FY 1977 STATE DEPARTMENT SUPPLEMENTAL

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 5040

TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

MARCH 21, 1977

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
87-212 WASHINGTON : 1977

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama, *Chairman*

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
DICK CLARK, Iowa
JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
JOHN GLENN, Ohio
RICHARD STONE, Florida
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland

CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas
CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., Tennessee

NORVILL JONES, *Chief of Staff*
ARTHUR M. KUHL, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR. Delaware

CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., Tennessee

Staff: JOHN B. RITCH
DAVID KEANEY

CONTENTS

	Page
Statements by:	
Beichman, Arnold, associate professor of political science, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Mass., representing Committee for an Effective UNESCO	24
Derian, Ms. Patricia, Coordinator-Designate for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, Department of State	17
Maynes, Charles William, Assistant Secretary-Designate for International Organization Affairs, Department of State	5
Moose, Richard M., Deputy Under Secretary for Management, Department of State	2
Power, Sarah Goddard, Chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Washington, D.C	38
Thomas, Hon. John M., Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of State	11
Insertions for the record:	
Text of H.R. 5040, 95th Congress, first session	3
"Fiscal year 1977 State Department supplemental authorization request," staff memorandum	5
Prepared statement of Charles William Maynes	6
"A Suggestion for Human Rights Diplomacy," by John Sommerville, from The Washington Post, March 21, 1977	9
Basis of construction cost estimate for Cairo apartments	16
Comparative spending on Soviet Refugees	22
Prepared statement of Arnold Beichman and attachments	26
Prepared statement of Sarah Goddard Power	41
"UNESCO Deserves Its Money," editorial from the Chicago Tribune, December 18, 1976	45
"GIVE to UNESCO," editorial from the New York Times, March 14, 1977	46
Appendix:	
Responses of Assistant Secretary of State Designate Maynes to additional questions of Senator Case	53
Letter to Senator George McGovern from Margaret Ackroyd, International Relations Representative, American Association of University Women, dated March 15, 1977	56
Letter to Senator John Sparkman from Donald E. Marlowe, executive director, American Society for Engineering Education, dated March 4, 1977	56
Letter to Senator George McGovern, from Adelaide Kernochan, executive secretary, associated schools project, dated February 28, 1977	57
Prepared statement of the Executive Committee of the American Association of Museums	57
Prepared statement of the American Council on Education	58
Letter to Senator John Sparkman from H. E. Hoelscher, professor at large, University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh	58
Critic of UNESCO urges United States to pay its full dues now, but monitor organization's activities as never before, news from Freedom House, February 17, 1977, and attached statement by the Executive Committee of Freedom House	59

Appendix—Continued

Page

Text of telegram League of Women Voters sent to each member of the House subcommittee 61

Resolution on UNESCO funding passed by the American Library Association 61

Resolution passed by the Council of Representatives, American Psychological Association, January 28, 1977 62

Letter to Senator John C. Danforth from Eldrige Lovelace, Vice President, Western Region, International Federation of Landscape Architects, dated March 15, 1977 62

Letter to Senator John Sparkman from James L. Aldrich, executive director, the Alliance for Environmental Education, dated March 7, 1977 63

Letter and enclosed statement to Senator John Sparkman from Leonard R. Sussman, Freedom House, dated March 17, 1977 63

Letter to Senator John Sparkman from Donald E. Marlowe, executive director, American Society for Engineering Education, dated March 4, 1977 65

Letter to Senator John Sparkman from Brian J. Larkin, executive director, and Howard D. Mehlinger, president, National Council for Social Studies, dated March 7, 1977 66

Letter and enclosed statement to Senator John Sparkman from H. Field Haviland, Professor of International Politics, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, dated March 17, 1977 67

FY 1977 STATE DEPARTMENT SUPPLEMENTAL

MONDAY MARCH 21, 1977

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:07 a.m., in room 4221, Dirksen Senate Office Building, the Honorable George McGovern (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Present: Senators McGovern, Clark, Biden, Case, Javits, and Baker.

Senator MCGOVERN. The committee will come to order.

OPENING STATEMENT

This morning's hearings marks the opening session of the new International Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The subcommittee will have legislative and oversight responsibilities for the State Department, for the USIA, for the diplomatic service, for international educational and cultural affairs, for foreign broadcasting activities, for foreign buildings, for general matters of international law, and for U.S. participation in the United Nations and all other multinational organizations, except those specifically focused on international economic matters. This is a rather sweeping jurisdiction, I must say, for a single subcommittee.

In its exercise of this responsibility, the subcommittee's principal legislative vehicle will be the annual Foreign Relations Authorization Act, which is one of the two major pieces of annual legislation relating to foreign affairs, the other being foreign assistance legislation.

Over the coming months the subcommittee will be addressing itself to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1978, and will be holding hearings and drafting amendments relating to that bill.

In this regard, the subcommittee now has outstanding a comprehensive 52-part information request which Senator Percy, the subcommittee's ranking member, and I submitted to the State Department earlier this month.

The Department's response to these questions, which the subcommittee expects to receive by the end of this month, will figure centrally in the subcommittee's subsequent actions.

This morning, however, the subcommittee is focusing not upon the fiscal year 1978 foreign relations authorization, but upon supplemental legislation which would amend the fiscal year 1977 authorization to provide additional funds in three budget categories: international organizations, foreign buildings, and migration and refugee assistance.

With us this morning we have a panel consisting of State Department officials directly concerned with these three areas. It consists of the following persons: Mr. William Maynes, Assistant Secretary-Designate for International Organization Affairs, who will discuss the administration's request in that category; Mr. John Thomas, Assistant Secretary for Administration, who will discuss the foreign buildings item; and Ms. Patricia Derian, Coordinator-Designate for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, who will discuss the migration and refugee assistance request.

Following the panel we will hear testimony from two additional witnesses concerning the international organizations item.

Before I call on Mr. Maynes, I would like to give Mr. Richard Moose, who is a former member of this committee's staff, an opportunity for a brief word.

I want to welcome you to the committee, Dick, in your new capacity.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD M. MOOSE, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. MOOSE. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to be here this morning for the first session of this subcommittee. We look forward, all of us, to working with you and the other members of the subcommittee and its staff on the various accounts which you will be considering.

I personally think it is a very good thing that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has formed this subcommittee so that there will be a body of particular expertise and interest among the Senators who follow activities of the Department of State. I particularly wanted to be here this morning since it was your first session. I do think that it would be more productive for you and for us if the Assistant Secretaries who are principally involved in the items that are before you bear the burden of the testimony this morning.

We do look forward to working with you. In particular we are going to give very careful attention to the list of 52 information items that you and Senator Percy have submitted. In the course of the weeks ahead, we will be working closely with you on those.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MCGOVERN. Thank you very much.

IMPORTANCE OF SUBCOMMITTEE

I agree that this is an important subcommittee. It was a difficult decision for me to give up the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia, in view of the special importance that the Middle East has in American foreign policy concerns right now, and also in view of the very important developments in India and in South Asia.

But I did feel when the opportunity arose to assume the chairmanship of this subcommittee that it dealt with the whole range of State Department and international organization concerns, and that it was a great challenge to have this new subcommittee in being. We appreciate the opportunity to work with you and with your colleagues and I am sure it will be a constructive relationship.

Mr. MOOSE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.

[The bill and a chart concerning it follow:]

[H.R. 5040, 95th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To authorize additional appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 1977

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES AND FOR MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

SECTION 1. Section 101(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1977, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking out "$342,460,453" and inserting in lieu thereof "$402,460,453"; and

(2) in paragraph (5) by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$28,725,000".

ASSISTANCE FOR AMERICANS INCARCERATED ABROAD

SEC. 2. In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State for fiscal year 1977, $150,000 for use in providing assistance, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine, to United States citizens incarcerated abroad. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

SEC. 3. Section 4(h)(1) of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, is amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) through (G) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) for use in Europe, not to exceed $225,000 for fiscal year 1977;

"(B) for use in the Near East and South Asia, not to exceed $12,885,000, of which not to exceed $3,985,000 may be appropriated for fiscal year 1976;

"(C) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed $3,400,000, of which not to exceed $2,800,000 may be appropriated for fiscal year 1976;

"(D) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed $150,000 for fiscal year 1977; and

"(E) for facilities for the United States Agency for International Development, not to exceed $17,200,000 for fiscal year 1977; and".

DELEGATIONS TO CERTAIN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUPS

SEC. 4. (a) The first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada", approved June 11, 1959 (22 U.S.C. 276d), is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of the first paragraph, by striking out "Foreign Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "International Relations";

(2) in the second paragraph, by striking out "Foreign Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "International Relations"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the House delegation shall be a Member from the International Relations Committee.".

(b) The first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Mexico", approved April 9, 1960 (22 U.S.C. 276h), is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking out "Foreign Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "International Relations";

(2) in the third sentence, by striking out "Foreign Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "International Relations"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the House delegation shall be a Member from the International Relations Committee.".

(c) The first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization", approved July 11, 1956 (22 U.S.C. 1928a), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "eighteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four";

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting "(not less than four of whom shall be from the Committee on International Relations)" immediately after "Members of the House";

(3) by striking out the third sentence; and

(4) by adding the following new sentence at the end of the section: "The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the House delegation shall be a Member from the Committee on International Relations.".

(d)(1) The second sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union", approved June 28, 1935 (22 U.S.C. 276), is amended by striking out "president and the executive secretary of the American group" and inserting in lieu thereof "Chairman of the House delegation in the case of delegates from the House of Representatives or the Chairman of the Senate delegation in the case of delegates from the Senate, except that either such Chairman may authorize the executive secretary of the American group to approve such vouchers on his behalf".

(2) Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 276a–1) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There shall be not to exceed twelve delegates from the House of Representatives (at least four of whom shall be from the Committee on International Relations) to each Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, such delegates to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the House delegation shall be a member from the Committee on International Relations. The Speaker shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the House delegation for each such Conference.".

(3) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4. The executive secretary of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union shall be appointed—

"(1) by the Chairman of the Senate delegation for service during odd numbered Congresses; and

"(2) by the Chairman of the House delegation for service during even numbered Congresses.".

(4) The undesignated paragraph under the heading "MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS" under the general heading "INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES" of the Department of State Appropriation Act of 1959 (22 U.S.C. 276c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Presiding Officer of the Senate shall designate one Senate delegate as Chairman of the Senate delegation for each such Conference.".

(5) The second sentence of the nineteenth undesignated paragraph under the general heading "DEPARTMENT OF STATE" in title I of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (22 U.S.C. 276b) is amended to read as follows: "The certificate of the Chairman of the respective delegation to the Interparliamentary Union (or the certificate of the executive secretary of the American group if the Chairman delegates such authority to him) shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers in the auditing of all accounts of the House and Senate delegations to the Interparliamentary Union.".

Passed the House of Representatives March 24, 1977.

Attest:

EDMUND L. HENSHAW, Jr.,
Clerk.

MARCH 18, 1877.

STAFF MEMORANDUM

FISCAL YEAR 1977 STATE DEPARTMENT SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

The attached chart shows the fiscal year 1977 State Department authorizations approved thus far and the categories in which the State Department has requested increases. These three categories and the additional amounts requested are as follows:

International organizations	$69, 275, 000
Migration and refugee assistance	15, 725, 000
Foreign Service buildings	10, 775, 000

As shown in the table, approval of this request would raise the State Department's fiscal year 1977 authorization from $1,097,144,000 to $1,192,919,000. Following the chart is a discussion of each of the three items.

FISCAL YEAR 1977 STATE DEPARTMENT SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1977 authorization	Ford amendments	Carter amendments	Total supplemental request	Existing fiscal year 1977 authorization plus supplemental
1. Administration of foreign affairs	552, 455				552, 455
2. International organizations and conferences	342, 460	[1] 69, 275		69, 275	411, 735
3. International commissions	17, 069				17, 069
4. Educational exchange	68, 500				68, 500
5. Migration and refugee assistance	10, 000	[2] 8, 325	[3] 7, 400	15, 725	25, 725
Total, 5 categories	990, 484	77, 600	7, 400	85, 000	1, 075, 484
Aid to Israel-bound Soviet refugees	20, 000				20, 000
Foreign buildings program	86, 660		[4] 10, 775	10, 775	97, 435
Grand total	1, 097, 144	77, 600	18, 175	95, 775	1, 192, 919

[1] UNESCO.
[2] Aid to Soviet refugees not going to Israel.
[3] Aid to Indo-Chinese refugees.
[4] Cairo.

Senator MCGOVERN. Mr. Maynes, we would be happy to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES WILLIAM MAYNES, ASSISTANT SECRETARY-DESIGNATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE; ACCOMPANIED BY SANFORD MENTER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR; SIDNEY S. CUMMINS, BUDGET OFFICER; AND RUSSELL HEATER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF UNESCO AFFAIRS

Mr. MAYNES. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear here.

Would you like me to summarize my statement?

Senator MCGOVERN. That would be fine. You may proceed in any way that you wish. We will include your entire statement in the record. If you just want to hit the highlights, that would be fine.

Mr. MAYNES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of the President's request to increase the authorization for the fiscal year 1977 under the category, "International Organizations and Conferences" by $69,275,000 from $342,460,453 to $411,735,453.

The present administration strongly supports this request and has endorsed it in a letter to the Chairman of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees sent by Secretary Vance on February 3. This action is based on our assessment of the results of the UNESCO General Conference held in Nairobi last fall, and a hard analysis of how best to promote and further U.S. interests in UNESCO, in the rest of the multilateral world, and in our relations with the developing countries.

At the Nairobi meeting the United States, working with like-minded countries, succeeded in reversing one of the main discriminatory actions taken against Israel in 1974, the denial of membership in a regional group. At the same time, we and our friends were able to thwart other efforts to take new procedural or substantive actions against Israel.

We were also successful at the Nairobi meeting in getting widespread support from other countries to prevent the adoption of a Communist-backed declaration which would have sanctioned state control of the mass media and thus threaten to interfer with the international activities of the American media.

It is our judgment that the United States should therefore resume full participation in the organization, including the payment of what we now owe. Continued withholding in our view is likely to have serious and damaging results.

The total requested at this time for UNESCO is therefore $69.3 million, which will cover U.S. arrearages for calendar years 1975 and 1976, plus our dues for the calendar year 1977.

This concludes my summary, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to answer any questions or to provide additional material for the committee.

