

HOPE &

THE UNITED STATES
AND UNESCO
1945-1985

WILLIAM PRESTON, JR.
EDWARD S. HERMAN
HERBERT I. SCHILLER
PREFACE BY SEÁN MACBRIDE

FOLLY

HOPE & FOLLY

THE UNITED STATES
AND UNESCO
1945-1985

WILLIAM PRESTON JR.,
EDWARD S. HERMAN, AND HERBERT I. SCHILLER

PREFACE BY SEÁN MACBRIDE
INTRODUCTION BY ELLEN RAY AND WILLIAM H. SCHAAP

MANUSCRIPT PRODUCED BY THE
INSTITUTE FOR MEDIA ANALYSIS, INC.
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PRESS • MINNEAPOLIS

UNESCO DISCLAIMER

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has declined to approve, authorize or sponsor this book and has refused to participate in its publication. The conclusions, viewpoints and opinions expressed in this book are wholly those of the Institute for Media Analysis, Inc. and the individual authors and do not reflect those of UNESCO. UNESCO has not participated in the writing of this book and disclaims responsibility for its contents. UNESCO will not receive any royalties or other payment from the sale of this book.

Copyright © 1989 by the Institute for Media Analysis, Inc.,

145 West 4th Street, New York, NY 10012.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Published by the University of Minnesota Press

2037 University Avenue Southeast, Minneapolis MN 55414.

Printed in the United States of America.

Book and cover design by Lois Stanfield.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Preston, William, 1924—

Hope and folly : the United States and Unesco, 1945–1985 / William Preston, Jr., Edward S. Herman, and Herbert I. Schiller ; preface by Seán MacBride ; introduction by Ellen Ray and William H. Schaap ; prepared by the Institute for Media Analysis, Inc., New York, New York.

p. cm—(Media & society)

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-8166-1788-0—ISBN 0-8166-1789-9 (pbk.)

1. Unesco—United States. 2. United States—Foreign policy—1981—
3. Unesco in the press—United States—History—20th century.
4. Press—United States—Influence. I. Herman, Edward S., 1925—
II. Schiller, Herbert I., 1919— . III. Institute for Media
Analysis. IV. Title. V. Series.

AS4.U83P74 .1989

341.7'67—dc20

89-33643

CIP

The University of Minnesota
is an equal-opportunity
educator and employer.

This book is dedicated, with great respect, to the memory of Seán MacBride (1904–1988), a giant of a man, who eschewed a life of privilege to work tirelessly for the disadvantaged of the world, for peace and disarmament, and for greater understanding and compassion among all the people of this earth. He was the only human being ever to be awarded both the Nobel Peace Prize and the Lenin Peace Prize, a tribute both to the universality of his life and to his consummate diplomacy.

He was the driving force behind the expression of the New World Information and Communication Order. It was our honor that he served as the founding Chairman of the Board of the Institute for Media Analysis. His preface to this book was one of his last writings.

PREFACE

Seán MacBride

Through the ages, mankind has been dominated by an aggressive desire to exercise power over other human beings. This compulsion to dominate and conquer is what has always led to wars.

Until the advent and development of explosives, railways, and internal combustion engines, wars were relatively limited and even often regarded as sporting events. But in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, the need to control war began to be recognized universally.

In 1868 the major nations adopted the Declaration of St. Petersburg, which proclaimed that the rights of belligerents in a war were not unlimited. On the initiative of Tzar Nicholas, a conference was convened at The Hague in 1899 to consider the “reduction of international armaments and the substitution of pacific methods to replace force and violence in the sphere of foreign relations.” This conference resulted in the adoption of a convention for the pacific settlement of disputes which was adopted by 24 major states. It was the first acknowledgment that the modern development of warfare and weapons was endangering civilization and that, therefore, an effort had to be made to curb the warlike propensities of humanity.

The trend toward the outlawing of wars was heightened by World War I, in which some ten million people were killed. It was the unprecedented destructive nature of that conflict which prompted the formulation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, which in turn led to the General Treaty for the Renunciation of Wars, which was signed on August 27, 1928. This treaty, in effect, for the first time outlawed war and the use of force in international affairs. However, it was not accompanied by any measures aimed at disarmament and proved, therefore, to be ineffective.

