copenhagen: Danish University Press.

Rubenson, K. (2008). OECD education policies and world hegemony. In R. Mahon, & S. McBride (Eds.). *The OECD and transnational governance* (pp. 241-259). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rubenson, K. (2009). Lifelong learning. Between humanism and global capitalism. In P. Jarvis (Ed.). *International Handbook on Lifelong Learning* (pp. 411-422). London & New York: Routledge.

Rubenson, K. (2015). Framing the adult learning and education policy discourse: The role of the OECD. In M. Milana, & T. Nesbit (Eds.). *Adult education and learning policy: A worldwide review*. London: Palgrave macmillan.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing. The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles and London: Sage.

Rüsen, J. (2004). Historical consciousness: Narrative structure, moral function, and ontogenetic development. In P. Seixas (Ed.). *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 63-86). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ruggie, J. G. (1982). International regimes, transactions, and change: Embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order. *International Organization, 36*(2), 379-415.

Ryan, R. J. (1999) *From recurrent education to lifelong learning. International seminar on the Delors report: Learning − The treasure within*. Institute of International Education. Elinders University, Adelaide.

Sachs, J. D., & Schmidt-Traub, G. (2015, June 18). *Financing sustainable development: Implementing the SDGs through effective investment strategies and partnerships*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/150619-SDSN-Financing-Sustainable-Development-Paper-FINAL-02.pdf

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Samoff, J. (1996). Which priorities and strategies for education. *International Journal of Educational Development, 16*(3), 249-271.

Sartre, J.-P. (1946). *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris: Nagel.

Sartre, J.-P. (1984). *War diaries: Notebooks from a phoney war. 1939-1940*. London: Verso.

Sathyamurthy, T. V. (1964). *The politics of international cooperation. Contrasting conceptions of UNESCO.* Geneva, Switzerland: Librairie Droz.

Schuller, T., & Megarry, J. (Eds.). Recurrent education and lifelong learning. *World Yearbook of Education 1979* (pp. 45-57). London: Kogan Page, and New York: Nichols Publishing.

Schultz, T. W. (1963). *The economic value of education.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Schultz, T. W. (1970). The reckoning of education as human capital. In W. L. Hansen (Ed.). *Education, income, and human capital* (pp. 297-306). New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Schwartz, B. (1968). Réflexions sur le développement de l'éducation permanente. *Revue française de pédagogie, 4,* 32-44.

Schwartz, B. (1974). Permanent education. *Project 1: Education man for the 21st century* (vol. 8). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff and the European Cultural Foundation.

Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations. Ideas and interests* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Seixas, P. (2005). Historical consciousness: The progress of knowledge in a postprogressive age. In J. Rüsen, A. Confino, & A. D. Megill (Series Eds.). Making sense of history. Studies in metahistory, historiography, historical culture, and intercultural communication, vol. 3: J. Straub (Ed.). *Narration, identity and historical consciousness* (pp. 141-163). New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Selcer, P. (2009). The view from everywhere. Disciplining diversity in post-world war II international social science. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 45*(4), 309-329.

Selcer, P. (2011). *Patterns of Science: Developing Knowledge for a World Community at Unesco*. Publicly accessible Penn Dissertations. Paper 323. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/323

Sewell, J. P. (1975). *UNESCO and world politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Singh, J. P. (2011). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Creating norms for a complex world. *Global Institutions Series* (Series Eds. T. G. Weiss, & Rorden Wilkinson). Abingdon: Routledge.

Singh, K. (n.d.a). Comments by Dr. Karan Singh, member, UNESCO Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. ED/EDC/6. UNESCO Archives.

Singh, K. (n.d.b). "To come at the end of chapter 5: p. 11. K. Singh drafted at New Delhi meeting." ED/EDC/6. UNESCO Archives.

Singh, K. (1994, November 4). Letter to H. E. M. Jacques Delors. ED/EDC/6. UNESCO Archives.

Singh, S. N. (1988). *The rise and fall of UNESCO*. Ahmedabad, India: Allied Publishers.

Skinner, Q. (1969). Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas. *History and Theory, 8*(9), 3-53.

Skinner, Q. (1978). *The foundations of modern political thought (Vol. 1: The Renaissance)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skinner, Q. (2002). *Visions of politics. (Vol. 1: Regarding method)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skovmand, R. (1962). Johannes Novrup and Danish adult education. *International Review of Education, 8*(2), 131-139.

Sluga, G. (2007). Introduction: D'une société des esprits à la création de l'UNESCO. *60 ans d'histoire de l'UNESCO* (pp. 57-59). Paris: UNESCO.

Sluga, G. (2010). UNESCO and the (one) world of Julian Huxley. *Journal of World History, 21*(3), 393-418.