[Mr. Maynes' prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHARLES WILLIAM MAYNES ASSISTANT SECRETARY-DESIGNATE BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of the President's request to increase the authorization for the Fiscal Year 1977 under the category "International Organizations and Conferences" by $69,275,000 from $342,460,453 to $411,735,453. This increase would authorize additional funds to pay the United States assessed share of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) budget for the calendar years 1975, 1976 and 1977.

As the Committee is aware, on December 29, 1976, the President made the certification required by the Foreign Assistance Act, 1974, before funding of our dues to UNESCO could be resumed. The present administration strongly supports this action and has endorsed it in a letter sent by Secretary Vance on February 3. This action is based on our assessment of the UNESCO General Conference held in Nairobi last fall, and a hard analysis of how best to promote and further U.S. interests—in UNESCO, the rest of the multilateral world, and in our relations with the Third World.

At the Nairobi meeting the United States, working with like-minded countries, succeeded in getting reversed one of the main discriminatory actions taken against Israel in 1974—the denial of membership in a regional group. This problem has now been solved. And although we were not able at this meeting to prevent a reconfirmation of previous resolutions critical of Israeli policies in Jerusalem and in the occupied territories, the conference avoided action which threatened to introduce the Zionism-racism issue into its deliberations. At the same time, we and our friends were able to thwart other efforts to take new procedural or substantive actions against Israel.

We were also successful at the Nairobi meeting in getting widespread support from other countries to prevent the adoption of a Communist-backed declaration which would have sanctioned state control of the mass media and thus threatened to interfere with the international activities of American media. There will now be an opportunity to draw up a new declaration which incorporates principles consonant with our own basic values regarding freedom of information.

In order to maintain the momentum we achieved at the Nairobi conference, to encourage moderate elements in the organization to continue to work with us in the pursuit of common objectives such as the freedom of information issue, and to continue to work effectively for our overall interests in UNESCO, it is our judgment that the United States should resume full participation in the Organization, including the payment of what we owe. Continued withholding, in our view, is likely to have serious and damaging results—which I would summarize by citing a portion of the letter which Secretary Vance addressed to the Chairmen of appropriate Senate and House Committees on February 3:

"—a sharp decrease in our ability to exert leadership or influence within the UNESCO system;

"—a weakening of the determination and effectiveness of many members, including our close friends, to work within UNESCO for objectives which they share with us;

"—severe difficulties in sustaining projects the United States values highly, in a situation in which shortage of funds would require sharp cutbacks in UNESCO programs;

"—a reversal in the trend toward closer cooperation between African and Western governments which was critical to the favorable results at Nairobi, and which could have long-range significance for our interests throughout the United Nations system; and

"—a deepening of the financial crisis faced by UNESCO to the point that a special session of the General Conference becomes necessary in 1977, a session at which the United States would be in a most unenviable position.

"Of even more fundamental importance, the U.S. has a treaty obligation to pay its assessed share of the UNESCO budget. Continued non-payment would increasingly raise a question of whether the U.S. intends to abide by its international obligations. Partial payment would still leave us delinquent and subject to charges of treaty violation. The implications, of course, go far beyond UNESCO. It would be difficult to overestimate the negative consequences of the United States' appearing to the rest of the world not to stand for observance of firm treaty commitments, specifically ratified by our own constitutional procedures."

The total requested at this time for UNESCO, therefore, is $69.3 million which will cover U.S. arrearages for the calendar years 1975 and 1976 plus our dues for the calendar year 1977. An additional amount of $28.1 million is included in the regular fiscal year 1978 request to cover our calendar year 1978 obligation.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to answer any questions or provide additional data for the Committee.

UNESCO'S VALUE IN TERMS OF U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

Senator McGOVERN. Mr. Maynes, the new administration has obviously reached the judgment that continued participation in UNESCO is worthwhile.

In terms of the U.S. national interest, what is the value of UNESCO? What purposes does it serve that we believe advance the interests of our country?

Mr. MAYNES. Mr. Chairman, it has important programs in the fields of science, education, and culture. In the field of science there are a number of programs that are of direct benefit to the United States. The international hydrology program was considered so successful that it is being continued. UNESCO has done important work on environmental control of the Mediterranean, which happens to be one of the few areas where Arabs and Israelis, for example, have been able to sit down together to try to work out a program of common interest to all. It has done important work in the field of earthquake projection.

In the field of education, the organization does important work in the developing countries, helping them to structure their primary and secondary education. This country certainly has a major national interest in making sure that our values are reflected in the kinds of programs which are provided to these countries.

It does important work in the field of helping the handicapped and the disadvantaged. Of course, in the field of culture, one of its important benefits is the preservation of monuments, which are the heritage of time.

PROPOSED UNITED STATES-SOVIET COLLOQUIUM ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Senator McGOVERN. Mr. Maynes, did you happen to see the rather lengthy letter to the editor in this morning's Washington Post addressing a possible role for UNESCO?

Mr. MAYNES. Yes, I did.

Senator McGOVERN. It was written by a man by the name of John Somerville. Do you know who he is?

Mr. MAYNES. No, I don't. But I did see the letter. It is the kind of activity that UNESCO can be helpful in promoting.

As I recall, the man suggested that UNESCO could promote a colloquium between the United States and the Soviet Union on different interpretations of human rights, in particular, the Soviet emphasis on certain economic rights and, of course, our deep concern with political rights.

This kind of structured forum, which forces all countries to take into account the interests of others, is an activity that UNESCO can promote. I think we are seeing it happen now on the mass media resolution, where the Soviets initially tried to push a resolution which would have been totally unacceptable to us. Now we have succeeded in putting that back in a structured form which will make sure that our values are taken into account.

Senator McGOVERN. It struck me as a rather thoughtful proposal. As I understand his basic thesis, it is that what is happening now is a kind of exchange of heated statements on the part of the two countries on the issue of human rights.

I personally think that the moral side of that argument is with us, and I have no complaint about what the President is attempting to do. But I do think there is a legitimate concern and that we seem to be arguing at long distance over problems that are viewed differently within the two societies. It might be a very useful effort to explore the possibility of UNESCO sponsoring such a conference, where the experts on these issues could indeed look at them across the table.

Would that in any way invade the jurisdiction of the Commission on Human Rights which operates under the aegis of the U.N.?

Mr. MAYNES. I don't believe so, sir. I believe that the President's decision to sign the covenant on economic and social rights will make it easier for us to enter into some kind of dialog with countries like the Soviet Union.

Senator McGOVERN. Without objection, I would like to ask that the letter by Mr. Somerville in this morning's Washington Post be made a part of this hearing record.

[The information referred to follows:]

[From The Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1977]

A SUGGESTION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS DIPLOMACY

No exceptional insight is needed to realize that in the Soviet Union there is a relative lack of individual freedom to dissent openly from established authority. But one must also have enough insight to realize that this particular freedom is not the only important human right, and that any given human right can have a different degree of importance under different conditions. It has fallen to my lot to arrange a number of conferences between American and Soviet scholars where such questions were rationally discussed and debated. The general Soviet theory put forward was that, if they were to grant, under their conditions, the degree of open dissent that is customary in a country like ours, it would endanger a number of other important human rights that they claim their system implements more fully than our system does. I think some of their reasoning in this regard must be given serious weight.

Apart from that factor, there is great need for diplomacy if one really wishes to succeed in changing the human rights situation in a country other than one's own. All past experience shows that certain approaches only make things worse. Clearest of all is the fact that success cannot be gained by the heads of government of one country publicly and directly contacting and giving support to the embattled dissenters who live within the other country. The attempt to do this not only constitutes obvious interference by one government in the internal affairs of another, but seriously reduces the chances of successful negotiations between the two governments on other important problems.

In relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. there is no doubt that the most important problem is nuclear war, which threatens the very existence of humanity as a whole. When the interfering government says that its direct and public interference for human rights will not affect negotiations on nuclear disarmament, we cannot help but doubt either its candor or its intelligence. Would it not have an adverse effect upon us in any negotiations with the Soviets if Brezhnev began writing open letters of support to those whose human rights are being violated in our country? Moreover, if he did, would it help or hurt our human rights problem? Any criticism coming from the head of a rival government would be taken as a threat. If our government really thinks the Soviet government is violating the Helsinki Agreement, a proper complaint should be set forth with particulars and with an opportunity for the accused government to answer the charges (this is also a human right) before the accusing government makes political hay out of the whole thing. But if Carter himself fires the opening gun with a personal letter of support to Sakharov, are we not inviting Brezhnev to write similar letters to oppressed individuals or groups here? What possible good could come from starting something like that?

What would be a better international (or bi-national) approach to the human rights problem at this stage? I believe a genuine contribution could be made by a conference, sponsored perhaps by UNESCO, between American and Soviet specialists, with all conference proceedings being published in both countries. Such a conference, breaking new ground, would of course begin from the premise that problems of human rights exist in all countries, and would give equal opportunities to both the American and the Soviet participants to raise and answer questions in good faith and in a context of rational discussion. From my own experience I am sure the Soviets would agree to this, and that the results would be beneficial to both sides in relation to human rights as well as to other matters.

JOHN SOMERVILLE.

El Cajin, Calif.

MINIMUM NECESSARY TO MEET UNESCO'S FINANCIAL EMERGENCY

Senator MCGOVERN. Mr. Maynes, what is the minimum payment the United States would have to make to avoid the convening of a special session of the general conference this year to deal with UNESCO's financial emergency?

Mr. MAYNES. Mr. Chairman, you have to look at the overall financial situation of the organization.

The total budget of UNESCO this year is $112 million. The Director General owes $38 million in outstanding loans; $24 million of that is to the Arab countries. He owes the remainder to the working fund and to other funds under his control. So at a minimum he has to pay back $38 million this year. The Arab loans come due by the end of December of this year.

In addition, he has his ongoing program which he has to fund. If the United States does not pay its contributions for this calendar year, he will have a cash shortfall of something in the order of $64 million.

HOW UNESCO WOULD MEET SHORTFALL

Senator McGovern. How do you think they would most likely meet that shortfall if the United States did not pay its arrearage? Would they do it by reducing the scope of the UNESCO activities, or would they go further into debt?

Mr. Maynes. It depends on whether he can get additional loans. His two choices are additional loans from the Arab governments, which of course, increases their leverage over the organization, or program cuts.

Senator McGovern. Have they used that leverage?

Mr. Maynes. Certainly they resisted vigorously the efforts which we made at Nairobi to try to end the discriminatory actions against Israel. It stands to reason that if the size of those loans is increased, the leverage will also increase.

WORKING WITH UNESCO BY WITHHOLDING FUNDS

Senator McGovern. One of the arguments raised against our making up the shortfall we owe is that we have, in fact, had some success in working with UNESCO by withholding funds over the last couple of years.

Do you think there is some logic on the side of those who argue that we ought to make up part of the deficit but keep them on a rather short string in order to maintain leverage on our part?

Mr. Maynes. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should recognize the situation that the organization is in right now. As I have already indicated, there will be a cash shortfall of $64 million. If the Director General cannot make up that shortfall, he will have to convene an extraordinary session of UNESCO sometime this year and the result will be a very embarrassing diplomatic situation for the United States and for Israel. Such a conference will cost an additional three quarters of a million dollars for UNESCO, and beyond that the individual states will have to pay the cost of sending a delegation to this conference, the only purpose of which will be to cut programs, and this would be the result of our decision.

In terms of the amount of influence that we have over the organization, you have to remember that our contribution is 25 percent. That is a major portion of the budget. The United States is not in the position of other countries which would have to wait many years before they have the kind of leverage over the organization which we have every year, even if we are fully paid up.

Senator McGovern. I have just one additional question, Mr. Maynes.

FORD AND CARTER ADMINISTRATIONS' RECOMMENDATIONS

It is my understanding that both the Ford administration and the present administration have recommended that we make these back payments. Is that so?

Mr. MAYNES. That is correct, sir.

Senator MCGOVERN. Senator Biden?

Senator BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have no questions.

Senator MCGOVERN. Thank you, Mr. Maynes. We appreciate your testimony this morning.

The next witness is Mr. John Thomas, who is the Assistant Secretary for Administration, the Department of State.

Mr. Thomas, please proceed in any way you see fit.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. JOHN M. THOMAS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE; ACCOMPANIED BY DANIEL L. WILLIAMSON, JR., DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND FINANCE; AND DON C. ELLER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a very brief statement and would like to read it, if I may.

Mr. Chairman and Senator Biden, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of the Department's request to amend the fiscal year 1977 authorization of appropriations for our foreign buildings program.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide a net increase in authorization of appropriations to permit the Department to utilize excess foreign currency to acquire real property in Cairo, Egypt, in order to house U.S. Government personnel. Seventy-two housing units are planned for employees of the Agency for International Development and 36 units for Department of State and United States Information Agency personnel. The amount requested will be used to acquire three sites, develop plans and specifications, and construct three apartment buildings, each one containing 36 units. The total cost will be paid in local excess currency—Egyptian pounds.

There is currently available in the foreign buildings program an unused authorization of $13,925,000 for capital projects. This amount, when added to the $10,775,000 of additional authorization we are requesting, will provide a total fiscal year 1977 authorization of $24,700,000 to accommodate the full cost of completing the three apartment buildings.

There is a critical shortage of housing in Cairo and those units available are extremely costly. In addition, the relocation from Beirut of Western and Middle Eastern commercial activities has produced a severely competitive real estate market. Annual rental rates for suitable apartments are now ranging from $10,000 to $22,000.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my very brief statement.

I have with me this morning Mr. Dan Williamson, the Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget and Finance, and Mr. Don Eller, the Department's Budget Officer.

We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Senator MCGOVERN. Thank you, Mr. Thomas.

UTILIZATION OF EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCY

Senator McGovern. I notice that you suggested these new units were going to be financed with excess foreign currency. Is that currency generated under the Public Law 480 program; that is, commodity transfer?

Mr. Thomas. Primarily, sir; yes.

Senator McGovern. Do you have any idea what that account is now in Egypt, how much we have in Egyptian currency?

Mr. Thomas. As of June 30, 1976, sir, it was the U.S. equivalent of $281 million.

Senator McGovern. $281 million?

Mr. Thomas. Yes, sir.

Senator McGovern. Does the United States now purchase any Egyptian pounds with U.S. currency?

Mr. Eller. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to that?

Senator McGovern. Of course.

Mr. Eller. This appropriation, if enacted, would be used to buy the excess Egyptian pounds from the U.S. Treasury so that the dollars appropriated would not leave the United States.

Senator McGovern. But it is a way of us utilizing Egyptian currency generated under the so-called food-for-peace program?

Mr. Eller. Yes, sir.