Then there was World War II, in which some 60 million human beings were killed, more than half of them civilians. And on August 6, 1945, the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, killing some 140,000 people; three days later, another, dropped on Nagasaki, killed a further 70,000 people.

The failure of the League of Nations to prevent World War II, and the advent of nuclear weapons, posed to the leaders of the world problems

of a magnitude never before envisioned. It was no longer merely a question of preventing an ordinary war, but it was the very survival of the human race which was at stake. As Arthur Koestler put it:

From the dawn of consciousness until 6 August 1945, man had to live with the prospect of his death as an individual. But since the day when the first atomic bomb outshone the sun over Hiroshima mankind as a whole has had to live with the prospect of extinction as a species.

The world leaders at that time had a much better sense of moral responsibility and of the dangers which faced the human race than do our present-day leaders, and they realized that oblivion was now the only alternative to world disarmament. After prolonged discussions they finally came to the conclusion in 1962 that the only way of saving humanity from nuclear destruction was to proceed to general and complete disarmament. This decision was followed through by the adoption unanimously of the proposal by the Soviet Union and the United States of the Eight Principles upon which the Treaty for General and Complete Disarmament would be based. Very briefly, this agreement provided for the destruction of all existing nuclear weapons and a prohibition against the manufacture of such weapons, and the reduction of all other armaments and of armies to the maximum numbers and capacities that would be reasonably required to maintain peace and order within the boundaries of each State.

These decisions would sound the death knell for arms manufacturers and would call for a very considerable reduction of the size of existing armies. The agreement also provided for the elimination of all foreign bases throughout the world. But the forces in favor of armament—not only the arms manufacturers but also the military establishments and the financial and industrial structures that profit from arms races and wars—are much more extensive and powerful than is usually appreciated. To them, disarmament spelled disaster. When they realized, in 1962, that the governments of the world were agreeing on General and Complete Disarmament, all the forces of the military-industrial complex were mobilized to oppose and disrupt the disarmament agreement between the governments of the world and the United Nations.

These forces extend their influence in most countries to the parliaments and the governments themselves. They work as well through the secret services and other secret organs of government, influencing parliamentarians and other officials, and particularly concentrating on journalists and other media people.

Control of the media, written and electronic, is of vital importance to those who wish to destabilize a government or to create tensions in different parts of the world. We have had many examples of this in the Congo, Vietnam, Chile, Angola, and the Middle East. Secret services and news agencies were used to distort events in order to justify military in-

tervention. In some cases the military intervention would be operated by proxy or by bogus liberation movements that were financed and armed by the major power involved, which, more often than not, was the United States.

In some situations, the only protection available to the country under attack was the United Nations; not by direct intervention but by providing a forum in which the facts could be exposed. Indeed, this was one of the objectives that the founders of the United Nations had in mind when the charter was adopted. And be it said in their favor, the American leaders of that period were motivated by the high principles which were reflected in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

However, since then, the United States has not hesitated to ignore the provisions of the charter and other United Nations decisions and to resort to actions not far removed from those of non-governmental terrorists. By behaving in such a manner, the United States has certainly created a very bad impression for its views of international relations. By the continual use of force, or the threat of the use of force, in countries such as Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Lebanon, and Grenada, the United States has lost credibility and the confidence of most states that respect the Rule of Law and Human Rights.

The misbehavior of governments and of persons occupying high positions of trust has also been very damaging to the credibility of governments. The payment of bribes to people in high positions has eroded the modicum of respect and trust which is so necessary. Watergate, Muldergate, Irangate, the Lockheed bribery case, and the Mafia cases in Italy have all combined to destroy the confidence of the ordinary people in governments and their establishments.

Since the days of President John F. Kennedy, the U.S. has been resentful of the United Nations and of its agencies. It resented any criticism of its policies or actions. Threats of withholding payment of its contribution were not infrequent, and, in recent years, carried out. Finally, the U.S. withdrew completely from the International Labor Organization. It was also critical of the other U.N. agencies, in particular of UNESCO, and with the help of a section of the U.S. media, the U.S. mounted a full campaign against UNESCO and finally resigned its membership. Under the Reagan administration the campaign against the U.N. and UNESCO was stepped up very considerably. It came to the point where U.S. officials stated that the departure of the U.N. from New York would not be unwelcome. The U.S.-influenced press joined in the campaign of denigration of UNESCO and of its director-general. In this way, American public opinion was conditioned for the decision of the U.S. government to leave UNESCO.