Spring, J. (2000). *The universal right to education. Justification, definition, and guidelines.* Mahwah, N. J., and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sternhell, Z. (1996). Modernity and its enemies: From the revolt against enlightenment to the undermining of democracy. In Z. Sternhell (Ed.). *The intellectual revolt against liberal democracy, 1970-1945.* International Conference in Memory of Jacob L. Talmon. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Sternhell, Z. (2010). *The anti-enlightenment tradition.* USA: Yale University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents.* New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *The roaring nineties. A new history of the world's most prosperous decade.* New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stoczkowski, W. (2008). Claude Lévi-Strauss and UNESCO. *UNESCO Courier, 5*, 5-10.

Stoczkowski, W. (2009). UNESCO's doctrine of human diversity. A secular soteriology? *Anthropology Today, 25*(3), 7-11.

Stoikov, V. (1975). *The economics of recurrent education and training.* Geneva: International Labour Office.

Suchodolski, B. (1965). Renaissance humanism and Marxian humanism. In E. Fromm (Ed.). Socialist humanism. An international symposium (pp. 28-38). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Suchodolski, B. (1976). Lifelong education – some philosophical aspects. In R. H. Dave, (Ed.). (1976). *Foundations of lifelong education* (pp. 57-96). Hamburg/Oxford: UNESCO Institute for Education/Pergamon Press.

Suchodolski, B. (1979). Lifelong education at the crossroads. In A. Cropley (Ed.). *Lifelong education: A stocktaking* (pp. 36-49). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for

Education.

Swedish National Commission for UNESCO (1973, September 27). Swedish comments on the Faure report "Learning to be". Letter Jens Cavallin to René Maheu. ADG/EG/13.2. UNESCO Archives.

Swyngedouw, E. (2008). Where is the political? Article based on Antipode Lecture, IBG/RGS annual conference 2007, London, 29 August – 1 September and on James Blaut Memorial Lecture, Annual Conference of the AAG,Boston, 16-21 April 2008. Retrieved from the website of the University of Manchester. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Erik_Swyngedouw/publication/228910953_ Where_is_the_Political/links/02e7e53b17da8509fb000000.pdf

Swyngedouw, E. (2011). Interrogating post-democratization: Reclaiming egalitarian political spaces. *Political Geography, 30*, 370-380.

Swyngedouw, E. (2014). Where is the political? Insurgent mobilisations and the incipient "return of the political". *Space and Polity, 18*(2), 122-136.

Task Force on Education for the Twenty-first century (1997, September 12). Learning: The treasure within. Brief overview of debate about the report. ED/EDC/16. Paris: UNESCO Archives

Tawil, S. (2013). Education for 'Global Citizenship': A framework for discussion. *Education Research and Foresight Working Papers.* Paris: UNESCO.

Tawil, S., & Cougoureux, M. (2013, January 4). Revisiting *Learning: The Treasure within*. Assessing the influence of the 1996 Delors report. UNESCO Education Research and Foresight. *Occasional papers*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002200/220050E.pdf

Thatcher, M. (1988, September 20). Speech to the College of Europe ("The Bruges Speech"). Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332.

Thatcher, M. (1993). *The Downing Street years*. London: HarperCollins.

The Arab States (2000). Education for All in the Arab States: Renewing the commitment. The Arab framework for action to ensure basic learning needs in the Arab States in the years 2000-2010. Adopted by the Regional Conference on Education for All for the Arab States. Cairo, Egypt, 24-27 January, 2000.

The New York Times (1987, May 18). Gunnar Myrdal, analyst of race crisis, dies. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.nytimes.com/1987/05/18/obituaries/gunnar-myrdal-analyst-of-race-crisis-dies.html

Thomas, A. (1963). The learning society. In J. R. Kidd (Ed.). *Learning and society.* Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education.

Thomas, M. (2007). France's North African crisis, 1945-1955: Cold War and colonial imperatives. *History, 92*(306), 207-234.

Tinbergen, J., Dolman, A. J., & Van Ettinger, J. (1976): *Reshaping the international order. A report to the Club of Rome.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

Toffler, A. (1970). *Future shock.* New York: Random House.

Tomasevski, K. (2003). *Education denied. Costs and remedies*. London & New York: Zed Books.

Tomasevski, K. (2005). Has the right to education a future within the United Nations? A behind-the-scenes account by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education 1998-2004. *Human Rights Law Review, 5*(2), 205-237.

Torres, C. A. (2013). Political sociology of adult education. *International issues in adult education (vol. 12)*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: SensePublishers.

Torres, C. A. (2015a). *Fifth message from Dr. Carlos Alberto Torres, President WCCES: Vive la liberté!* World Council of Comparative Education Societies. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://wcces.com/Presidential%20addresses/PresidentWCCES-Message5.pdf

Torres, C. A. (2015b). *Neoliberalism, globalization agendas and banking educational policy: Is popular education an answer?* Lecture held on May 12, 2015 at the University of British Columbia. Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zzuGO-trvu0 (last viewed December 14, 2015).