Mr. Thomas. That's right.

EXISTING U.S. HOUSING FACILITIES IN CAIRO

Senator McGovern. Could you describe in terms of size and condition the existing U.S. housing facilities in Cairo to give us a brief overview of what we now hold?

Mr. Thomas. Yes, sir.

At the present time we have 7 office buildings, the Ambassador's residence, the Deputy Chief of Mission's residence, 6 senior officer residences, and a total of 46 staff residences and apartments. In addition, we have residences for the Public Affairs Officer, 4 attaché residences and a Marine security guard quarters.

So we do have some property, sir, but we are still woefully short of what we need to house the new people coming to Cairo under the AID program.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN U.S. PRESENCE IN EGYPT

Senator McGovern. Could you tell us a little bit more precisely what changes are in the offing as far as the U.S. presence in Egypt is concerned that necessitates additional housing?

Mr. Thomas. Yes, sir.

At the present time we have a current complement for the Department of State, USIA, the Defense Attachés, Agriculture, the Marine security guard program, and AID of approximately 137 people. The proposed complement, sir, for the same agencies in fiscal year 1978 will total approximately 213. The largest increase, sir, is in the AID complement, which is going from approximately 50 employees to a total of 125.

EXTENT OF ASSIGNED HOUSING

Senator McGovern. Under the Department's plans, do you envision that all U.S. personnel will have assigned housing?

Mr. Thomas. Sir, we will be able to take care of about 70 to 75 percent of all of those employees that I mentioned. The balance would still be in some short-term leased quarters. So this will take care of about 75 percent of them, sir.

Senator McGovern. Senator Biden, do you have any questions?

Senator Biden. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

"APPROPRIATE" HOUSING

Mr. Thomas, you said in your statement when describing the apartments being constructed, I think you used the phrase "adequate," or "appropriate" housing.

What is "appropriate" housing?

Mr. Thomas. In this case, sir, we are talking of apartments that are two-, three-, and some four-bedroom units. The largest four-bedroom apartment, sir, would be approximately 2,600 square feet. It is not an extremely large apartment by any means, sir.

PERSONNEL MOVING INTO NEW APARTMENT COMPLEXES

Senator Biden. Would the people moving into these new apartment complexes be mostly the additional AID personnel?

Mr. Thomas. We are talking about constructing a total of 108 apartments in 3 buildings with 36 units each; 2 of those buildings, or 72 of the apartments, would be for AID. The third apartment of 36 units would be for the Department of State and for USIA personnel who are currently on short-term leases, which are becoming very expensive.

Senator Biden. Not only are they very expensive, but in most instances they are not particularly attractive. Isn't that so?

Mr. Thomas. We feel that by tastefully constructing a series of apartment units of two, three, and four bedrooms, with common use facilities—that is to say, common areas where representation activities can take place—that we are in fact improving the lot of our people. However, we are not building expensive quarters such as villas, et cetera.

COMMON USE ACTIVITIES

Senator Biden. Common use activities—does that mean they will have swimming pools and tennis courts?

Mr. Thomas. No, sir. To the best of my knowledge, sir, there will not be pools. I would hope that we could put in a few tennis courts.

Senator Biden. You say that you hope to. Are they or are they not in the plans?

Mr. Thomas. I am looking now, sir.

[Pause.]

Mr. Thomas. No, sir, I do not see them on our projections.

Senator Biden. I hope you don't. You see, what happens is this. In my short tenure on the Public Works Committee, the Building and Grounds Subcommittee, we would see folks like you come in and tell

us what the cost would be, and then someone would say something like, "but we hope to do such and such." When we ask about tennis courts, they say that they hope to have them. They would have them; they would come back for a supplemental a little while later.

Over here tennis courts cost $14,000 a shot. I would imagine they would cost a little bit more over there. So I do hope you have them in your plans already before you start asking us for the money.

COMPARATIVE OPULENCE OF AID APARTMENTS

One of the things that concerns me is this. I have only been to Cairo twice and have found it in some quarters to be an ungodly looking place. Are these AID apartments going to stick out like sore thumbs as comparatively opulent buildings for our people, who are supposed to be there to help?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Senator. The facade of the buildings will blend in with the local architecture. They will not be marks of U.S. presence.

AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION PRIOR TO ARCHITECTUAL PLANS

Senator BIDEN. I will not bore the committee with details now, but do you have your architectural plans for these?

Mr. THOMAS. We are right now in the process of selecting an architectural firm. I will be unable to finish that process until I have the authorization and the appropriation for this project.

Senator BIDEN. I am curious. Do you want the authorization and appropriation first, before you get your plans, or will you plan before you get your authorizations?

Mr. THOMAS. We have tentatively selected the site, sir. We have in mind ideas of how the three 36-unit apartments would be configured, and we would hope, sir, to finalize the site acquisitions in July of 1977.

Senator BIDEN. Is this money just for site acquisition?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir. It is for site acquisition, for development of the plans and specifications, and for construction.

Senator BIDEN. How did you come up with the figure of $24 million if you don't have detailed plans? I am confused.

Mr. THOMAS. We arrived at this by beginning with an estimate of the cost of land—we sent a team out and they looked at the sites. We then took the cost of architectural and engineering fees for similar projects that we have done elsewhere. Finally, we added an estimate for construction based on current building costs in Cairo today to arrive at a total figure.

Senator BIDEN. So you know what the complex is going to look like now?

Is that the usual way of doing things? I hope we don't do it in this country that way, do we? Is that how we build buildings here? Do we appropriate money first, and then go out and get a plan?

Mr. THOMAS. In many cases, sir, yes.

Senator BIDEN. We do? No wonder we are in trouble.

Senator MCGOVERN. That's why the elevators don't work.

Senator BIDEN. That's right.

I do not wish to quibble with you. I don't know enough about your proposal to quibble, but I will probably be back in a little while doing so anyway. If we are going to appropriate money I think we

ought to know what we are doing, in light of the experiences we have had in other parts of the world, especially in the Third and Fourth World countries. We have in the past constructed facilities to house persons in the AID program, which were—at least I have been told they were—embarrassing. I am not suggesting that I know they will be here, too. But certainly before I vote for any amount of money out of this or any other committee, I would like to know what you are building, how much it will cost and what it will look like. Again, maybe I am asking too much. I don't know.

Mr. THOMAS. Senator, if I may respond, this is the first time that the Department of State, through our Foreign Buildings Operations, has undertaken a construction project for AID. We are in the throes, sir, of trying to bring the AID program into our foreign buildings program.

Senator BIDEN. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS. I can assure you, sir, in terms of the plans for these buildings, that they will be functional buildings, period.

Senator BIDEN. You would not mind if I saw them first?

Mr. THOMAS. I would not mind at all, sir. I would be happy to show the plans to you.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate Mr. Thomas's responses.

Senator MCGOVERN. Mr. Thomas, I think Senator Biden is doubtless on sound ground in suggesting that we know as much as possible about the nature of these building authorizations.

SWIMMING POOL AND TENNIS COURTS SUGGESTED

Speaking for myself, however, I hope you do put in a swimming pool out there, and also a tennis court. I think it is important to have our Foreign Service officers stay in good shape. You cannot swim in the Nile River; you will get sick. There is a disease out there, bilharziasis, that you get if you even stick your hand in that river.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Senator MCGOVERN. So I hope we have a swimming pool to keep these people in good phyical shape, and also some tennis courts so that they can maintain some physical strength. They are going to need it in that post.

But the point may be well taken that it would be a good thing for us to know a little bit more about the nature of the plans. Maybe at some point you could detail the nature of these expenditures. I don't think you will have trouble getting things like that approved if we know about it.

The point Senator Biden was making is that it is embarrassing when we approve these things and do not know what we are approving.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that fully, sir.

Senator BIDEN. If the Chairman would yield for a moment, that is exactly the point that I was making.

I have no objection really to building a swimming pool, tennis courts, or a gymnasium. I don't care. But I do have objections to what happens, as for example, when I was on the Public Works Committee.

Time and again Federal officials would come in and talk about the construction of a building, and ask for a certain dollar amount; and time and again we would find out after the fact that certain aspects of the building, which were intended to be incorporated at a later date, weren't in the first appropriation. Then they would say to us that if we remembered, they had said they wanted to put in a swimming pool, that they had hoped they would have a pool or a tennis court. "Well," they would say, "that is another $195,000 Senator, that we did not tell you about because we did not know the cost at the time."

That is all I mean. I, too, want our Foreign Service officers to stay in great shape.

PROVISIONAL ESTIMATES FOR CAIRO APARTMENTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will submit for the record the provisional estimates for the Cairo apartments, which detail the apartment units, the common areas, all of the service areas that we plan, and the dollar cost. If that would be helpful, I would be very happy to put that into the record.

Senator MCGOVERN. If you put the pool in, I hope it will be better than the one we have here in the Senate. There was a recent article about the "imperial Congress" and its "fancy" swimming pool. For your information, it is 4 feet deep at the deepest part, and I think it is probably 30 feet long. You can hardly turn around in it. It is little better than a bathtub, and not much better than some I have seen. So I hope you do better than that.

If you would be kind enough to send us that information that you just mentioned, we are sure it will be helpful.

[The information referred to follows:]

BASIS OF CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE FOR CAIRO APARTMENTS

[Supplied by Department of State]

In November 1976, during discussions in Cairo with contractors engaged in the construction of apartment buildings, departmental officers were advised that:

(*a*) the cost for apartment construction ranged in price per square meter from $144 to $270, or $13.40 to $25 per square foot. The minimum price quoted was for a building utilizing all Egyptian building materials. The maximum price was for a building utilizing local and imported building materials, and imported plumbing fixtures, light fixtures, hardware, flooring, and other mechanical equipment, and

(*b*) construction costs had increased 20 percent in one year, and there were no indications that the present inflationary trend would abate.

Based on this information and inspection of several apartment buildings, both under construction and completed, it was determined that U.S. quality construction could only be acheived for the maximum estimated cost per square foot. Also, a factor for the rampant annual inflation would have to be added. Finally, an increment would have to be included to cover installation of air conditioning systems, hot water systems, and other contingencies. Conseqently, since site acquisition and architectural services have to be completed before actual construction can begin and since it is anticipated that the award of construction contracts will be in December 1978, the $25-per-square-foot estimate has been increased to $50 per square foot.

However, since site acquisition and architectural services have to be completed before actual construction can begin, and since we anticipate the award of construction contracts in December 1978, the $25-per-square-foot estimate has been increased to $40 per square foot, with $10 per square foot added to cover installation of air conditioning systems, hot water systems, and other contingencies.

The resultant average construction cost per apartment is, therefore, $166,667, exclusive of site and design costs. The latter two costs average $54,167 and $16,667 per apartment, respectively. The total average cost per unit is $237,500. Recently, single family dwellings, containing approximately 3,000 gross square feet of space, offered to the Embassy for purchase, carried price tags of approximately $320,000. This equates to $107 per square foot. However, the supply of such houses is extremely limited and insufficient for our requirements.

It is estimated that site acquisitions can be finalized by July 1977, with architectural services completed in August 1978. Construction is scheduled for completion in August 1981, and building occupancy planned for October 1981.

Senator McGovern. I guess those are all the questions we have for you, Mr. Thomas. Thank you for coming this morning.

Mr. Thomas. Mr. Chairman and Senator Biden, we thank you.

Senator Biden. Thank you.

Senator McGovern. We are happy to welcome to the committee now Ms. Patricia Derian, who is the Coordinator-Designate for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. Ms. Derian happens to be an old friend of mine, so I am especially glad to welcome her here this morning.

It's nice to see you, Patricia.

Please feel free to proceed in any way you wish.

STATEMENT OF MS. PATRICIA DERIAN, COORDINATOR-DESIGNATE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE; ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES L. CARLIN, DEPUTY COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AND MIGRATION AFFAIRS; E. AVERY ADAMS, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS; AND SHEPARD C. LOWMAN, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM AND ASYLUM DIVISION, REFUGEE AND MIGRATION AFFAIRS

Ms. Derian. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do believe I am getting old as I need to get my glasses on.

Mr. Chairman and Senator Biden, I am very pleased to appear before the committee this morning. I would like to introduce the people who are with me.

On my far left is Mr. Shepard Lowman, who is the Director for the Program and Asylum Division of the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs. Mr. James Carlin is seated next to him, and he is the Deputy Coordinator for Refugee and Migration Affairs. Mr. Avery Adams is seated on my right, and he is the Executive Director of the Office of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

We are here today to request additional authorizing legislation in the amount of $15,725,000 in the current fiscal year. The supplemental authorization now being sought will continue two ongoing programs of assistance to refugees.

SOVIET REFUGEES NOT GOING TO ISRAEL

An authorization and subsequent appropriation of $8,325,000 for the first program will provide assistance during the second, third, and

fourth quarters of calendar year 1977 to refugees from the Soviet Union going to countries other than Israel. During 1973 and 1974, refugees not going to Israel were assisted by funds made available in the special appropriations for Soviet refugees. However, toward the end of 1974, and in both 1975 and 1976, the amounts available from special appropriations were insufficient to assist the increased numbers not going to Israel, and additional funding was necessary.

In late 1974, a Presidential transfer of $5 million of foreign assistance funds was made available pursuant to section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962. Of this transfer, $1.5 million was used in 1974 to augment $5.7 million from the special appropriation for Soviet refugees, and $3.5 million was used in 1975 to agument the $4.8 million provided under the special appropriation. In 1976, $3 million from the special Soviet refugee appropriation was augmented by $5.3 million from the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.

While the total annual number of Soviet refugees has dropped from the 1973 of 35,200, these refugees in recent years have increasingly chosen resettlement locations other than Israel, principally the United States. Unlike previous years, however, funds from the fiscal year 1977 special appropriation of $15 million for Soviet refugees are not authorized to assist those refugees who do not go to Israel. Accordingly, a fiscal year 1977 supplemental request for $10,325,000 for Soviet refugees not going to Israel was submitted to Congress in September, 1976, but was not acted upon prior to adjournment. Because most of the funds made available earlier for this program had been used up by the end of December 1976, the President approved the use of $2 million from the emergency fund to assist the refugees during the first months of calendar year 1977, while the present authorizing legislation and related appropriation in the amount of $8,325,000 are being considered.

INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

An authorization of $7,400,000 and an appropriation of a like amount for the second program constitute a portion of the U.S. contribution to the programs assisting Indochinese refugees under the general administration of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). As in the case of the Soviet refugee program which I just discussed, assistance to Indochinese refugees has been funded previously from a special appropriation and emergency funds.