The campaign against UNESCO and its Director General was reminiscent of McCarthyism. Of course, the Western powers were not really so committed to UNESCO's objectives regarding its educational and scien-

tific program for Third World countries; the betterment of education, the elimination of illiteracy, and the development of scientific expertise in the underdeveloped areas of the world were not regarded as top priorities for the United States. Hence UNESCO was to be brushed aside.

The fact that the then director-general, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, was a black African, and a French-speaking African at that, did not endear him to the American establishment. And here I would pay tribute to Mr. M'Bow for his courageous leadership of UNESCO over two terms of office.

One of the great dangers facing democratic countries arises from the operations of the secret services. In many cases they have formed separate squads to carry out secretly illegal and criminal acts. In some cases they act on their own initiative; in others, they act with the sanction of their governments and carry out terrorist activities; they have unlimited financial resources and do not hesitate to blackmail or assassinate people who get in their way. The activities of secret services are damaging to democracy and are destructive of the proper application of the Rule of Law.

This book is about such matters. The only way of dealing with the problems to which I have referred is by informing public opinion, which is not conscious of the gravity of the present situation.

INTRODUCTION

Ellen Ray and William Schaap

“What really bothers me about the MacBride Report¹ is the way it calls for the licensing of journalists.” We were lunching with a senior editor of one of the most prestigious newspapers in the United States.

“What are you talking about?” we said. “It specifically does *not* call for the licensing of journalists.”

“Don’t be ridiculous. Of course it does.”

“Have you *read* the MacBride Report?” we asked.

“No, but I don’t have to.”

“What do you mean by that?”

“I’ve read dozens of news articles and feature stories about the MacBride Report, and they *all* say that it calls for the licensing of journalists. Don’t try to tell me they all are wrong and you are right.”

THE MACBRIDE REPORT

This conversation, which took place not long after the United States had withdrawn from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is a tribute to the strength of the campaign of disinformation against UNESCO which developed over the 1980s.

Our friend² was not alone in criticizing a book he had never read; this practice was encouraged by its foes before the report was published. On May 17, 1980, after it had been presented to the UNESCO director-general, but before it had been officially released, *Editor and Publisher* had this to say about the MacBride Report:

Whether you have read it or not, the IPI [International Press Institute], ANPA [American Newspaper Publishers Association], ASNE [American Society of Newspaper Editors], IAPA [Inter-American Press Association], the World Press Freedom Committee believe there is enough wrong with it to constitute a threat to the existence of a free press everywhere.³

When Seán MacBride was asked what it was about his report that upset the United States government and establishment so much, he replied:

That is a difficult question to answer, because the criticism of the United States was obviously made by people who had never read the Report. It criticized things that the Report never said. It invented recommendations which the Commission never made . . . recommendations which were made in the opposite sense to the recommendations that were made.⁴

Indeed, the criticisms of the report, and of UNESCO in general, deviated so sharply from reality that the notion of a hidden agenda was hard to avoid. This held true for general as well as specific criticisms. As one commentator noted, "The high moral tone in which the U.S. decision to withdraw from UNESCO has been couched presents a sharp contrast with the political realities that lead to that decision."⁵ "Most obviously," another observer noted, the crisis at UNESCO is "part of a challenge to U.S. hegemony by most of the rest of the world."⁶

The purpose of this book is to put the anti-UNESCO campaign in historical perspective, to elaborate the *entire* history of U.S.-UNESCO relations, without which it is impossible to understand fully the events of the last few, stormy years of what was once a staunch alliance. Indeed, it is only in light of this history that the intensity and significance of the campaign against UNESCO can be appreciated. It is also necessary in order to understand the gulf that separated the realities of U.S. policy from the general, often greatly distorted, perceptions of that policy.