Torres, R. M. (2001). What happened at the World Education Forum? *Adult Education and Development, 56.*

Torres, R. M. (2002). Lifelong learning in the north, Education for All in the south. In: Medel-Anoñuevo, C. (Ed.). *Integrating Lifelong Learning Perspectives* (pp. 3-12). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Torres, R. M. (2011). Lifelong learning: Moving beyond Education for All (EFA). In Yang, J. & Valdés-Cotera, R. (Eds.). *Conceptual evolution and policy developments in lifelong learning* (pp. 40–50). Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Toye, J., & Toye, R. (2010). One world, two cultures? Alfred Zimmern, Julian Huxley and the ideological origins of UNESCO. *History, 95*(319), 308-319.

Tröhler, D. (2010). Harmonizing the educational globe. World polity, cultural features, and the challenges to educational research. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 29*(1), 5-17.

Troger, V. (1999). De l'éducation populaire à la formation professionnelle, l'action de « peuple et culture ». *Sociétés Contemporaines, 35*, 19-42.

Tuijnman, A., & Boström, A.-K. (2002). Changing notions of lifelong education and lifelong learning. *International Review of Education 48*(1/2), 93–110.

Tuijnman, A. (1991). Emerging systems of recurrent education. *Prospects, XXI*(1), 17-24.

Tuschling, A., & Engemann, C. (2006). From education to lifelong learning: The emerging regime of learning in the European Union. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(4), 451-469.

UNESCO (n.d.a). *Logo toolkit. Specifications for secondary logos*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/28318/12361778799public_specifications.pdf/public%2Bspecifications.pdf

UNESCO (n.d.b). *Second World Conference on Adult Education.* Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0006/000645/064542eo.pdf

UNESCO (n.d.c). Position paper on International Commission on Education for the XXIst century. ED/EDC/8. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1946, November 25). In *General Conference. 1ˢᵗ session. Paris, 1946. Programme Commission I. Documents. UNESCO/C/Prog.Com./Plen/3*. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1947a). *Communication with regard to the Draft World Declaration of the Rights of Man.* From His Excellency Monsieur Jacques Maritain, French Ambassador at the Holy Sea. Paris, 18 June 1947. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001243/124341eb.pdf

UNESCO (1947b, January 20ᵗʰ). Memorandum. De Dr. Kuo à Mr. J. Havet. Droits de l'Homme. *File 342.7 (100): 1A02*. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1947c). Fundamental education. Common ground for all peoples. Report of a Special Committee to the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. New York: The MacMillan Company.

UNESCO (1948a). Dr. Huxley on "The advance of world civilization". *UNESCO Courier, I*(10), pp. 1; 6.

UNESCO (1948b). M. Maritain calls for unity. *UNESCO Courier, I*(1), p. 1. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0007/000736/073649eo.pdf#73649

UNESCO (1948c). Pragmatic viewpoint on human rights. Professor Maritain says conflicting ideologies no obstacle. *UNESCO Courier, I*(8), pp. 3; 6.

UNESCO (1948d). *Human rights. Comments and interpretations*. A symposium edited by UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001550/155042eb.pdf

UNESCO (1948e). *Records of the General Conference*. Third session. Beirut, 1948. Proceedings. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1949a, December). *Records of the General Conference*. Fourth session. Paris, 1949. Proceedings. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1949b). *UNESCO Courier, II*(6) (July).

UNESCO (1949c). Summary report of the International Conference on Adult Education. Elsinore, Denmark 19-25 June 1949. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0007/000712/071263eo.pdf

UNESCO (1949d). Fundamental education. Description and programme. *Monographs on Fundamental Education, I.* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1949e, February). *Records of the General Conference*. Third Session, Beirut. Volume II: Resolutions. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001145/114593e.pdf

UNESCO (1950a). Fallacies of racism exposed. UNESCO publishes declaration by world scientist. *UNESCO Courier, III*(6-7). July-August, 1950, pp. 1; 8-9).

UNESCO (1950b). Records of the General Conference of the United Nations Cultural, Educational and Scientific Organization. Fifth session. Florence, 1950. Resolutions. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001145/114589e.pdf

UNESCO (1951a, April 30). Preliminary Draft Charter proposed by the Norwegian Commission for UNESCO as a basis for discussion. Document 6C/PRG/17, Annex I. File 351. 85A 102. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1951b). Fundamental education. 1,000 million illiterates. Half the world is in

darkness. *UNESCO Courier, IV*(6), 6.

UNESCO (1951c). *Democracy in a world of tensions*. A symposium prepared by UNESCO. Edited by Richard McKeon, with the assistance of Stein Rokkan. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1956). Conference of fundamental education experts. Unesco House, Paris. 18-29 June, 1956. Working Paper 2. Description of fundamental education. UNESCO/FE/TA/Conf. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001451/145197eb.pdf

UNESCO (1961). The race question in modern science. A collection of pamphlets published by UNESCO, 1951-1953. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1962). Economics of education. *International Social Science Journal, XIV*(4). Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1966a, February 23). International Committee for the advancement of adult education: Report of the third session. 9-17 December, 1965. UNESCO/ED/219. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001263/126387eo.pdf

UNESCO (1966b). *Kierkegaard vivant. Colloque organize par l'UNESCO à Paris du 21 au 23 avril 1964.* Paris: UNESCO & Gallimard: Collection idées.