However, the special appropriation for Indochinese refugees expired on June 30, 1976, and the limited emergency fund is more properly employed for unexpected, rather than ongoing problems. And the problem indeed remains: Approximately 80,000 refugees, most of whom are in Thailand in camps provided by the Royal Thai Government, are in need of assistance. Through 1976, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, with international contributions, and the Thai Government, with in-kind assistance, jointly funded a program of assistance of over $24 million to refugees in the camps, and it appears that the 1977 program in Thailand will total approximately $22 million. Another $5 million will be used for Indochinese in Southeast Asia, and for resettlement travel expenses, so the total UNHCR program for 1977 will amount to nearly $27 million.

The Thai Government will continue for 1977 an in-kind contribution, primarily in lands and services, which it values at $12 million. The international community, we expect, will contribute up to $5 million, and the U.S. contribution will help make up the balance.

Overall for 1977, the U.S. contribution for Indochinese refugee assistance is envisioned at $10 million, portions of which have already been made.

A $500,000 contribution was made to the UNHCR late in 1976, from residual emergency funds for Laotian refugees, and limited to the support of Lao refugee camps. On January 20, the President approved a $2.1 million drawdown from the emergency fund. We consider that this initial 1977 U.S. contribution of $2.6 million will meet the costs of vital UNHCR operations including provision of a minimal subsistence level for refugees in camps for the first quarter only. An authorization of U.S. funding for the balance of 1977 is requested at this time.

ONGOING NATURE OF PROGRAMS

Assistance to Soviet refugees not going to Israel and Indochinese refugees are not new programs. An authorization approved by this committee will support our proposal to fund these programs as a part of ongoing migration and refugee assistance activities. Regular funding is a preferable course rather than the continued use of emergency funds since assistance to these refugees can no longer be properly described as unforeseen or unexpected emergencies.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This concludes my prepared statement. We would be glad to answer any questions you may have.

REFUGEE PROGRAMS RELATING TO EASTERN EUROPE AND SOVIET UNION

Senator McGovern. As I understand it, we have three programs that relate to refugees from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. One is referred to as the U.S. refugee program, one is the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and the third is U.S. Assistance for Israel-Bound Refugees.

Since they are all directed at the same purpose, assisting refugees from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, what is the relationship between those three programs? How do they dovetail and what is the reason for three separate programs?

Ms. Derian. Mr. Carlin?

Mr. Carlin. Mr. Chairman, if I may, the U.S. program for assisting with the absorption of Soviet refugees in Israel started in 1973, at the initiative of Congress, and Congress has been making special appropriations for that activitiy each year since. The program is designed to assist those Soviet refugees going to Israel. It includes care and maintenance in Vienna, when the refugees are en route. When they arrive in Israel, the program covers training, retraining, housing, medical services—things of that nature.

Senator McGovern. None of that money can be used to finance refugees moving to any place other than Israel; is that right?

Mr. Carlin. It could, sir, until this year.

Effective this year Congress restricted the use of that special appropriation to those Soviet refugees going to Israel. So, therefore, we are coming to the committee today to seek authority for supplemental funding for those Soviet refugees going to destinations other than Israel.

Senator McGovern. I guess the problem is that increasing numbers of the refugees leaving the Soviet Union are, in fact, going elsewhere, rather than to Israel.

Mr. Carlin. You are quite right, sir. About 50 percent of the Soviet refugees coming out with end destinations for Israel are now breaking off in Vienna and seeking resettlement in countries other than Israel.

If I could just respond now to the other two parts of your question, sir. You mentioned the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. That is an international entity which the U.S. Governernment, along with Belgium founded in 1951. It is essentially in business to effect the movement of refugees and migrants. It is an international operation which the United States and 32 other governments support for the purpose of effecting the resettlement of refugees and migrants.

You also made reference to the U.S. refugee program. That is the program under which we assist refugees from Communist dominated countries. We are now endeavoring to bring the Soviet activities—those Soviets going to destinations other than Israel—under the U.S. refugee program.

COMPARATIVE U.S. AND EUROPEAN SUPPORT FOR PROGRAMS

Senator McGovern. How do U.S. expenditures for these programs of assistance compare with what the European countries are doing?

Do we have information on that?

Ms. Derian. For the Indochinese, Japan, Germany, the Netherlands, Canada, Norway, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, the Philippines, and New Zealand pay about $5 million. The Thais contributed $12 million of in-kind services and we paid the balance.

For the Soviet programs—I don't have that information right here.

Mr. Carlin, do you have it?

Mr. Carlin. For the Soviet program, sir, the U.S. Government and the Israeli Government are the two principal supporters—certainly for those going to Israel. With respect to those going to destinations other than Israel, principally the United States, we finance the greatest part of that activity. However, with respect to transportation of Soviet refugees through ICEM—that migration organization to which you referred—other governments do contribute limited amounts.

COMPARATIVE EXPENDITURES FOR ISRAEL-BOUND AND OTHER REFUGEES

Senator McGovern. How do the per capita expenditures for Israel-bound refugees compare to what we are doing for other refugees?

Do you have those figures?

Mr. CARLIN. Well, sir, owing to the nature of the program in Israel, the absorption of the Soviet refugees, the per capita cost is substantially higher. I think it is somewhere between $40,000 to $50,000 per refugee family unit. It involves housing, training, retraining, care and maintenance, scholarships, etc.

So, it involves substantially greater amounts on a per capita basis than the program of assistance to those Soviet refugees going to destinations other than Israel. I think the per capita for the others is currently ranging between $1,000 and $1,200.

Senator MCGOVERN. I am not sure I heard you right. What is the per capita expenditure on refugees to Israel?

Mr. CARLIN. As I say, sir, because it involves housing, training, and retraining, and a lot of services which the average refugees to other destinations do not receive, it is a very substantial amount. I think it is in excess of $40,000 per refugee family unit. The per capita cost of assisting those going to destinations other than Israel which merely involves their temporary care and maintenance in the asylum area, resettlement documentation, laguage training, and eventually their transportation is considerably less—approximately $1,000–$1,200 per capita.

Senator MCGOVERN. So there is really a very dramatic difference in the cost of the program in Israel as against what we are doing elsewhere.

You are comparing a $40,000 to $50,000 per family unit expenditure to something in the area of $1,000 per capita.

Mr. CARLIN. That is quite right, sir.

Senator BIDEN. Would the Chairman yield?

Senator MCGOVERN. Yes, I yield.

Senator BIDEN. Following up on that point, more and more of these refugees are opting in Vienna to head west to the United States. Are we spending approximately $1,200 per refugee, even for those who are coming to the United States?

Mr. CARLIN. That is correct, Senator Biden.

Those choosing resettlement in countries other than Israel normally move from Vienna to Italy, where they spend a few months while awaiting immigration processing.

While they are in Italy, we—the USRP—assist them through a network of voluntary agencies with their care and maintenance, resettlement documentation, counseling, language training, and when they are visaed, we finance their transportation to the United States.

Senator BIDEN. I see.

COMPARATIVE UNITED STATES AND ISRAELI REFUGEE SERVICE PROGRAMS

Are you aware of any domestic programs not funded through refugee programs that would extend the same kinds of services offered in Israel to refugees? Are there any which offer those kinds of services here in the United States?

I am trying to compare not only the dollar amount expended, but whether or not a refugee coming from the Soviet Union to the United States is given as much time and attention and concern as a refugee going from the Soviet Union to Israel.

Is there any way of comparing that? I realize that would not be all reflected in that budget. Do you know anything about this?

Mr. CARLIN. Sir, each of the Soviet refugees coming to the United States is sponsored by an American voluntary agency representing one of the principal religious or nationality groups in this country. When that agency sponsors the refugee, they give assurances that housing will be provided for that individual, that employment will be found for him, and that he will not become a public charge.

So, through a network of voluntary agencies, a variety of services are provided to the refugees. In the case of Israel, the situation is quite different. Congress, in its wisdom, decided that there was a need for a considerable amount of absorption assistance for the Soviets going to that country.

Senator BIDEN. I understand.

I will not belabor the point, but is there any way to accurately reflect the amount of per capita expenditure by American volunteer agencies on Soviet refugees? Has anyone ever attempted to measure that? Does anybody know?

Mr. CARLIN. Sir, we will endeavor to provide something for the record on that point, if we may. It varies from voluntary agency to voluntary agency, because they operate somewhat differently.

Senator BIDEN. I would imagine that it varies from locality to locality, too.

Mr. CARLIN. Quite true, sir.

Senator BIDEN. I would be curious, in round figures as to whether or not the expenditure was anywhere near what it is. After all, $40,000 to $50,000 per family unit is a great deal of money.

We would thank you for that information.

[The information referred to follows:]

COMPARATIVE SPENDING ON SOVIET REFUGEES

[Supplied by Department of State]

As indicated in our previous remarks, the amount expended on a Soviet refugee in the United States varies from voluntary agency to voluntary agency depending upon their operating methods, from locality to locality, and indeed from refugee to refugee depending upon his trade or profession, his knowledge of the English language, etc. The expenditures of the voluntary agencies on resettling a Soviet refugee in the United States range from a few hundred to $2,000 to $3,000 per capita.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FIGURES OF $40,000 TO $50,000

Senator MCGOVERN. One thing that confuses me on that $40,000 to $50,000 figure is this. I understand the Department's projections. You had $15 million for this program for the Israeli-bound refugees, and the Department projects only about 7,000 refugees. If you divide 7,000 into $15 million, it comes out to $2,000 per person. How do we arrive at this figure of $40,000 to $50,000?

Mr. CARLIN. Sir, the Soviet refugees arriving in Israel receive, among other things, an apartment. A considerable amount of money has been expended in Israel on housing. While the amount for the current year is $15 million, in 1973 I think it was $50 million, and in 1974 it was some $30 million, et cetera. So there have been substantial amounts of money appropriated and made available for this purpose

over the last few years—since 1973. The $15 million amount for 1977 does not necessarily relate in terms of housing and other services to the 7,000 arrivees there in the current year.

DROP IN REFUGEE EXPENDITURES

Senator McGovern. The per capita expenditures by your own calculations are going to drop very dramatically in the coming fiscal year. If the Department estimates that you have 7,000 refugees go to Israel in calendar 1977 and you only have a $20 million supplemental, you are talking then about expenditures of less than $3,000 per refugee.

Mr. Carlin. I would add the point, sir, that the money that the U.S. Government makes available for this program is supplemented with funds from the Jewish Agency for Israel. It is a combined effort. Those two sources provide the funds for the various types of absorption services in Israel.

Senator McGovern. Yes, I see.

I have a few questions on the Indochina refugee program.

ASSISTANCE TO INDOCHINESE REFUGEES IN THAILAND

What is the assistance that is now being provided to Indochinese refugees in Thailand? What is the nature of that assistance?

Ms. Derian. They are mostly in camps.

Go ahead, Mr. Carlin. Would you answer that, please?

Mr. Carlin. The nature of the assistance in Thailand is principally care and maintenance—shelter, food, water, medical attention, counseling, and documentation and processing for resettlement for those who choose to be resettled abroad. In the current year the program also involves some projects designed to make more of the refugees self-supporting. Lastly, there would be money for the actual resettlement and transportation for those who choose resettlement abroad.

Senator McGovern. What is the Thai Government doing to assist in this program? What is the extent of their contribution and what form does it take?

Mr. Carlin. The Thai Government is making available in-kind facilities and services amounting to approximately $12 million toward the $26.9 million program. They also provide the camps. I think there are 17 camps currently existing in Thailand. That is the nature of the Thai Government's support of the program, sir.

Senator McGovern. In addition to the United States and Thailand, are there other countries helping in the program there?

Mr. Carlin. There are, sir. It amounts to about $5 million per year.

Senator McGovern. Thank you very much.

Joe, did you have anything to ask?

Senator Biden. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

I have one more question with regard to the Thai Government's in-kind contribution estimated at $12 million.

Is that a Thai estimate, or is that ours?

Ms. Derian. It is a Thai estimate.

Senator Biden. Thank you.

Senator McGovern. Senator Baker.

Senator Baker. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions.

I apologize that I was unfortunately, though necessarily, detained at the confirmation hearings before the Public Works Committee. I am sorry I had to be late.

Senator McGovern. Senator Clark.

Senator Clark. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but I have no questions.

Senator McGovern. We thank you, Ms. Derian.

Ms. Derian. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator McGovern. Our next witness is Mr. Arnold Beichman of the University of Massachusetts.

He is testifying as a representative of the Committee for an Effective UNESCO.

Mr. Beichman, you may proceed in any way you see fit. I want to welcome you to the committee.

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD BEICHMAN, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON, MASS., REPRESENTING COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE UNESCO

Mr. Beichman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For purposes of identification, I am Arnold Beichman, associate professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts.

I was formerly a correspondent at the United Nations for about 10 years. I have also written a book which might bear on some of the hearings. It is called, "The Other State Department", and is an analysis of the U.S. Mission to the U.N. and the continuing troubles between Ambassadors and different desks of the Department of State.

I also want to say just as a citizen that when I teach my class in political science, I say that Congress has three functions: legislation, representation, and oversight. Of the three, I regard oversight as the most important. It is a pleasure to see a new subcommittee formed which will engage in what I regard as a tremendously important function.

With that, sir, may I discuss the UNESCO problem with which we are concerned.

PLANE OF DEBATE ABOUT UNESCO

Much of the debate about UNESCO is on a plane of unreality and fictitious abstraction. For example, the distinguished Assistant Secretary-Designate said in his testimony earlier, the Assistant Secretary for International Organizations, that the consequences of nonpayment of the full payment of the UNESCO appropriation would be serious and damaging.

There is no empirical data for this statement and there is no possible way of proving this. Let me add something which was said recently. I quote:

> Our withholding has brought forcefully to the attention of others the seriousness with which we view the discriminatory actions of the last General Conference. We believe this has played a role in pulling some members back from extreme positions, and overall there has been some increase in moderation in the actions by government representatives at UNESCO meetings.

That statement was made by Samuel Lewis, the predecessor of the Assistant Secretary-Designate when he, Mr. Lewis, was Assistant

Secretary for International Organizations. It was a statement that he made on June 14, 1976.

The present Director General, Mr. M'Bow, recently said,

> We must avoid those conflicts that take on the character of systematic confrontation. We should perhaps avoid even the adoption of resolutions, no matter how strong the majority behind the, that leave profound bitterness among some of us. I want to launch an urgent appeal for tolerance and understanding and seek consensus through patient dialogue.