In fact, there *were* some material threats to vested American interests in some of the positions advocated by UNESCO, although they were greatly exaggerated by media which, at the same time, would not tolerate any discussion of this exaggeration.⁷ Indeed, they warped the public's perception of the entire issue by converting these relatively minor threats to private, material interests into dangerous and evil threats to fundamental principles. (This manipulation is discussed at length in Section II of Part II of this book, Edward S. Herman's detailed analysis of the media coverage of UNESCO; see especially Subsection H, on the real corporate interests, and Section IV of Part III, Herbert I. Schiller's analysis of U.S. media policy.)

Another, albeit implicit, purpose of this book is to raise one more voice in defense of international cooperation and the United Nations system. The virulence of the irrational attack against that system has intensified of late. In a time when we can destroy our planet not only by nuclear holocaust, but also, it seems, by the senseless rape of the world's environment, universal, international cooperation is more important than ever.

UNESCO—indeed the United Nations system itself—has been subjected to harsh criticism from the most conservative elements of the

Western establishment since its creation. But the tenor and the scope of the dispute rose to a crescendo in the middle and late 1970s and the early 1980s. To some extent this heightening of the debate was a function of the change in membership—and the outlook of members—wrought by the decline of colonialism through the 1960s, and the concomitant loss of Western power and influence in the United Nations, where each nation has one vote. (This phenomenon is discussed in detail below in Sections VI and VII of Part I, William Preston, Jr.'s historical overview, and by Schiller in Part III, Section V.)

The U.S. backlash was a natural complement to what became known as the Reagan Doctrine, an attempt to reverse any decline in U.S. influence wherever and whenever possible. Since 1980, when the Heritage Foundation published *Mandate for Leadership*, a vast collection of conservative proposals—adopted nearly in its entirety by the Reagan administration⁸—minimization of the role of the U.N., indeed its elimination, has been the chilling plan on the Heritage agenda and a right-wing priority. (The role of the Heritage Foundation is discussed below and in Preston: Part I, Sections VIII and IX; Herman: Part II, Section II, especially Subsections A, D, and F; and Schiller: Part III, Section X.)

Among the several controversies that brought UNESCO into the line of fire was a series of battles focusing on Israel's role in the territories it occupied after the 1967 war. (See Preston: Part I, Section VIII.) In 1970, then Director-General René Maheu complained that Israel was preventing the distribution of school books in the occupied territories; he was vilified in the U.S. press.⁹ UNESCO criticized Israel's archaeological policies in Jerusalem (see Preston: Part I, Section VIII), for which it was also bitterly attacked; and for two years, from 1974 to 1976, the UNESCO General Conference (not the director-general, but the actual executive body) refused to include Israel in any of its regional groupings. (It was, in fact, the newly elected Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow who defused this conflict and saw that Israel was admitted;¹⁰ ironically, M'Bow, as noted below, was continually baited by UNESCO critics as being anti-Israel.) But there was one particular issue that overshadowed all the others in the UNESCO embroglio: Communications.

COMMUNICATIONS

In reality, sweeping world changes were making communications and the flow of information a new and critical area. Among them was the development of satellites and other high technology methods of instantaneous communication (see Schiller: Part III, Section VIII); also significant was the growth in influence—outside the West—of the Non-Aligned

Movement. But several symbolic events combined to propel UNESCO into the forefront of the communications battle.

In 1974 a new director-general was elected, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow of Senegal, first seen as a "moderate," but soon recognized as an outspoken critic of the Western media's insensitivity to the Third World.¹¹ In 1978 UNESCO issued the Mass Media Declaration, which calls, rather blandly, for the "wider and better balanced dissemination of information."¹² And in 1980 UNESCO published the MacBride Report, after nearly three years of painstaking research, analysis, debate, and compromise.

Despite the fact that M'Bow's election, and the passage of both the Media Declaration and the MacBride Report, were unanimous decisions, approved by *all* the Member States, including the United States and the United Kingdom; despite the fact that the Declaration of 1978 "unequivocally supports government-free news media and omits press-control proposals";¹³ despite the fact that the MacBride Report *nowhere* calls for licensing of journalists; despite all the *facts* apparent to anyone who took the trouble to read the documents or had the minimal sophistication to distinguish between UNESCO debates and UNESCO final reports and declarations, the organization was depicted as the greatest threat ever to freedom of the press and the "free flow of information." The reality—objective challenges to Western commercial oligopoly and control, however limited—was not discussed. (See Herman: Part II, Section II, Subsection F.)