UNESCO (1970a). 84th session of the Executive Board. Executive Board. 1969-1970. Comptes rendus. Vol. VIII, 82-86 sessions. 84/EX/SR. 1-33 (SR.10). UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1970b, 10 avril). Memo EDV/31/70/043. Au directeur-général du Sous-directeur général pour l'éducation. Objet: Commission internationale d'experts sur les strategies du développement de l'éducation dans le monde. ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1971a). Quatrième session de la Commission internationale sur le développement de l'éducation. Comptre rendu des séances des jeudi 7 octobre (après-midi) et vendredi 8 octobre (matin) 1971. Débât avec les jeunes. ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1971b). Allocution de M. René Maheu. Directeur général de l'Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'education, la science et la culture (Unesco). Paris, le 15 mars 1971. DG/71/2. ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1972a, 25 septembre). Présentation par M. Edgar Faure du Rapport de la Commission international sur le développement de l'éducation. 90th session of the Executive Board. 90 EX/SR. 1-19. Paris, 19 janvier 1973. Annexe (pp. 15-19).

UNESCO (1972b, July 4). Rapport de la commission international sur le développement de l'éducation. CDE/264. ADG/EG/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1972c, July 13). Comments by the office of Pre-programming on the report of the International Commission on the Development of Education "Learning to be". PPR/72/12. ADG/ED/13.1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1972d, December 21). Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Executive Board at its 90th session (Paris, 25 September - 21 November 1972). 90 EX/Decisions. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000022/002233e.pdf

UNESCO (1973a, 19 janvier). Summary records. 90th session of the Executive Board. 25 September – 20 November, 1972. 90 EX/SR.1-19. Paris: UNESCO Archives.

(UNESCO (1973b, 11 May). Follow-up of the Report of the International Commission for the Development of Education. Memo. EP.D./2329. UNESCO Archives (Rue Miollis).

UNESCO (1975). *Education on the move. Extracts from background papers prepared for the report of the International Commission on the Development of Education.* Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education & Paris: UNESCO Press.

UNESCO (1976). *Moving towards change: Some thoughts on the New International Economic Order.* Appendix: Report of the panel of counsellors on major world problems and Unesco's contribution to solving them (pp. 101-137). Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1980). *Many voices one world. Communication and society today and tomorrow. Towards a new more just and more efficient world information and communication order.* Report by the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems. London: Kogan Page; New York: Unipub; Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1990). *World Declaration on Education for All and Framework for Action to meet Basic Learning Needs.* Adopted by the World Conference on Education for All. Meeting Basic Learning Needs. Jomtien, Thailand, 5-9 March 1990. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from *www.unesco.org/education/pdf/JOMTIE_E.PDF*

UNESCO (1992a). International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century. C21.1E. 29.10.92. ED/EDC/1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1992b). *Education and the twenty-first century.* Address given by Mr Jacques Delors, Chairman of the International Commission on Education and Learning for the Twenty-First century to the 140th session of the Executive Board. ED/EDC/1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1992c). 140th Session of the Executive Board. 140 EX/14. 26. Paris, 27 July 1992. Implementation of 26 C/Resolution 19.3 (III). Report by the Director-General on the subject of the review of all constitutional and statutory texts. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1993, October). EDC/2. International Commission on Education for the 21st Century. First session. UNESCO Headquarters, 2-4 March 1993. EDC.93/CONF.001/I.7 REV. UNESCO: Paris. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1994a) Approved programme and budget for 1994–1995. 27 C/5 (Paris, UNESCO). Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0009/000956/095663eo.pdf

UNESCO (1994b). International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. Second Session. Dakar, Senegal – 18-21 September 1993. Report. EDC/3 (January 1994). ED/EDC/2. UNESCO: Paris. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1995). International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. Sixth Session. UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, France – 6-10 February 1995. Report. EDC/3 (January 1994). ED/EDC/2. UNESCO: Paris. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1996). International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. Eighth Session. New Delhi, 15-17 January 1996. Interactions of education and culture for economic and human development: An Asian perspective. Zhou Nanzhou. EDC/3 (January 1994). EDC-96/CONF.008/INF.2, 8 January 1996.

ED/EDC/4. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO (1997). *50 years for education*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001102/110264eb.pdf

UNESCO (1998). Education for the twenty-first century: Issues and prospects. Contributions to the work of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, chaired by Jacques Delors. *Education on the Move*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO (2000). *World education report 2000. The right to education: Towards education for all throughout life*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO (2000b). *World Education Forum. Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000. Final report.* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2004). Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. In *Basic texts. 2004 edition* (pp. 7-23). Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2007, August 3). United Nations Literacy Decade (2003-2012): Progress Report 2006-2007. Executive Board. 177 EX/8. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001520/152008e.pdf

UNESCO (2009, 3 novembre). Allocution prononcée par Mme Irina Bokova à l'occasion de son installation dans les fonctions de Directrice Générale de l'Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture. *35 C/INF. 43*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001855/185556f.pdf

UNESCO (2011a). *36 C/5 Draft Resolutions 2012-2013*. Volume I.