That was a statement of Mr. M'Bow, the Director General of UNESCO, which he made in 1974. Of course, there has been very little attention paid to his request. The 1974 Conference, and even the 1976 Conference, have been a violation of what Mr. M'Bow has called for.

POLITICIZATION OF UNESCO

I think that we have to concern ourselves with the future of UNESCO not merely as UNESCO itself, but with our participation in many other international organizations. The ILO is on notice from the American Government that it will not stay in the ILO after December 1977, if its politicization continues.

UNESCO has continued, despite what seemed to be withdrawals and retreats, to be a highly politicized organization. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the media are under international attack in UNESCO, no matter that it is reported that the resolution, a very bad one, which UNESCO produced has been withdrawn. It will only be back 2 years from now.

I am particularly concerned that the permanent representative of the United States to UNESCO, Mr. William Jones, said in the Washington Post of November 30, 1976, page A–10, that he hoped that American media representatives would take an active role in drafting a declaration acceptable to both the United States and the Soviet Union. They should not leave this issue in the hands of diplomats, Jones said.

Any resolution which could be acceptable to both the United States and the Soviet Union on freedom of the press could not possibly exist in a logical world. The only way UNESCO can function successfully is if everyone checks his ideological guns at the door, if we let each other alone as a form of peaceful coexistence.

The tragedy of UNESCO, starting with 1974, is that there has been a great intrusion of ideological debate and confrontation where hitherto there had been a sort of tacit understanding that we would leave each other alone in UNESCO because educational, cultural, and scientific activities would suffer with ideological debate.

But when a draft resolution comes in sponsored by the Soviet Union which says that states are responsible for the activities in the international sphere of all mass media under their jurisdiction, that is making international law and it is legitimating the possible suppression, the possible intrusion, of governments into freedom of the press and the way a democratic press covers stories.

Never mind that this resolution has for the moment been set aside. The mere introduction of it, it seems to me, is already a violation of whatever implicit and tacit understanding there are which make possible the functioning of UNESCO.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING "TAIWAN CLIQUE"

Let me add another one which I find extremely worrisome and, that is a resolution passed by UNESCO which calls upon NGO's—nongovernmental organizations—not to have any dealings whatsoever with the "Taiwan clique" as it is called. That means it is calling upon scientists, social scientists, natural scientists to have nothing to do with scientists who happen to have Taiwanese passports.

Now this is a total violation of UNESCO's constitutional mandate. UNESCO has no right to call upon scientists, free scientists, to have no dealings with Taiwan scholars. It is another example of the intrusion of ideology into an organization which simply will not survive such confrontations, unless, of course, our government will surrender its right to exist in terms of UNESCO.

This has been so much a matter of concern that Science, the magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, has published an editorial in its November 20, 1976, issue entitled, "UNESCO's Tarnished Image." For the first time this official journal raises the possibility for new organizations for international scientific, cultural, and educational cooperation. Let me just quote a sentence:

> Since UNESCO is in the process of destroying its own usefulness, those who are interested in advancing science, culture, and education should now explore alternative avenues.

Such avenues already exist, Mr. Chairman.

LIMITED PAYMENT CALLED FOR

Our committee feels very strongly opposed to the possibility of UNESCO becoming a commissariat of education, science, and culture to be run by political commissars in whatever their guise. We are opposed to this serious and crucial change in the functioning of UNESCO, and this is the reason that we in our statement have called for a limited payment—in no way a full payment—of our contribution.

I have quoted to you what Mr. Lewis, the previous Assistant Secretary, said, which is that it does pay off to withhold payments, and I think we ought to continue on that level.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I will submit the Science article as well as an editorial from the Journal of College Science Teaching bearing on the same subject for the official record.

Senator McGovern. Thank you very much, Mr. Beichman.

[Mr. Beichman's prepared statement and the Science and Journal of College Science Teaching articles follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ARNOLD BEICHMAN, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON, COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE UNESCO

The Committee for an Effective UNESCO wishes to state clearly its position on the issue of U.S. funding of UNESCO. The Committee was organized by a group of scholars in March 1975 to provide a coordinated means by which the American intellectual community could voice concern about UNESCO's increased politicization and act responsibly to help assure the Organization's return to legitimacy as a universal instrument for genuine international cooperation.

On December 20, 1976, we issued a statement which recommended that the United States Government pay to UNESCO the 1975 assessed contribution in

arrears, and withhold any further payments until there is clear evidence that further concrete steps are being taken to depoliticize the Organization. This decision was based upon unanimous conviction, following the Nairobi 19th General Conference of UNESCO, that partial reinstatement of U.S. contributions would (1) encourage the UN agency to continue working in a constructive direction, and would (2) continue to give to the U.S. the ability to exercise the influence it must have in order to ensure that this constructive direction is followed. We stated then that the U.S. pays a substantial percentage of the cost of UNESCO and that under the right circumstances it is money well spent, but that under the wrong circumstances it would be a subsidy to political discrimination, to scientific and cultural division and impotence. We emphasized that nothing would do more to thwart that purpose than to give a blank check to political assaults on the United States, its friends and allies, and on the principles of universality in educational, scientific and cultural endeavors.

Subsequently, in support of President Ford's request of December 29, 1976, Secretary of State Vance, for President Carter, requested that Congress not only restore all arrearages owed to UNESCO, but pay also future assessments for fiscal years 1977 and 1978. This request for Congressional authorization and appropriation of the sum of $97.4 million is based upon certification by the President that the conditions of Section 9(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 have been met.

We will take the liberty of reviewing briefly the legislation mandating the withholding of funds for UNESCO and the history of events leading to the legislation, so that our Committee's unequivocal objection to the Administration's request, and the reasons given in the Secretary of State's letter of February 3, 1977, to justify the request, will be clear.

Section 9(h) of the 1974 Foreign Assistance Act declares that no funds will be paid to UNESCO until the President certifies that the Organization:

"(1) has adopted policies which are fully consistent with its education, scientific, and cultural objectives, and

"(2) has taken concrete steps to correct its recent actions of a primarily political character."

This decisive action by Congress in 1975 was a direct response to the adoption by the 18th UNESCO General Conference in Paris of three resolutions condemning the State of Israel, resolutions which were acknowledged by Congress and the international public as manifestly political and detrimental to UNESCO's constitutional aims. The resolutions concerned (1) the protection of cultural property in Jerusalem; (2) Israel's membership in the European group of UNESCO for the purposes of regional activities, and (3) national education and cultural life in the occupied territories.

Therefore, the legislation refers specifically to the 1974 actions. The conditions established *before* funding for UNESCO can be resumed must be met primarily by repeal of the relevant 1974 resolutions against Israel.

As an indisputable result of the leverage borne by the U.S. cut-off of money and the international intellectual community's censure of UNESCO's 1974 actions, Israel has been restored to full UNESCO membership. At the 1976 General Conference she was admitted to the European region. Thus, but one concrete step pertinent to Section 9(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act has been taken to correct the politically inspired actions by the 1974 General Conference. Given that earlier anti-Israel resolutions were confirmed in Nairobi, and that another resolution was adopted in violation of UNESCO's constitutional mandate, which calls upon all international non-governmental organizations to bar Taiwan scholars from participation, it is erroneous to assert that the Organization has adopted policies which are fully consistent with its educational, scientific and cultural objectives. Although the odious linking of Zionism with racism was "put aside" and the issue of state control of the mass media was postponed, these can hardly be viewed as major steps forward.

To state these as indications of real progress in light of the other steps taken backward is unrealistic. We will elaborate on why we believe there has been insufficient movement to justify the optimism avowed in the State Department's memorandum of February 3.

The 1974 General Conference resolution on the Jerusalem issue condemned Israel for "its persistance in altering the historical features of Jerusalem" during excavations, subsequent to its "illegal occupation" of the City. It requested the Director-General to withhold assistance from Israel until that State respects the General Conference resolutions. Since June 1969, the Director-General has dispatched expert representatives to inspect the situation in Jerusalem. A UNESCO

presence in Jerusalem was instituted with the appointment, in Spring 1974, of Raymond Lemaire, Professor of Architecture at the University of Louvain an Secretary-General of the International Council of Monuments and Cities. Lemaire's report (Spring 1974) did not substantiate the claims that the continuing excavations posed a danger to religious and cultural monuments and that "some of the criticisms that have been leveled at the methods used in the excavations are groundless," and concluded that the excavations were being carried out by qualified experts and that "The same care is expended on the preservation of remains of the Ommiad palaces as on those of the Herodian period."

Despite Arab charges of non-cooperation and nonimplementation of resolutions, UNESCO's Director-General was of the opinion that he had implemented the mandate by the arrangement with Israeli authorities to establish a UNESCO presence in Jerusalem. Thus, it is apparent that, again, political considerations were the overriding factor in the 1976 reconfirmed resolution on Jerusalem at Nairobi. The evidence did not substantiate the repetition of the unprecedented move to sanction a member by withholding cultural aid.

The sanctions issue must be questioned on the ground that no provision exists in the UNESCO Constitution for the suspension, by the General Conference, of the rights and privileges of a Member State for failure to comply with UNESCO General Conference and Executive Board resolutions. This issue was not addressed at the 1976 session. Thus, although the constitutional legality of this measure remains in question, the General Conference nonetheless reinstated this sanction against Israel.

Following the 1974 General Conference resolution condemning Israel's educational and cultural policies in the occupied territories, UNESCO's Deputy Director-General Mr. Fobes had stated that its implementation would not be undertaken without further study and interpretation, including contacts with the parties involved. No new evidence was submitted for re-evaluation at the Nairobi Conference, yet the 1976 General Conference renewal of the 1974 resolution notes with concern information received from various sources," that the Arabs in the territories are not enjoying their inalienable rights. The resolution, which calls for implementation of "full supervision" was still based on the 1974 Director-General's Report, despite the criticism and conflict of opinion leveled at this Report in 1974.

Therefore, the resolution represents "conviction without trial," the denial of due process. Thus, the Committee remains very discouraged on the Arab education issue.

Concerning then the crucial matter of U.S. financial participation in UNESCO we would like to reaffirm our position that limited partial payment only should be authorized at this time. May we refer you to a February 1977 report on U.S. Participation in International Organizations by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, in which an exhaustive investigation of 65 international organizations to which the U.S. belongs is discussed. In a section on U.S. policy with respect to UNESCO it is noted on page 9 that "For the United States to retain its vote in UNESCO meetings, Congress must approve a minimum payment this year of about $23 million." Under UNESCO's charter a country remains in good standing if it is no more than two years in arrears of assessed contributions. There is absolutely no validity to the statement that the U.S. has a treaty obligation to pay all of its past, current and future assessed share of UNESCO's costs.

It is our assessment that stringent standards of performance must be established by UNESCO to eliminate all possible avenues or opportunities for political opportunism and abuse before the U.S. can in good conscience provide the full support of its government and its scholars. Either UNESCO is an instrument of politics, or it is an instrument of international collaboration for the promotion of peace and universal well-being.

The UNESCO Executive Board has ample opportunity to demonstrate which it will be. The Organization, through this implementing body, can, as early as the spring of this year, take additional concrete steps to ensure depoliticization. Our Committee supports further U.S. funding on this basis.

Let us put this matter in a broader perspective. The real point is that UNESCO, like its parallel international organizations, is an affirmation of the current needs and values of the world community, as opposed to the political divisions represented in the UN General Assembly and Security Council. It is not merely that this resolution or that is objectionable. It is the general principle that

UNESCO, the World Health Organization or the World Meteorological Organization should not be used as instruments of extraneous political conflicts. It is not merely that this resolution or that should be fended off or postponed to another session, or even repealed. It should be understood and agreed that such resolutions not be considered, they are *ultra vires*. It is ridiculous in view of the real needs served by UNESCO and the other international organizations that their time should be wasted with extraneous issues.

What happens at UNESCO has served and will continue to serve as a precedent for the other organizations. Already in WHO, attempts have been made to expel Israel on trumped-up political charges—even though epidemics and diseases know nothing of national boundaries.

The political neutrality and universality of international organizations represent not only a necessity for their proper function, but also represent symbolisms for peace and friendship. They are striking affirmations that mankind has unifying values and needs, to be remembered in times of strife.

In conclusion, we would like to comment on the issue of African support of the U.S. versus African alliance with the Arabs as raised in the aforementioned State Department memo.

We are, at best, dismayed, at worst, shocked, by the implications of the statements bearing upon the supposed shifting loyalties of the African states. We are warned that if we do not pay up, the Africans will remain neither our friends or allies in the cause of UNESCO's depoliticization and restored integrity, not Israel's. Is it State's contention that the support of Israel's admission to the UNESCO European region, and on that of freedom of the press, was so devoid of principle or of genuine desire to save UNESCO from further destruction by political malevolance that the Africans would easily abandon continued effort to depoliticize the Organization? We consider this view a disservice to the black Africans.

Even more, to allege that by withholding funds we invite renewed Arab efforts to isolate Israel and encourage attacks upon the U.S. is to affirm that UNESCO is hostage to the political caprice of the Arab nations. Thus it follows that we must surrender to the political gamesmanship of the Arabs and to political blackmail.

The U.S. cannot underwrite immoral and illegal actions of international organizations for fear of losing points in the international arena. In no way can the U.S. be accused of practicing financial blackmail if it refuses to subsidize UNESCO's politicization.

The optimum way for the U.S. to aid the Africans and other members of the Third World is to see to it that there is a complete turnaround in UNESCO's politicization so that it can again attract international scholars and experts who will help the Organization to carry out educational, scientific and cultural programs designed to benefit humankind.

[From Science 26 November 1976, Volume 194, Number 4268]

[From Science, Nov. 26, 1976]

UNESCO'S TARNISHED IMAGE

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco) was formed in 1946 amid high optimism and with excellent sponsorship. Eleanor Roosevelt was a key figure in the early years, and Archibald MacLeish voiced the hopes of many when he said, "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. . . ."

With the passage of years Unesco's image began to tarnish. Although its financial support was derived from the advanced countries, its biennial General Conference came to be dominated by politicians from the Third World, who have little knowledge of what science is all about and who have taken political steps injurious to Unesco's objectives. Illustrative of these were actions taken 2 years ago designed to diminish the status of Israel.

During the current General Conference at Nairobi there has been a softening of the stand toward Israel. However, there has been a new ugly manifestation of politics.

The General Conference has adopted a resolution designed to intimidate the nongovernmental organizations (NGO's) such as the International Council of Scientific Unions. The resolution that has been adopted—

"requests all the international nongovernmental organizations which maintain relations with Unesco and retain bodies or elements linked with the Chiang

clique and having illegally usurped the name of China or using any other names, to take measures to exclude these bodies or elements immediately and to break off all relations with them."