This transformation was accomplished by distortion, misrepresentation, selective quotation, and all the other methods of disinformation, including outright lies and fabrications in the Western media. (For the historical development of this campaign, see Preston: Part I, Sections VIII and IX; and see Herman: Part II, generally; and see in particular Appendix III, in which Herman dissects one particularly vicious television "documentary" on UNESCO. For a good sense of the anti-UNESCO campaign in the United Kingdom, see the speech by Gough Whitlam, set forth in Appendix IV.¹⁴)

THE HERITAGE ATTACKS

One of the most significant movers and shakers in the entire campaign against UNESCO has been the Heritage Foundation. It has spewed forth a plethora of publications criticizing the United Nations and virtually every branch of it. Dozens of books, pamphlets, background papers, and memorandums have attacked the U.N., the General Assembly, the FAO, UNCTAD, the ILO, UNICEF, and, of course, UNESCO.¹⁵ A brief descrip-

tion of some of the anti-UNESCO material will give the flavor of the Heritage Foundation line.

Backgrounder Number 221 appeared in October 1982, entitled “For UNESCO, A Failing Grade in Education.” It criticized UNESCO for advocating the New International Economic Order, which it described as “a simplistic scheme to redistribute the world’s wealth and resources to more than 100 underdeveloped nations, creating a global welfare state financed mainly by the U.S. and the western industrial nations.” It calls the NIEO “Fabian socialism,” a secret plan to create a “world government.” It accused UNESCO of trying to “take NIEO into the classroom,” by advocating such nefarious doctrines as “teaching international human rights,” “disarmament education,” and “moral education.” It sniped at Director-General M’Bow for shifting UNESCO’s focus away from “its original goal of creating world ‘intellectual cooperation’ towards emphasis on Third World ‘development.’”

In December 1982 Heritage published *Backgrounder* Number 233, “UNESCO, Where Culture Becomes Propaganda.” This paper attacked the World Conference on Cultural Policies sponsored by UNESCO in Mexico City. M’Bow was faulted for “leading the charge against western media and cultural projects.” The concept of “cultural imperialism” was ridiculed as a “game played at Mexico City.” The notion that Western television exerts an undue and improper influence on the Third World was dismissed as so much Soviet propaganda—because one of the authors of one of the studies cited by advocates of this position is an official of an organization “closely aligned with the editorial policies of Moscow [*sic*],” the International Organization of Journalists (IOJ).¹⁶

Another typical Heritage *Backgrounder* was Number 253 in March 1983, entitled, “The IPDC: UNESCO vs. the Free Press.” UNESCO, it said, “has declared war against the western free press.” It described the New World Information and Communication Order as the logical result of UNESCO’s approval of the New International Economic Order—which is called “a formula for a global socialist state”—and the presence at its meetings of personnel from the IOJ. The NWICO, Heritage says, “preaches redistribution of the wealth of ultramodern and global mass communication infrastructures created by the western world.” This, to say the least, is an astonishing reading of the MacBride Report, which, as noted earlier, was approved unanimously. (See Herman: Part II, Section II, Subsection C, for a discussion of this use of the terminology of socialism in the media campaign against UNESCO.)

This particular *Backgrounder* also demonstrates how Heritage, and other critics of UNESCO, deliberately confuse subjects that are *discussed* with policy positions that are *adopted*. It says, “Out of this meeting [at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, on the protection of journalists] came suggestions for regulating the reporting and the movement of journalists. Devices like international I.D. cards and a code of ethics for the

press administered by an 'International Commission for the Protection of Journalists' were proposed." Nothing whatsoever along those lines, of course, was ever *passed*. This same paper describes Seán MacBride as a "Moscow-aligned radical." M'Bow is criticized for having been a "student radical" at the Sorbonne in the late 1940s and early 1950s!

On October 19, 1983, Heritage published *Backgrounder* Number 298, "The U.S. and UNESCO at a Crossroads," by Owen Harries, a former Australian ambassador to UNESCO. Harries was a John M. Olin Fellow at Heritage, its pointman in the fight against UNESCO.¹⁷ This paper, a ten-page diatribe, described UNESCO as "a worst case model of the U.N. system." It rehashed all the standard complaints, but went further. It proposed a specific U.S. policy: "The United States should announce formally that it will withdraw from UNESCO in one year unless there are substantial changes in the organization." Harries also called for substantial reductions in U.S. contributions to the budget, even while remaining a member. Ironically, given the history of U.S. domination of UNESCO's early years (see Preston: Part I, Sections V and VI), Harries demanded that UNESCO have "a proper respect for the interests and view of minorities."