UNESCO (2011b). *UNESCO Courier, 64*(4) (October-December).

UNESCO (2012). *UNESCO's response to DFID*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/BPI/EPA/images/media_services/Director-General/DFID-MAR-EN.pdf

UNESCO (2013). *37 C/4. 2014-2021. Draft medium-term strategy*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2014a, July). *Engage with UNESCO. Leave your mark. UNESCO and the private sector.* Paris: UNESCO. Division of Cooperation with Extrabudgetary Funding Sources.

UNESCO (2014b, February 28). Education beyond 2015. Hundred and ninety-forth session of the Executive Board. 194 EX/6. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002266/226628e.pdf

UNESCO (2014c). Position paper on education post-2015. ED-14/EFA/POST-2015/1. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002273/227336e.pdf

UNESCO (2015a). *Rethinking education: Towards a global common good?* Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002325/232555e.pdf

UNESCO (2015b). Job advertisement. Senior project officer (in education). Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf/VN_PA-P4-ERF.pdf

UNESCO Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (1995, December 3). Comments by Fay Chung: Education in Africa today. ED/EDC/5. UNESCO

Archives.

UNESCO International Bureau of Education (1995). International Conference on Education. 44th session. Geneva, 3-8 October, 1994. ED/MD/99. Paris, May 1995. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/34_69.pdf

UNESCO Institute for Education (1951). Erste Tagung des Kuratoriums. Bericht ueber die erste Sitzung in Wiesbaden am 17. Juni 1951 um 9.30 Uhr. Hamburg: UIL Archives.

UNESCO Institute for Education (1953). A report on the establishment and development of the Institute, June 1951–June 1953. Nr. GB/15. Hamburg: Archives of the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

UNESCO Institute for Education (1962). *Evolution of the forms and needs of leisure.* A selection of reports contributed by the International Study Group on the Social Sciences of Leisure International Study Group on the Social Sciences of Leisure, during the first stage of an international comparative study, concluded at Portoroz, Yugoslavia, June 1960. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001628/162819eo.pdf

UNESCO Institute for Education (1997). *The Hamburg declaration on adult learning and The agenda for the future.* Fifth International Conference on Adult Education, 14–18 July 1997. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from www.unesco.org/education/uie/confintea/pdf/con5eng.pdf

UNESCOPRESS (1993). Whither education? First session of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. No. 93-21. ED/EDC/1. UNESCO Archives.

UNESCO-UIS & Brookings Institution (2013, September). *Toward universal learning. Recommendations from the learning metrics task force.* Summary report.

United Nations (n.d.). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/

United Nations General Assembly (2014, September 24). Right to education. Note by the Secretary-General. Sixty-ninth session. Agenda item 68 (b). Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.right-to-education.org/sites/right-to-education.org/files/resource-attachments/UNSR_Report_to_UNGA_Privatisation_2014.pdf

United Nations Treaty Collection (2015). Status as at 9 May, 2015. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-3&chapter=4&lang=en

Van Apeldoorn, B. (2000). Transnational class agency and European governance: The case of the European Roundtable of Industrialists. *New Political Economy, 5*(2), 157-181.

Van der Pijl, K. (1993). The sovereignty of capital impaired. Social forces and codes of conduct for multinational corporations. In H. Overbeek (Ed.). *Restructuring hegemony in the global political economy: The rise of transnational neo-liberalism in the 1980s* (pp. 28-57). London and New York: Routledge.

Vasak, K. (1977). A 30-year struggle, the sustained efforts to give force of law to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *UNESCO Courier, 1977 (November)*, 29-32.

Vernon, J. (2012). Hegel, Edward Sanders, and emancipatory history. *Clio, 41*(2), 27-52.

Vinokur, A. (1976). Economic analysis of lifelong education. In R. Dave (Ed.). *Foundations of lifelong education*. Pergamon Press & UNESCO Institute for Education.

Wagner, D. (2011). What happened to literacy? Historical and conceptual perspectives on literacy in UNESCO. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*, 319-323.

Wain, K. (1987). *Philosophy of lifelong education*. London: Croom Helm.

Wain, K. (1993). Lifelong education and adult education – the state of the theory. *International Journal of Lifelong Education 12*(2), 85-99.

Wain, K. (2004). *The learning society in a postmodern world: The education crisis.* New York: Peter Lang.

Walker, J. (2020045). BC's blueprint for extraction education. *Proceedings of the 34th CASAE Annual Conference*, June 9-11, 2015, Montréal

Wang, J. (2006). The United States, the United Nations, and the other post-cold war world order: Internationalism and unilateralism in the American century. In Schrecker, E. (Ed.). *Cold war triumphalism: The misuse of history after the fall of communism.* New York: The New Press.

Wang, N., & Morgan, W. J. (2012). The harmonious society, social capital and lifelong learning in China: Emerging policies and practice. *International Journal of Continuing Education & Lifelong Learning, 4*(2), 1-15.