Also implicit in the resolution is the threat to withdraw intellectual cooperation and financial support from the NGO's. Thus Unesco attempts to dictate the countries or geographical areas from which the NGO's may obtain their experts or members.

These latter organizations generally eschew intergovernmental politics, recognizing their divisive nature and their tendency to destroy other types of human pursuits—such as science and culture—which draw people together rather than drive them apart. Such nonpolitical activities are conductive to transnational cooperation in fields which promote international amity and which enrich the quality of life.

Since Unesco is in process of destroying its own usefulness, those who are interested in advancing science, culture, and education should now explore alternative avenues.

For example, in the sciences there are many nongovernmental organizations dedicated to international cooperation. One complex of such bodies, the International Council of Scientific Unions, recently met at the National Academy of Sciences (*Science*, 5 November, p. 587). Part of the support for ICSU comes from the advanced countries via Unesco. Such support should now be furnished directly.

In addition to ICSU there are new instrumentalities which deserve trial and greater public awareness. One is the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, the multinational, nongovernmental, East-West research center outside Vienna, Austria. which only 4 years after its inception is showing substantial promise in multidisciplinary exploration of problems to mankind. Still newer is the European Science Foundation, which is composed of representatives of some 45 scientific institutions—research councils, academies, and so forth—from 16 Western European countries. Apart from these existing bodies, thought should be given to the creation of new organizations to perform the tasks which Unesco is abandoning for politics. Further, governments that now contribute large amounts of funds to Unesco would do well to examine whether such funds would not go further in advancing international cooperation in education, science, and culture if invested elsewhere.

The Third World should be made aware that it risks losing both financial support and, more important, intellectual cooperation.—PHILIP H. ABELSON.

[From the Journal of College Science Teaching, March–April, 1977]

EDITORIAL

(By Leo Schubert, Editor)

Politicization of an organization formed for cooperation in science is undoubtedly the prelude to its death. This seems to be what is happening to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO was formed in 1946 "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture . . . ." Politicization of an organization is the antithesis of collaboration. Yet this is what has happened to UNESCO. Many societies, including the National Academy of Sciences (unanimous Council resolution, April 1975), American Association for the Advancement of Science (unanimous Council resolution, February 1975), and the National Science Teachers Association (Executive Council, December 1974) have taken the unusual step of condemning recent UNESCO political acts.

While UNESCO's political waters have never been calm, the recent past has seemed more turbulent. It started in November 1974 when the cultural committee passed a resolution calling on Israel to halt its archeological diggings in Jerusalem as well as any other activities that might alter the city's "features in its cultural or historical character." Hard upon this was its withholding from Israel of $12,000 a year in cultural grants. The resolution is nominally a reasonable one but it is in face of praise received previously from UNESCO inspection teams. Of course, these teams were comprised of professional scientists, not politically motivated persons. Subsequent to this action, UNESCO excluded

Israel from the European grouping of members. The issue is fairly inconsequential but it has the effect of isolating Israel from any grouping of nations within UNESCO.

There have been other anti-Israel resolutions that have been passed by UNESCO. For example, the equating of Zionism and racism is one. But these anti-Israeli resolutions are not the sole evidence of UNESCO's politicization process. South Africa was condemned as "illegitimate," and outside countries were authorized to help blacks seize power by "armed struggle." The U.S. delegate described this as "tantamount to a call for an uprising in South Africa which would in effect be a racial bloodbath." Latin America was selected by UNESCO for a conference on "Communications Policies for Latin America and the Caribbean" during June 1976. The draft resolution read; "States are responsible for the activities in the international sphere of all mass media under their jurisdiction."—a blatant attempt at media censorship.

UNESCO recently backed away from media censorship at its November 1976 meeting and has altered somewhat its anti-Israeli stand. But political pressure has not lessened; only its direction has changed. A resolution was adopted that would compel nongovernmental organizations such as the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) to "take measures to exclude (elements linked with the Chiang clique . . .) immediately and to break off all relations with them." Those of us in science education know and value the excellent work done by ICSU.

The United States normally pays for a quarter of UNESCO's budget. Unless it pays $70 million, its 1977 assessment and one year's arrears, UNESCO will be in serious financial difficulties. If the United States does not pay next year, it will forfeit its voting rights. For UNESCO to raise the money in some other way would require an extraordinary general conference.

It seems that UNESCO has permitted politics rather than culture to be its principal concern. As Nobel Laureate Kenneth Arrow observed in 1975, UNESCO will be reduced "to a position of historial irrelevance." This may have already happened. It may be prudent for this country to withhold funds from UNESCO and allocate money directly to such nonpolitical organizations as ICSU, IUPAC, and other international scientific and cultural organizations rather than route money through the political channels of UNESCO. The recent past of UNESCO suggests that its future is very dim.

[From The International Herald Tribune, Oct. 5, 1976]

Leninism and the Charter of Unesco

(By Arnold Beichman)

Paris—The main auditorium of Moscow University carries the slogan:

"A Leninist cannot simply be a specialist in his favorite branch of science . . . he must be an active participant in the political leadership of his country."

Such an assertion of a mandatory political obligation upon a scientist could not—to state the obvious—be made by the government of any democratic, pluralist country. If by chance it were made, no scientist would pay it the slightest heed.

The Soviet Union approach to the arts and sciences is quite simple: no inherent right exists for anybody to do his own intellectual thing unless there is party approval.

DOCUMENT ACCEPTED

Yet the U.S.S.R. accepted the constitution of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization more than three decades ago. That document proclaims Unesco's purpose—"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 people of the world. . ."

About 140 other countries have also signed this charter, most of whom have peculiar definitions for "the rule of law and for human rights and fundamental freedoms." By any democratic standard, however narrow, there is neither justice nor rule of law nor inherent human rights in the Soviet Union.

Quite rightly the Soviet cultural attaché in Paris could argue that such concepts are defined differently in Russia, by proletarian, not bourgeois or capitalist-imperialist, standards. Yet there sits the Unesco Charter, which also provides in its preamble that the signatories believe "in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge. . ." But Leninism spurns the very idea of "objective truth" and Russia repudiates, Helsinki or not, "the free exchange of ideas and knowledge."

These paragraphs constitute a longish preface to a report on a one-day conference Saturday at the Paris Hilton, of some 200 academics, scientists, writers and other intellectuals from the still free world, on the issue: what should independent intellectuals do about Unesco?

CATALYTIC EVENT

The catalytic event for last week's meeting occurred in October, 1974, when Israel, a Unesco member state, was barred by majority vote from participation in Unesco activities. From that day Unesco has been under fire, particularly in U.S. and European intellectual circles. The all-day debate at the meeting, held under the auspices of the Committee for the Universality of Unesco, revolved around three questions:

Should intellectuals continue to participate in Unesco events, as they had before 1974, or should further boycotts be encouraged?

Should a campaign be organized to press democratic countries to withdraw from Unesco and form a "Unesco Two," something proposed by several speakers?

Should a worldwide campaign be undertaken to secure reversal of the anti-Israeli vote in Unesco, a campaign to be pursued at the three-week Unesco general conference in Nairobi.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The answers to these questions were embodied in a resolution passed unanimously by the conference. Prepared by Raymond Aron, the resolution called for a permanent committee to undertake a watching brief over Unesco activities as well as those of other UN specialized agencies like the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization, where the Soviet bloc and the Arab countries with some African countries have overwhelming numerical majorities. The resolution also warned that these agencies were on their way to "disintegration."

The U.S. government has already given notice, under AFL–CIO prodding, that it will withdraw from the ILO by 1977 unless the ILO stops harassing Israel and twisting the ILO charter to make life difficult for other democratic countries.

What the conference didn't even try to answer is how is it really possible for countries with diametrically opposed cultures, beliefs and political ambitions and with clashing views on almost every conceivable issue to belong to the same organizations—like Unesco and ILO—while proclaiming a faithful adherence to the charter of both. The answer, of course, is that for years everybody left everybody else alone and didn't engage in war *à outrance*.

Thus Unesco published a booklet in 1962 by two Soviet experts under the Unesco imprint—titled, "Equality of Rights between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." It is full of lies. One example: "In 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic republics (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) which voluntarily joined the union." There are worse lies but Unesco published it with no repercussions.

MORAL NICETIES

One can understand that governments may and probably should belong to the same international political organization—the UN itself, for example—without regard for moral niceties. After all, at the same time in October, 1956, that the UN General Assembly was forcing, with U.S. and Soviet backing, an end of the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt, the Soviet Union was invading Hungary to disapproving tut-tuts by the same General Assembly.

The dominant question for a group of intellectuals, not paid government servants, is whether they can safely ignore moral niceties in an organization dedicated by its own definition, to various freedoms while the overwhelming majority of members in both Unesco and ILO resolutely oppose any action which would

further those freedoms. Perhaps, one might ask whether intellectuals can ever successfully cooperate with an organization which has violated its own charter so flagrantly.

UNESCO WORRY

The U.S. government seems to have decided to keep a low profile on the anti-Unesco agitation. The American intellectuals who came to this meeting, including several Nobel laureates, had asked President Ford for a message expressing his views on the politicization of Unesco. The request was made in writing by several academics. The Ford message never came. Instead, a lowlevel member of the Unesco delegation from the United States appeared the morning of the meeting. He sought our Mrs. Ruth Levine, executive director of the American Committee for an Effective Unesco, and read to her four points about the U.S. position from a sheet of paper. He then disappeared. A similar request for a message was made to Gov. Carter. That message never came either, although it is possible that his staff of newcomers may not have as yet heard about Unesco.

The Unesco bureaucracy, its secretariat, is quite worried about American public opinion because more than a quarter of the Unesco budget is paid for by the United States. Some money had already been withheld by congressional action. Nothing so concentrates the mind of an international civil servant as the knowledge that a wealth contributing member-state may refuse to pay its dues and, consequently, his salary.

The Unesco Secretariat was rather busy in recent days assuring protesting U.S. intellectuals that miraculous changes and conversions would be seen at the Nairobi conference if only they would hold their fire. Poor international bureaucracies are always going off with the prevailing political winds, the new majorities. It is one of the ironies of international political life that organizational action is always taken by majority vote in what passes for a parliamentary atmosphere while probably a mere 30 UN member countries of the 145 allow a competitive vote in their own internal elections, if any.

A significant final question which the permanent-committee-to-be will need to answer sometime is this: Supposing some kind of gimmicky compromise is worked out in an attempt to erase the infamous action against Israel; do Unesco problems disappear for free intellectuals?

One issue which received almost no mention at the meeting was a deeply felt concern about tentative steps taken at a Unesco regional conference a few months ago which, if it were to be implemented, could legitimate the outlawing of press agencies like the AP, UPI, Reuters, Agence France-Presse in the unfree world. Unesco spokesmen will, of course, deny this possibility but also, of course, they know better.

HIGHLY POLITICIZED MOVES AND IDEOLOGICAL DEBATES

Senator McGovern. I agree with you that there have been a number of highly politicized moves inside UNESCO, a number of highly ideological debates taking place within the framework of that organization. I regret that because I think your point is well taken. It is difficult to deal effectively with cultural and educational issues in that kind of climate.

On the other hand, hasn't that been one of the faults of the U.N. as a whole? Senator Baker and I were delegates at the U.N. last fall. It struck me that much of what goes on within the framework of the U.N. is highly politicized. Nobody checks their ideological guns around that place. If we were going to drop out or withhold support on that ground what part of the U.N. could we participate in? We certainly could not participate in the General Assembly. It strikes me that well over half the debate in the General Assembly is highly politicized and ideological, centering largely around criticism of the State of Israel or Southern Africa.

I wonder if we were to adopt a position that we cannot participate in those aspects of the U.N. that are politicized or overly ideological, whether there is any part of it left that would meet our standards.

Mr. BEICHMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a great distinction between the activities of the Security Council, the General Assembly on the one hand, and subsidiary, specialized agencies, like the ILO or the WHO or, in this case, UNESCO—the functional organizations. It is understood that international politics is what must dominate an organization like the United Nations.

But the specialized agencies were created, perhaps even going back to the old days of the League of Nations, to sort of bring, as somebody once put it, peace by pieces; namely that postmasters could cooperate from all over the world through some kind of functional organization like the postal union, or others, such as typographical organizations. They would have all kinds of organizations, the idea being that if we cooperate internationally on the lowest possible functional level, somehow peace would break out.

Now in the case of the General Assembly and the Security Council, they are especially licensed to be political. The issues that they take up are war and peace issues. They have to be political.

But where does it say in any part of the constitution of UNESCO that the "Taiwan clique"—by implication, of course—that scientists have no right to deal with scientists of any other country? If they passed a resolution saying, "Thou shalt not deal with Soviet scientists," would that be accepted? Of course not. And yet this is passed automatically by the automatic majority because the dirty word is "Taiwan."

Now I hold no brief for Taiwan. That is an entirely separate problem which the Security Council or the General Assembly should worry about. I find it particularly dangerous when specialized agencies, like the ILO, which has a constitution permitting membership only to trade unions, to governments, and to employers, take in the Palestine Liberation Organization, which makes no pretense to being any of the three. This is a total violation of the constitution and I find that very dangerous to the future of these organizations.

It is not that I ignore the need or that we ignore the essentiality of politics in international organizations, but there is a time and a place for everything. Think of the tremendous amount of time and cost that ensued with the debate about Israel in UNESCO.

POSSIBILITIES OF ZERO BASED BUDGETING

Now I am prepared to make another suggestion, Senator, which I think the committee might well consider, and that is zero based budgeting for UNESCO and for most of the international organizations.

Now that UNESCO is talking about a 6-year budgeting cycle, I think it might be meet for this committee to investigate the possibilities of zero based budgeting. The costs of these programs keep going up. In come UNESCO, we need the money, if you don't pay it, the consequences, says the State Department, will be serious and damaging. It seems to me, Senator, that the committee might well look upon zero based budgeting as the greatest contribution Georgia has made since peanuts toward the welfare of the country. I think it might be very worthwhile to examine that possibility. The Ribicoff

committee certainly showed that there are vast expenditures in international organizations which are just taken for granted.

Senator McGovern. I am not at all unfriendly to the concept of zero based budgeting both at home and abroad. I think a lot of these programs probably need to be brought under that kind of purview.

Mr. Beichman. I think I detected a little zero based interest in your questioning of the previous witnesses.