Harries made a final push for U.S. withdrawal in Heritage Executive Memorandum Number 68 of December 5, 1983, "The U.N. and UNESCO: Time for Decision." "The only effective political leverage available to the U.S.," he insisted, was the withdrawal announcement. Shortly thereafter, President Reagan took his advice.

In a fund-raising letter sent out October 8, 1984, as the time approached for the United States' announced withdrawal, December 31, 1984, Heritage president, Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., bragged that President Reagan's decision to withdraw was a "direct result" of the Heritage campaign in general and the Harries *Backgrounder* in particular. But he bewailed the fact that UNESCO's supporters were urging Congress to stop the withdrawal. "I need your help," he wrote, "to stop a corrupt third-world despot from undoing one of the Heritage Foundation's most significant achievements." He urged recipients to "send the enclosed postcard to U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick to let her know whether you think the United States should get out of UNESCO."¹⁸

Finally, on December 10, 1984, Heritage sent out Executive Memorandum Number 68, also by Owen Harries, "UNESCO—Time to Leave." It argued that no significant reform had taken place and that, despite efforts by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO to persuade the administration to reverse itself, the withdrawal should be allowed to take place as planned.

Harries outdid himself in hypocrisy. His original paper had suggested that the withdrawal announcement might prompt changes during the ensuing year which would enable the U.S. to remain. Now he stated that "apart from the merits of the case, the fact that the U.S. has taken the

decision to withdraw, after due deliberation, in itself is a compelling reason for not retreating from it or delaying its implementation. A great country which values its reputation should carry out what it has solemnly announced it will do. To do otherwise is to invite derision and contempt, not only in UNESCO but generally.”

The administration, despite objections from some quarters of the State Department, was not about to reverse itself.

The administration’s actual intentions were significantly different from its public pronouncements during the year preceding withdrawal. Indeed, Assistant Secretary of State Gregory Newell prepared an “action memo” in January 1984 that discussed the degree to which the media would be manipulated during the ensuing year. (This plan is discussed in Herman: Part II, Section II, Subsection A, and in Preston: Part I, Section IX.)

THE CRITICS OF HERITAGE

The Heritage Foundation’s campaign was not without its critics, although they had little influence and received almost no coverage in the mainstream media. The United Nations Association of the United States published numerous line-by-line, statement-by-statement rebuttals of the Heritage *Backgrounders* and Memorandums. They demonstrated that most short Heritage papers contained dozens of lies, distortions, and omissions.

A detailed analysis by the UNAUS, “Lies, Distortions, and Nonsense from the Heritage Foundation,”¹⁹ debunks the Heritage insistence that the UNAUS “fails to note the grave threat posed to press freedom by NWIO under the shibboleth of ‘protection of journalists’ (i.e., licensing of Western newsmen in the Third World).” The analysis points out that UNAUS had stressed that the MacBride Report explicitly warns that “to propose a licensing system for journalists was dangerous since it would require someone to stipulate who would be entitled to claim such protection.”

The U.N. Department of Public Information also issued a detailed report²⁰ exposing some two dozen errors of fact and misrepresentations in one Heritage report. And the Southern California Division of the UNAUS published a series of analyses and rebuttals to the Heritage Foundation *Backgrounders*.²¹

The American scientific establishment was also dismayed by the U.S. pullout. The president of the National Academy of Engineering, the foreign secretary of the National Academy of Sciences, and many presti-

gious members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science all objected to the withdrawal.²² All, unfortunately, to no avail.

Finally, although it was far too late to be closing the barn door, on April 29, 1985, Canada's United Nations Ambassador Stephen Lewis gave a rousing speech to the UNAUS national convention in New York City. He lambasted the Heritage Foundation, in the most undiplomatic language. He said:

And then there are other critics . . . there are others still who are quite simply malevolent and they do great damage. They pretend to be dispassionate, analytic, concerned. Poppy-cock. Folderol. They are, by and large, neo-isolationists in their views of the world, and they are made up of the Heritage Foundation and others of their ilk.