Wanner, R. E. (2015). UNESCO's origins, achievements, problems and promise: An inside/outside perspective from the US. *CERC Monograph Series in Comparative and International Education and Development, 12.* The University of Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Ward, B., & Dubos, R. (1972). *Only one earth. The care and maintenance of a small planet.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Watras, J. (1995). Education at the crossroads. Jacques Maritain. *Educational Studies, 26*(3), 201-209.

Watras, J. (2006). From philosophy of education to philosophizing about education. *Philosophical Studies in Education, 37*, 87-96. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1072481.pdf

Watras, J. (2007). Was fundamental education another form of colonialism? *International Review of Education, 53*(1), 55-72.

Watras, J. (2010). UNESCO's program of fundamental education, 1946–1959. *History of Education, 39*(2), 219–237.

Watson, K. (1999). UNESCO's vision for education in the twenty-first century: Where is the moral high ground? *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*, 7-16.

Weindling, P. J. (2010). *John W. Thompson. Psychiatrist in the Shadow of the Holocaust*. University of Rochester Press.

Weiss, T. G. (2012). Can we fix the United Nations? *WFUNA Acronym, 1*(1), New York: World Federation of United Nations Associations.

Weiss, T. G., Carayannis, T., Emmerij, L. & Jolly, R. (2005). *UN voices. The struggle for development and social justice.* United Nations Intellectual History Project. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wheatland, T. (2009). *The Frankfurt School in exile*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Williams, D. (2015, May 22). Clarifying the obsure: Facing the "measurement" challenge of the Education Post-2015 targets. *NORRAG NewsBite.* Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from https://norrag.wordpress.com/2015/05/22/clarifying-the-obscure-facing-the-measurement-challenge-of-the-education-post-2015-targets/

Williamson, J. (2004). A short story of the Washington consensus. Paper commissioned by Fundación CIDOB for a conference "From the Washington Consensus towards a new Global Governance". Barcelona, September 24–25, 2004. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www.iie.com/publications/papers/williamson0904-2.pdf

Wincott, D. (2004). Policy change and discourse in Europe: Can the EU make a 'square meal out of a stew of paradox'? *West European Politics, 27*(2), 354-363.

Winnick, R. H. (1983). *Letters of Archibald MacLeish. 1907 to 1982.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, p. 339.

World Bank (1987, September 15). *Education policies for Sub-saharan Africa: Adjustment, Revitalization, and Expansion.* Report no. 6934. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1987/09/15/000009265_3960926112039/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf

World Bank (1995). *Priorities and strategies for education. A World Bank review.* Washington, D. C.: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (The World Bank).

World Education Forum (2015). Incheon Declaration. Education 2030: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all. UNESCO, World Education Forum 2015 and Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea. Retrieved (December 14, 2015) from https://en.unesco.org/world-education-forum-2015/incheon-declaration

Yin, R. K. (2009). Case study research: Design and methods (4th edition). *Applied social research methods series, vol. 5.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zhang, W. (2008). Conceptions of lifelong learning in Confucian culture: Their impact on adult learners. International *Journal of Lifelong Education, 27*(5), 551-557.

Žižek, S. (2001). The ticklish subject. The absent centre of political ontology. London & New York: Verso.

Žižek, S. (2009). *Žižek on utopia*. Available at https://vimeo.com/7527571 (last viewed December 14, 2015).

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of Interviews

Interviewee	Function of interviewee	Aspect of the study the interviewee spoke to	Date of interview	Location of interview
Sir John Daniel & Stamenka Uvalić – Trumpić	Assistant Director-General for Education, 2001-2004; Chief of UNESCO's Higher Education Section	Institutional culture and tensions between different ideologies	27 May 2014	Vancouver
Roberto Carneiro	Member of the Delors Commission	The work of the Delors Commission; the philosophical underpinnings of lifelong learning	27 June 2014	Lisbon
Klaus Hüfner	Professor Emeritus, Free University Berlin; President of the German UNESCO Commission (1998-2002); since 2000 member of the UNESCO Committee on Conventions and Recommendations (CR); former Board member of the IBE and IIEP (UNESCO education institutes)	Overall expertise on UNESCO and the historical development of education with a focus on economic theories; author of several books about UNESCO, also in relation to education as a human right.	4 July 2014	Berlin
Nicholas Burnett	Assistant Director-General for Education, 2007-2009	UNESCO's institutional culture; as a former World Bank employee he could speak to the ideological tensions	6 July 2014	Dorking, Surrey, UK
Peter Williams	Member of the Secretariat of the Faure Commission	The work and background of the Faure Commission; the history of education as a development agenda	6 July 2014	Dorking, Surrey, UK
Ravindra Dave	Director of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE), 1979-1989	One of the main "pioneers" of lifelong education; the philosophy of lifelong education	14 July 2014	Ellerbek (Hamburg)
Jacques Hallak	Acting Assistant Director-General for Education, January to	The origins of EFA and UNESCO's institutional culture. As a former World Bank employee he could	18 July 2014	Nice