PROGRESS AT 1976 GENERAL CONFERENCE ON UNESCO

Senator McGovern. What is your view, Mr. Beichman, of the progress which is generally thought to have taken place at the 1976 General Conference on UNESCO? Some of those who were there argue that because of the activity of the United States and the at least partial cooperation of the Director General at UNESCO we were able to get some concessions from UNESCO that at least got Israel assigned to the European region. There was some inflammatory language that might otherwise have been accepted had it not been for the fact that the United States and those who supported us were very active at that Conference.

Do you agree with that? Do you believe we achieved something in the way of constructive criticism?

Mr. Beichman. Yes, I think so. That is why we ought to continue that policy in which we stop assuming that dire consequences will follow if we don't bow before the storms of oratory, as was the case in 1974.

I think there has been some progress, but in my opinion insufficient progress, to warrant resumption of full payments to the organization. I have offered several examples of that.

You see, we have a sort of comparative approach. Joe E. Lewis, the great comedian, had a wonderful line. When he would walk out on the stage, somebody would say, "Hello, Joe, how is your wife?" He would respond, "Compared to what?"

I take this approach very often when I deal with international organizations. Sure, there has been an improvement, but what was the improvement? Compared to what? UNESCO finally did what they should have done in the first place. There was nothing in their constitution that called for the actions they took against Israel. It was a total violation of UNESCO's charter to bar Israel from any regional organization. So very graciously and generously Israel is now allowed to belong to a regional organization in Europe. It should never have happened in the first place.

I think that UNESCO is not standing by its constitution.

WITHHOLDING CONTRIBUTIONS DESPITE COOPERATION QUESTIONED

Senator McGovern. Isn't there something to be said for the fact; if you are going to use the carrot and the stick approach, that the carrot has to appear at some point? My understanding is that one of the reasons we were successful at the Nairobi conference is that the African states generally moderated their position.

Having done that, including the Director General of UNESCO, and having cooperated at least partially with our efforts there,

wouldn't we now be in a difficult position if we still withheld American contributions to UNESCO?

Mr. BEICHMAN. It depends on how much you withhold. We are not opposed to paying some of the arrears. I think it is a question of whether we should pay very much more without a thorough examination of the UNESCO budget. We strongly hold that there ought to be a zero based budget analysis of UNESCO, because how do we know where the money goes?

For example, the Ribicoff committee did a fantastic study, about which I am sure the Senators know, in which the Director General of FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) has argued that the amount of money which has been paid to FAO has been 100 percent wasted. I am talking about D. J. Saouma, the Director of FAO, who on taking office in 1976 said, and I quote:

> Eighty percent of FAO's regular budget was destined to pay for a gigantic centralized bureaucracy in Rome, 11 percent to put out publications that no one reads, and the remaining 9 percent for holding meetings and for travel expenses that are largely unnecessary.

That is 100 percent of an appropriation totally wasted, according to the Director General of FAO. Therefore, I think that before we even talk about giving back the money to UNESCO, this committee owes an obligation to the taxpayer since our IO contributions are in the neighborhood now of $1 billion. I think this committee ought to take a look at the budget of UNESCO and have a justification made for the items in that budget. When that occurs, I think we can talk much more saliently to the issue of fuller payment.

Senator MCGOVERN. I think that is a good suggestion. We certainly will take a look at the UNESCO budget, as well as other international organization budgets.

Senator Clark.

Senator CLARK. I have a very brief comment. I rather think I I share the Chairman's view that if we were to indeed withhold funds or pull out of each international organization, even the specialized agencies that did not check their ideological guns at the door, I am not sure that we would belong to any.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES WITHOUT IDEOLOGICAL BIAS

Can you, in the briefest way, Professor, tell us if there are any specialized agencies you think have overcome that, that we should be fully funding, that do not have any ideological bias?

Mr. BEICHMAN. Yes. ICAO, the civil aeronautics organization and those functional organizations where you cannot fool around with ideology.

Senator CLARK. Is that the only one?

Mr. BEICHMAN. Oh, no, there are others. We belong to about 50 IO's, and many of them are totally meaningless, like the Organization of Legal Metrology, where we spend $12,000 a year, and to administer the appropriation according to the Ribicoff study, costs us $112,000.

There are a number of organizations like that where there are no ideological questions. But there are certain organizations and specialized agencies where ideology for whatever good reason, is going to be an important factor. It is not necessarily a matter of pulling out.

Senator CLARK. My question really goes to the issue of whether one can expect international organizations generally, admirable, as you say, as it certainly would be, to in a sense discuss those issues in the way which we see them.

Mr. BEICHMAN. Ah, now Senator, I have no objection to discussion. It is when resolutions which are passed are given the color of legitimacy both in international law and by the existence of international organizations. I don't care what the Soviet Union wants to say, if Pravda or Izvestia want to say the worst things. That is their privilege and we are delighted to listen.

OTHER SPECIALIZED AGENCIES FROM WHICH FUNDS SHOULD BE WITHHELD

Senator CLARK. Are there other agencies, specialized agencies, for which you would suggest that we withhold funds, or withhold part of our funds?

Mr. BEICHMAN. We are doing it right now with the ILO (International Labor Organization).

Senator CLARK. Do you approve of that?

Mr. BEICHMAN. Yes, sir. The Secretaries of State, Labor, and Commerce have reaffirmed a 2-year notice of withdrawal to the ILO, which would be effective in November 1977.

Senator CLARK. I know about that.

Are there other agencies where you would recommend that we do that, or just these two?

Mr. BEICHMAN. Well, WHO, if it will continue on its ideological course. Now there is a place where ideology should be totally irrelevant. Epidemics don't understand ideology.

Senator CLARK. Are you saying you recommend that we do the same there?

Mr. BEICHMAN. That we withhold money if they continue, but I think it is working out there. I think there is a rationality to people at these organizations. My hope is that they will alter their course, so that if they want to make terrible speeches, let them do it, but do not try to legalize or legitimate these opinions with the force of international law or moral sanctions, or moral obligations.

RESPONDING MORE POSITIVELY THAN PARTIALLY PAYING ARREARS SUGGESTED

Senator CLARK. Let me say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that I think we are all familiar with the background of the rather painful general conference meeting in 1974, about which the professor and others have spoken. I attended very briefly the Nairobi conferences last year, and I do think that many of the problems that originated in 1974 were corrected in this last conference. My own judgment would be that based on that, we ought to have some more favorable response than simply saying that we will pay a part of our arrears but will stay in arrears again. It seems to me that it would be wiser to respond more positively and to reserve the right in the future to take that kind of action.

I particularly was interested in the black African nations. Fifty-five of the 141 nations in UNESCO are from that area. That is well

over one-third. It seems to me that there in particular there was a changing attitude and we would do very well to respond to that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator McGovern. Thank you, Senator Clark, and thank you, Mr. Beichman. We very much appreciate your testimony.

Mr. Beichman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator McGovern. Our final witness today is Sarah Power, Chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO of Washington, D.C.

Ms. Power, we are very glad to receive your testimony.

STATEMENT OF SARAH GODDARD POWER, CHAIRMAN, U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO, WASHINGTON, D.C.; ACCOMPANIED BY RICHARD NOBBE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

Ms. Power. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do, sir, if it is satisfactory by you, is to submit my statement for the record and make a few comments from it.

Senator McGovern. That will be fine. The entire statement will be reprinted in the record of this hearing.

Ms. Power. I am pleased to have been invited to testify, and I do so, as I indicated in my statement, as Chairman of the U.N. National Commission for UNESCO and as a delegate to the 19th General Conference which took place in Nairobi.

I would just point out that the U.S. National Commission was created by the Congress in 1946. It consists of 100 members, representing nongovernmental organizations, State and local government, and the Federal Government it serves to advise the U.S. Government on matters related to UNESCO.

UNESCO AND U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. Chairman, earlier you asked about UNESCO and the U.S. national interest. I observed in President Carter's speech to the United Nations on Friday that he commented as follows, and I quote,

> The basic thrust of human affairs points toward a more universal demand for fundamental human rights. Strengthened international machinery will help us all to close the gap between promise and performance in protecting human rights.

I would suggest to you that UNESCO has an important institutional role within the context of the President's foreign policy objectives and the importance he is assigning to it.

UNESCO is the only international specialized agency which has a human rights educational mission.

As has been said earlier, those of us who attended and participated in the General Conference felt that considerable progress was made. There were no rollcall votes in the plenary. The Director General took a very active role in the deliberations. The drafting and negotiating committee appeared to have a very positive effect upon the proceedings. The maturity of the African delegates in particular have been commented on, many of them participating for the first time in a general conference.

Mr. Chairman, some people said that the 2 weeks of debate on the draft declaration—which declaration you will recall the Soviets had been working on aggressively for at least 6 years—was the most exciting debate that has ever taken place in UNESCO. It culminated, as you know, in a 78 to 6 vote.

I think it should also be noted for the record that Clayton Kirkpatrick, the editor of the Chicago Tribune, was willing, if you will, to cross the line a little and serve on a Government delegation.

QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT UNESCO IS STILL POLITICIZED

I would next like to address myself to the question of whether or not UNESCO is still politicized. It is, in one sense, less so than several years ago, but in another sense of course UNESCO is political. Anybody, any institution that treats issues of importance on which there are divergent views must of necessity be political.

Indeed, I view the fact that many of UNESCO's activities are political as the best evidence that the institution is dealing with serious subjects in the real world: the status of women, literacy and its spread, communications, and the free and untrammeled flow of scientific information.

QUESTION OF WITHHOLDING FUNDS

Mr. Chairman, let me speak for a minute, if I may, to the question of withholding funds.

I believe myself and for the commission that I represent that the withholding has had mixed effects. On the one hand, I concur with the view expressed by some that withholding has provided a powerful incentive for bringing the Director General and the Secretariat to make extraordinary efforts to encourage the moderation that has been increasingly marked in UNESCO activities since the 18th General Conference.

I do believe, and I saw and felt it in Africa, that the majority of member states, especially when confronted with a real option, sincerely wish our continued participation in UNESCO.

I do believe that the point, as you termed it earlier of the "carrot and the stick" has been made. Let me cite some of the specific effects of our current posture as I see them.

We are currently in violation of our treaty obligation to pay our legally assessed share of UNESCO's budget, which makes us a target for telling charges by the Soviets and others that we are practicing financial blackmail.

Further, if we do not pay our arrearages and current dues during 1977, UNESCO will be forced further into debt to other nations. As was pointed out earlier by Mr. Maynes, UNESCO at present is in debt, primarily to Arab States, to the extent of $22 million.

Further, continued withholding of U.S. funds will force it to make wholesale reductions in technical assistance, which will have its most immediate and serious effect in the underdeveloped world.

Lastly, continued failure to meet our share of UNESCO's budget hurts our own self-interest. Put bluntly, our previous leadership position in the organization is now rapidly eroding.

I went to the headquarters of UNESCO before the opening of the General Conference, and you could see, Mr. Chairman, the vacuum of leadership with which we are now confronted. Our Soviet colleagues have a long range and politically motivated plan for gaining appointments and thereby influencing the Secretariat. Their permanent delegation is roughly twice the size of ours. They have been strong in administration and personnel. Now a Russian heads the education sector, which accounts for approximately 25 percent of the budget. The medium term plan in education, for example, calls for 40 teams to go out into the field to review the program. The implications of who selects those teams should be obvious.

One of your own staff, Mr. Chairman, who is sitting behind you in this room, said to me in Nairobi that he thought the long-range impact of what is happening in education in UNESCO is the most telling thing, to him, of what has happened to our leadership posture—that it will be past his children's maturity before we will be able to bring that into line, even if we were aggressively in there now.

The highest ranking official in UNESCO, the Deputy Director General, steps down in 2 years. If we can keep him there for that long, I would suggest that it is in our self-interest to be able to maintain that position.

The editorial in the New York Times of March 14 I do believe put it well. It said:

> The budget pressure, combined with some skillful diplomacy, has had its effect.

It concluded by saying:

> The purpose of holding back funds was to protest UNESCO's unacceptable political actions. Precisely because the tactic worked, it should not now be misused.

You will recall that in December, the Chicago Tribune, a paper that has been unshyly conservative with respect to the United Nations, ran an editorial entitled, "UNESCO Deserves Its Money."

If I may be allowed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of comparative figures. I serve as a regent of the University of Michigan, which has an annual operating budget of approximately $370 million. The biennial budget for UNESCO is approximately $224 million. I think our national self-interest is clear.

The point is made that the Congress took this stern action 2 years ago as a result of certain actions taken against Israel at the last General Conference, which in some degree have been addressed. I left the Nairobi Conference early, Mr. Chairman, to go to Israel because I wanted to see and feel the situation with my own eyes. The members of the Government arranged the trip that one of my colleagues from the commission and I took, and the people with whom we spoke said they wanted to stay in UNESCO, they would stay in UNESCO and fight, and they hoped we would be in UNESCO in a strong position.

I would suggest to you and to Senator Case that it is in the interest of the United States and of Israel and in the interest of such issues as communications and human rights for us to have a strong continued pressure in UNESCO.

UNESCO is a young organization, only 30 years old. I feel that our relationship with it is at a turning point. I believe that if we pull

out or if we remain ambiguously suspicious, we may well have contributed the first fatal breach in the dike of that structure of international organizations, which I do believe offer all of mankind the last and the best hope for peace and evolutionary development.

Let me just tell you a little story that happened as I was 3 or 4 weeks into the conference at Nairobi. I had been reading the Kenyan press, which was fair, balanced, and thoughtful. I met one of the staff of the Kenya press and I enquired about it. I told him that I thought it was thoughtful, balanced, and fair. He looked at me in a puzzled way and said, "But ma'am, it is my responsibility. I was trained in an American school of journalism."

STATEMENTS BY ORGANIZATIONS WITH WHICH UNESCO WORKS

Mr. Chairman, if I may, afterward I would like to submit for the record some of the statements by the organizations with which the commission works which have gone on record for the United States having a firm and strong posture in UNESCO: The American Council of Education, the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Voters, the National Council of Negro Women, the YWCA, the National Education Association, the United Nations Association, among others. [See appendix.]

I thank you for letting me come today.

[Ms. Power's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SARAH GODDARD POWER, CHAIRMAN, U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am pleased to have been invited to testify before this Committee. I do so as Chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and as a delegate to the 19th Session of the General Conference of UNESCO, which took place in the fall of 1976 in Nairobi.