Heritage, he insisted, specialized "not in insightful analysis, but in inspired sophistry," and engaged in "philistinism." The right-wing press, led by *The Washington Times*, attacked Lewis; the U.S. mission dismissed his remarks as "the same kind of intemperate rhetoric everyone in the U.N. grows used to."²³ Heritage, with its unique logic, deplored Lewis's "interference in American internal affairs," and promptly called upon the Canadian government to fire him. But the Canadian prime minister, Brian Mulroney, who refused to withdraw from UNESCO, supported him: "When he speaks," Mulroney said, "he speaks for the government of Canada and I thought he spoke well."²⁴

THE ATTACKS AGAINST M'BOW

Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow was under attack virtually from the time he took office as director-general in November 1974 until the day he left office in November 1987. One of the first widely read attacks appeared in the March/April 1976 issue of *Columbia Journalism Review*, written by Joel Blocker, who had recently resigned after two years as director of UNESCO's public information office. Blocker's hatchet job, "The Bad News From UNESCO," dealt primarily with Israel's isolation at the United Nations. The article was blatantly anti-Arab and at the same time accused M'Bow, ever so subtly, of anti-Semitism.²⁵

Blocker complained that "in 1975, the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization and Environment Program were taken over, respectively, by a Lebanese and an Egyptian." He described M'Bow as "a handsome, personable Senegalese Moslem." He deplored M'Bow's defense of two UNESCO resolutions on Israel, one denying it membership in UNESCO's European regional group, "the only member to be so deprived," the other "sanctioning it for alleged continuing abuses in Jerusalem." The

very phraseology belies any objectivity on Blocker's part. (Shortly thereafter, in fact, Israel was admitted to the European regional group.)

The author demeaned M'Bow's "tendency to respond to western criticism by associating it with the color of his own skin." For M'Bow to suggest that there was any racism in the Western media was, to Blocker, ridiculous. But most outrageous was the way in which the author imputed to M'Bow anti-Semitism: "A high U.N. official," he writes, absolving himself of responsibility for what follows, "puts it this way: 'For him, the press is immoral, sensationalistic, decadent, without ethics. He believes that it is in the nature of the press to sell itself, that it is open to manipulation by monied interests. He never quite says "Jewish" money and would be shocked if told there was anything anti-Semitic about his views.' "

It is, in fact, not M'Bow but the anonymous "official" who is being stereotypically anti-Semitic, assuming—quite incorrectly—that most of the Western press is owned by Jews and assuming—equally erroneously—that most representatives of the "monied interests" are Jews. M'Bow is being accused of not *quite* saying anything anti-Semitic and not *quite* thinking any such thing, but *being* so nevertheless.

The attacks on M'Bow escalated during the campaign to get a U.S. withdrawal announcement and during the one-year waiting period that followed. They are described in the main text of both Preston's and Herman's sections. Indeed, the campaign became so personalized, replete with canned newspaper editorials captioned "M'Bow Must Go," that many commentators viewed the issue as, in fact, one of personalities. (See Herman: Part II, Section II, Subsection B.)

After the British announcement of withdrawal, *South* magazine²⁶ published an analysis which quoted Jean Gerard, the last U.S. ambassador to UNESCO,²⁷ as pointing out that the accomplishment of all the requested reforms "still would not by itself be enough." And Representative James Scheuer notes: "If UNESCO were to appoint a responsible person tomorrow, the U.S. government might change its mind." From this, *South* concludes: "There: it is not politics or polemics, not mismanagement, or poor accounting, it is M'Bow, and Reagan wants him out."

In fact, as this book attempts to demonstrate, this is a simplistic and false analysis. The campaign against him profoundly misrepresented what M'Bow stood for; he was not guilty of what he was accused of; but he was simply a symbol, an excuse. What the United States wanted was a UNESCO that followed its orders, as it had in the 1940s and 1950s and 1960s. (See Preston: Part I, Sections VI and VII.) Now M'Bow, in fact, is out, and the U.S. has not rushed to rejoin UNESCO. Perhaps the new administration will reconsider, but the problem is not one of personalities.