Interviewee	Function of interviewee	Aspect of the study the interviewee spoke to	Date of interview	Location of interview
	December 2000. Former director of IIEP and IBE	speak to the ideological tensions		
Alexandra Draxler	Secretary of the Delors Commission	The background and workings of the Delors Commission	22 July 2014	Paris
Ulrika Peppler Barry	Deputy Executive Secretary for the Education for All Forum (in charge of the World Education Forum (EFA) in Dakar and its follow-up), 2002-2008; Team manager of the Education for All Monitoring report; Head of the Knowledge Management Services (KMS) in the Education Sector, 2008-2012	Institutional culture and EFA, in particular the Dakar conference	25 July 2014	Paris
Henri Lopes	Member of the Faure Commission	The background and workings of the Faure Commission	5 August 2014	Paris
Colin Power	Assistant Director-General for Education, 1989-1999	Institutional culture, the Delors Commission and EFA, in particular the conference in Jomtien	22 September 2014	Skype (Vancouver-Brisbane)
Arthur Cropley	Member of UIE's consultancy team that wrote several books about lifelong education in the 1970s	One of the main scholars of lifelong education; the background of UIE's work on lifelong education	2 October 2014	Skype (Vancouver-Adelaide)
Adama Ouane	Director of the UNESCO Institute for Education 2000-2011	The history and semantics of lifelong learning and the institutional culture of UNESCO	17 October 2014	Skype (Vancouver-Hamburg)

Appendix 2: Sources of Evidence

Source of Evidence	Description	Evidence on Which Aspect/Perspective of the Study	Accessability/Strengths and Weaknesses
Primary literature and audiovisual materials	Minutes and reports of the meetings of the Executive Boards and General Conference; conference declarations and recommendations; videos and audio materials	Socio-political context; status, conceptualization and contesting views of lifelong learning in UNESCO; the perspective of the member states as well as the "official" perspective	A big part of the minutes and reports of the Executive Board and General Conference are easily accessible on the internet. For the early years, I accessed the documents in the UNESCO archives. Strength: Data give an original account of what has been said during the sessions. Weakness: Only the official text is there, not the "subtext," what happened behind the scenes.
Secondary literature	Books and scholarly articles written by UNESCO "insiders" and "outsiders" on specific developments and activities	Socio-political context; institutional structures; the perspective of experts and intellectuals	Strength: The most accessible source, gives a good overview. Weakness: Time-consuming as difficult to find and "limitless." Often contradicting perspectives.
Archival materials	Correspondence, minutes, internal reports	Socio-political context; influence of individuals; institutional structures; the perspective of the relations between the internal and external actors	Strength: Insightful as these materials render much of the "subtext." Weakness: Accessible only in Paris and with the help of UNESCO staff. Limitations: The archives of the Faure Commission were destroyed in the 1986 fire at the UNESCO headquarters, which leaves only very limited material relating to the *Faure report*. The files of the Delors Commission are not openly available at this time (as the publication of the report does not yet date back 20 years), and I had to submit a special request to access the most important ones.

Source of Evidence	Description	Evidence on Which Aspect/Perspective of the Study	Accessability/Strengths and Weaknesses
Interviews	13 open-ended, semi-structured interviews with 14 former UNESCO staff and experts related to UNESCO's work	Socio-political context; influence of individuals; institutional structures; the perspective of insiders now speaking as outsiders	Strength: Very insightful with regard to all three main aspects of my study (context; change; institutional aspects). Weakness: Volatile –two interviews did not happen because of the age of interviewees (one passed away in the meantime). Personal bias needs to be balanced.

Appendix 3: Publications on Lifelong Education Published by the UNESCO Institute for Education, 1970 to 1980[75]

Publication date	Author(s)/Editor(s)	Title
1973	R. H. Dave	Lifelong Education and School Curriculum. *UIE Monographs 1*.
1974	R. H. Dave, & P. Lengrand	Lifelong education and learning strategies. Special issue of the *International Review of Education*.
1973	R. H. Dave, & N. Stiemerling	Lifelong education and the school: Abstracts and bibliography. *UIE Monographs 2*.
1974	J. Knoll	Lebenslanges Lernen.
1975	H. W. R. Haves	Lifelong education, schools and curricula in developing countries. Report of an international seminar. Hamburg, 9.-13. December 1974. *UIE Monographs 4*.
1975	R. H. Dave	Reflections on Lifelong Education at the School. Hamburg: *UIE Monographs 3*.
1976	R. H. Dave	Foundations of Lifelong Education.
1977	A. J. Cropley	Lifelong education: A psychological analysis . UIE and Oxford: Pergamon.
1977	A. J. Cropley	Lifelong Education: A Psychological Analysis UIE and Oxford: Pergamon.
1977	R. Skager & R. H. Dave	Curriculum Evaluation for Lifelong Education.
1977	J. Lynch	Lifelong education and the preparation of educational personnel. *UIE Monographs 5*.
1978	Cropley, A. J., & Dave, R. H.	Lifelong education and the training of teachers . Oxford: Pergamon.
1978	V. Patel, N. N. Shukla, & W. van Vliet	Lifelong education and community learning: Three case studies in India. *UIE Monographs 7*.
1978	R. Skager	Lifelong education and evaluation practice. UIE and Oxford: Pergamon.

[75] This table includes the special issue of UIE's journal, the *International Review of Education* (IRE), but not the articles on lifelong education that appeared in the journal throughout the 1970s (for a discussion of the journal content, see Tuijnman & Boström, 2002).

Publication date	Author(s)/Editor(s)	Title
1979	A. J. Cropley	Lifelong Learning: a Stocktaking. *UIE Monographs 8.*
1979	U. Hameyer	School curriculum in the context of lifelong learning. *UIE Monographs 9.*
1980	A. J. Cropley	Towards a system of lifelong education: Some practical considerations. UIE and Oxford: Pergamon.

Appendix 4: Comparing the *Faure report* and the *Delors report*

Name of report	Learning to be ("Faure report")	Learning: The Treasure Within ("Delors report")
Year of publication	1972	1996
Commission	International Commission on the Development of Education, chaired by Edgar Faure, consisting of five members.	International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, chaired by Jacques Delors, consisting of fifteen members.
Purpose of report	Mapping a vision of education for the future.	
Approach to education	Humanistic; "development of individuals capable of reaching their full potential in a pluralist society."	
The main dilemmas faced by the Commission	The May 1968 student revolution; social transformations in terms of rapid technological change; decolonization and the political claims of the Third World.	Neoliberalism and the predominance of the market; structural adjustment programs; challenging features of globalization such as particularism and technological change.
Key ideas	Lifelong education (*éducation permanente*) as the new educational "master concept"; the "learning society" (cité educative"); the "complete man"; solidarity with the developing world.	Learning throughout life (*éducation tout au long de la vie*); the four pillars of education: learning to know; learning to do; learning to live together; and learning to be. The focus is on "learning to live together," and the report takes a strong stance against neoliberalism and particularism.
Main similarities	Universal humanistic and utopian message, aspiring at "eternal principles" valid for everybody; The full development of the potential of human beings is considered the main purpose of education; Education and learning are seen as a continuum with a lifelong and lifewide dimension; Shift away from the teaching to the learner; Concern about a too narrow economic view of education; a cosmopolitan view of society ("learning society"; "global village"); Solidarity as the main driver of development.	
Main differences	The main focus is on the development of the individual and the human condition ("learning to be);" Traditional pillars of society, such as the school system, are being called into question; The report exudes optimism about the possibilities of transforming societies towards greater democracy and participation, but also exhibits a sense of crisis in terms of awareness of the downsides of progress.	The main focus is on common values, multicultural politics and "learning to live together"; The school is not challenged as the main pillar of the education system; Although the report aspires at giving a message of hope, its tone is more disenchanted; it observes a crisis of democracy.

Appendix 5: Shifting Contexts and Meanings of the Concept of Lifelong Learning from the Perspective of UNESCO

Period	Socio-political Context and Dilemmas	Policies/Events/Publications	Meaning of Education and Lifelong Learning
1945-1950	Post-WWII; The experience of dehumanization and totalitarianism; Emerging of multilateral organizations	UNESCO's Constitution (1945); Universal Declaration of Human Rights (art. 26) (1948); Fundamental education	Education for the full development of the human potential and for international understanding; rejection of totalitarian power; a strong focus on adult education and literacy; "individualization" (focus on the dignity of every human being) and "universalization" (stressing the unity of humanity); "unity in diversity"
1960s	Decolonization; Cold War; The "World Educational Crisis"; May 1968 revolution in France and elsewhere	First Development Decade Economists discovered education as an investment in productivity and economic growth – "human capital theory" (Schultz, 1963; Becker, 1964).	Education as a human right and the human capital approach were "two sides of the same coin"; focus on literacy; *éducation permanente* emerged
1970s	Cold War *Égalité des chances* Welfare state Third World claimed a "New International Economic Order"	Paulo Freire: *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (1970) Ivan Illich: *Deschooling society* (1971) UNESCO report *Learning to be* (*Faure report*, 1972)	Lifelong education marked a critical attitude towards traditional forms of formal education and schooling; Education for emancipation and social change, tied to democracy; at the same time rise of educational planning based on technocratic and economic principles
1990s	Rise of neoliberalism; the end of the Cold War; structural adjustment programs in developing countries	World Conference for Education for All (EFA), Jomtien (1990) UNESCO report *Learning: The treasure within* (*Delors report*, 1996).	Basic education for all; in parallel, reaffirmation of lifelong learning ("learning throughout life") as UNESCO's humanistic educational paradigm
2000 onwards	Increasing privatization and marketization of education under neoliberalism	Six EFA goals adopted at the Second Education for All (EFA) Conference (World Education Forum) in Dakar 2000	Narrow focus on primary education and expansion of schools in developing countries; reversal of education from a right to a responsibility