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO was created by the Congress in 1946. It consists of 100 members representing nongovernmental organizations, state and local government and the Federal government. It serves to advise the U.S. Government on matters relating to UNESCO, acts as liaison with organizations, institutions and individuals in the United States which are interested in matters relating to the activities of UNESCO, and promotes an understanding of the general objectives of UNESCO on the part of the people of the United States.

President Carter, in his address before the United Nations on Friday, March 11 said: "The basic thrust of human affaris points toward a more universal demand for fundamental human rights . . . Strengthened international machinery will help us all to close the gap between promise and performance in protective human rights." I would suggest to you that UNESCO has an important institutional role within the context of the President's foreign policy objectives.

UNESCO is the only international specialized agency which has a human rights education mission. UNESCO is singularly well equipped by its structural network—ministeries of education, regional offices, inter-governmental conferences, etc.—for effective work in the promotion of human rights. The problem now is to translate instruments affecting human rights already in existence into tools and action plans for teachers and education ministers.

Over the years the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO has given priority to this subject. The Commission has a permanent Committee on Human Rights which is chaired by Thomas Buergenthal, Professor of International Law at the University of Texas, and member of the editorial board of the American Journal of International Law. Others currently on this committee are some of the foremost international human rights experts in this country: Louis Sohn, Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard Law School: Louis Henkin, Hamilton Fish Professor of International Law, Columbia Law School; and Mr. John Carey, Vice President of the U.S. Institute of Human Rights.

Those of us who attended the General Conference in Nairobi came away with the overwhelming conclusion that UNESCO as an institution has made important strides over the past two years away from the rancor and suspicion which so marred the 18th General Conference, and the months immediately following it. Although from an American point of view the results of Nairobi were mixed, progress was made:

"Israel is now included in the Western European Regional Group, after several years of non-inclusion. Great praise should go to the Director General for working out a formula which enabled Israel's inclusion as part of a package deal covering a number of new member states, through quiet and non-political consultation."

"The grave threat to freedom of the press which was encapsulated in the proposed Draft Declaration on the Uses of the Media has been set aside for at least two years—long enough to allow careful, informed study and the development of a consensus on language which will not hinder those nations which hold press freedom precious in maintaining it. Further, UNESCO plans a large and potentially important international study on all aspects of communication around our globe, a study which may prove as important as the one on education completed several years ago by a commission headed by former French Prime Minister Edgar Faure.

"A modest budget for the coming biennium and an imaginative and searching middle term plan were adopted. This plan contains an honest effort to analyze UNESCO's own activities and to scrutinize the reorganization and consolidation of its structure into four basic sectors and 10 sub groups.

"Important resolutions on science and technology were passed to support UNESCO's participation in the UN Conference on Science and Technology which will be held in 1979 and which the United States has offered to host. Preparatory activity for this conference is extremely important and should be started in detail now.

"The draft Declaration on Race (which had a reference to the objectionable UN resolution equating racism with Zionism) was postponed for further study and development of consensus.

"The Council on the Man and the Biosphere program and the Council for the International Bureau of Education were both enlarged and strengthened."

Most importantly, in all this activity, an attitude which preferred discussion to acrimony, negotiations to walk out, and consensus to split votes came increasingly to the fore in both the formal and informal deliberations at Nairobi.

Is UNESCO still "politicized", as many complain? In one sense—that to which I just referred—it is much less so than two year sago. But in another sense, of course UNESCO is political. Any body, any institution that treats issues of importance on which there are divergent views must of necessity be political. Indeed, I view the fact that many of UNESCO's activities are political as the best evidence that the institution is dealing with serious subjects in the real world: The status of women. Literacy and its spread. Communications and the free and untrammeled flow of scientific information and data. Cultural integrity and threats of cultural imperialism. All these subjects and more are important; all of them are political. In this sense, I would regard it as a sign that the vitality of UNESCO is failing if the organization gradually became totally "apolitical".

Of course, the real point in discussions about politicization of UNESCO is whether or not the organization works to determine and achieve the common objectives of mankind of whether it acts narrowly to substitute political conflict for human progress.

Broadly, UNESCO is the only international agency which is concerned with those immeasurably precious aspects of the human condition—education, science, and culture—which make man what he is. The specific cutting edge of UNESCO's activities, however, is to act as a development agency assisting the economically less advantaged countries which constitute two thirds or more of the world's population. Most countries in the world are too poor or too small to muster the necessary intellectual, organizational and financial resources to solve by themselves their educational, scientific, cultural and social problems. They, therefore, must rely heavily on UNESCO to do so; quite simply, there is nowhere else to turn.

The scientific community in the United States, for example, holds deeply and intensely to the principles of the universality of science—the freedom to inquire without repression, the ability to disseminate data and experimental results without fear of suppression, the right and the responsibility to engage in intellectually honest and vigorous debate. Scientists in other developed nations, by and large, also hold these principles at the core of their ability to carry out their

work. But in some countries—developed and not so developed—such propositions are anathema. UNESCO is the single most powerful institution provoking and supporting the universality of scientific inquiry. In a sense there is simply no other organization which is concerned with this crucial problem. Indeed, all the fuss and furor about the draft Declaration on Uses of the Press was at heart a specific sub-sector of the concern for free flow of information and integrity of honest debate.

Let me cite another set of issues which, while no more important intellectually, are fraught with equally great risks politically. Probably the single most important issue facing the future of our globe consists in realigning the relationships between the by and large rich and developed nations of the northern hemisphere with the generally poor and less developed countries of the southern hemisphere. Emphasizing a wider role for Third World countries, the President said on Friday at the U.N.: ". . . The developing countries must acquire fuller participation in the global economic decision making process." It is my own view that the consequences of a failure to resolve peacefully and rationally the intensely deep problems in this area are so serious for the future of the entire human race that the process cannot be left only to purely political institutions. UNESCO, with its demonstrated abilities at international research and data collection and its uniquely developed institutional methods of arriving at consensus will—must—have a vitally important role to play. What is important about UNESCO is that it provides mechanisms for accelerating the evolutionary process of change through cooperative systems of worldwide participation.

I believe that the United States must—for its *own* interests, as well as those of UNESCO and, indeed, the entire human community—maintain a close and supportive relationship with it.

This view is not, I confess, universally shared. Public opinion of UNESCO and its programs is, at best, amiably confused, and at worst, suspicious or hostile. The news media, reacting to the dangers in the draft Declaration, have been critical of UNESCO. Certain parts of the academic commuity have withheld their support from the organization, and professional and other groups have not seen as clearly as they might have that UNESCO's agenda is *their* agenda. Lastly, the Congress has seen fit to withhold United States contributions from UNESCO until progress is made in eliminating its discriminatory attitudes toward Israel and reducing the level of unconstructive political squabbling.

Let me speak to the results, as I see them, of this last point at some greater length. I believe that withholding our assessments to UNESCO has had mixed effects. On the one hand, I concur with the view that withholding funds has provided powerful incentive for bringing the Director General and the Secretariat to make extraordinary efforts to encourage the moderation that has been increasingly marked in UNESCO activities since the 18th General Conference and the atmosphere of cooperation and consensus which developed during the Nairobi Conference. I believe that a majority of member states, especially when confronted with the real option, sincerely wish our continued full participation in UNESCO. Events, votes and private conversations in Nairobi convinced me that many third world nations are intensely anxious for America to bring to UNESCO the full measure of our revolutionary tradition of freedom and equality, our technology and knowledge, and our money and our leadership. The benefits of full American participation in UNESCO, once taken for granted, are now regarded as all the more important now that they are not so certain.

On the other hand, I believe that this point has been made more than adequately during the past two years, and that on balance if we allow our relationship with UNESCO to continue to be weakened for much longer, both our own interests and those of UNESCO will surely suffer profound hurt.

We are currently in violation of our treaty obligation to pay our legally assessed share of UNESCO's budget, which makes us a target for telling charges by the Soviets and others that we are practicing financial blackmail and do not honor our financial commitments.

Further, if we do not pay our arrearages and current dues during 1977, UNESCO will be forced further into debt to othern nations. UNESCO at present is in debt, primarily to a number of Arab states, to the extent of $22 million in interest-free loans. Further indebtedness will merely add strength to any anti-Israeli initiatives which might be made by radical Arab states at future UNESCO meetings.

Further, continued withholding of U.S. funds to UNESCO will force it to make wholesale reductions in technical assistance to developing countries. Cutbacks in technical assistance will have its most immediate and serious effect on the underdeveloped world—precisely that part of humanity that most needs our help.

Lastly, continued failure to meet our share of UNESCO's budget hurts our own self interest. Put bluntly, our previous leadership position in the organization is now rapidly eroding. Many member states, including a number of our friends and allies, are becoming increasingly resentful of our current posture. They think that we are punishing the Organization, whereas it was not UNESCO corporately but rather certain member states which were responsible for the past actions which discriminated against Israel.

Internally, our position in UNESCO is even worse. When I paid a short visit to Paris headquarters prior to the opening of the Nairobi Conference, I was struck at the rate we are losing our influence inside the Organization. Our semi-withdrawal has created a power vacuum, and this is being filled by those who are not entirely committed to the same things we are. Our Soviet colleagues have a long range and politically motivated plan for gaining appointments and thereby influencing the Secretariat. Their permanent delegation to UNESCO Headquarters is roughly twice the size of ours. They have been strong in administration and personnel, and a Russian now heads the Education Sector, which accounts for approximately 25 percent of UNESCO's total budget. The medium term plan in education, for example, calls for 40 teams to go out into the field to review the program; the implications of who selects these teams should be ovbious.

The highest ranking official in UNESCO of American origin will be due for retirement in 1978—if we can keep him there that long. I believe that we should be actively undertaking to replace him with another American. Two years for that kind of undertaking is not a day too long, and to attempt it while simultaneously continuing to withhold contributions is plainly impossible.

My point is clear. The costs to the United States in effectiveness in influence, in leadership and in personnel, in maintaining an ambiguous posture of neither being fully in the game nor out of it, are beginning to mount up. We must weigh the alternatives that are open to us in terms of the influence we can bring to bear. This is what is involved in the question of restitution of our contribution to UNESCO.

The editorial in the New York Times of March 14, 1977 put it well: "The budget pressure, combined with some skillful diplomacy, has had its effect . . . Some argue that to protest the politically offensive resolutions at Nairobi, something less than the full payment would be better. Paying just one year's assessments would preserve our voting rights in UNESCO: but anything less than a two year payment would leave the organization near bankruptcy. Not only would this threaten humanitarian projects, such as earthquake research and literacy programs but it might also lead to a new and bitter confrontation inside UNESCO. A full payment, on the other hand, might consolidate the progress made so far, and still leave the United States the option of withholding future dues in case of a political relapse . . ."

The editorial concluded by saying: "The purpose of holding back funds was to protest UNESCO's unacceptable political actions. Precisely because the tactic worked, it should not now be misused."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a number of resolutions received by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO urging a U.S. posture in UNESCO along the lines indicated above.

If the argument is clear with respect to our own national interests—and I believe that it is overwhelming—what of the situation of our ally and friend, Israel? In many respects, our decision to withhold payments to UNESCO came about as a result of actions taken by UNESCO member states which were plainly and unfairly discriminatory against Israel. The Nairobi Conference brought some change but there remains unfinished business. Will resumption of U.S. payments to UNESCO jeopardize the interests of our ally? The case has been made that only through continued U.S. withholding of funds can sufficient pressure be maintained on UNESCO to ensure fair treatment to Israel.

The real question contained in that argument is whether continued withholding of U.S. funds from UNESCO will not be counterproductive, and, instead of producing pressure to benefit Israel, will not instead produce irritation with the U.S. and a weakened U.S. posture in the Organization which, in the long run, are both bound to hurt our ally. I believe that the fact is that only through the continued participation, influence and involvement—in short, clout—of the United States with UENESCO can Israel receive fair treatment from the Organization. Already our in European allies are becoming increasingly irritated with what seems to them like a spiteful U.S. posture penalizing UNESCO overall because of our commitment to one member country. The longer this situation continues the more our

ability to assert ourselves on behalf of our ally will erode. And, clearly, the degree to which the Organization continues to be in debt to the Arab states also impacts adversely upon our ability to help and defend Israel.

The general proposition which I am asserting here is that the interests of the United States, of Israel of human rights around the world, are all best safeguarded by a continual and powerful American presence inside UNESCO. Let me illustrate this point: The Soviet Union recently expelled AP Moscow correspondent George Krimsky. His expulsion came because of his extensive coverage of human rights dissenters in the Soviet Union. This kind of unilateral action would have been internationally sanctioned had the UNESCO adopted in Nairobi the Soviet inspired Draft Declaration on the Uses of the Media to which I referred earlier. I believe that a strong U.S. presence within UNESCO is the surest defense against passage of a similar declaration next year.

Believe me, the stakes are high.

In summary, I would suggest to you that the following points be carefully considered. I believe—

(1) That UNESCO is engaged in important and constructive work;

(2) That UNESCO is not a hostile place for the U.S.—in fact, quite the reverse;

(3) That UNESCO has a vital role to play in the peaceful and legitimate development of the third world; and

(4) That we simply cannot permit Israel to be alone and isolated either in UNESCO or elsewhere.

This fall in Nairobi there was a brief ceremony to mark UNESCO's 30th anniversary. UNESCO and its relationship to the United States are at a turning point. If we pull out or if we remain ambiguously suspicious, we may well have contributed the first fatal breach in the dike of that structure of international organizations which offer all of mankind the last, best hope for peace and evolutionary development. If, on the other hand, we can sustain our commitment to the high goals of the international system and to the humanitarian ends of UNESCO, we may well have surmounted a temporary testing phase through which any new and creative system must pass.

[Pamphlet submitted by Ms. Power is in the Committee files.]

Senator McGovern. Thank you, Ms. Power. If you have that Chicago editorial, would you also make that available to the record?

Ms. Power. Of course.

[The information referred to follows:]

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 18, 1976]

UNESCO Deserves Its Money

Punishment isn't likely to correct misbehavior unless there is confidence that it will stop upon rehabilitation. Therefore we support the request of the United States National Commission for UNESCO that the U.S. resume its payments to that organization—at least to the extent necessary to permit us to continue to participate in its activity.

UNESCO was created for the best of purposes: to encourage international collaboration in education, science, and culture, If the world is to be brought together and the condition of mankind is to be improved, it is far more likely to be done in fields such as thsese, free from the political emotions that have turned the UN General Assembly into a circus. But, alas, UNESCO became as entangled in politics as the rest of the UN. When it yielded to the hysteria of the moment in 1974 and threw Israel out of its regional grouping, the U.S. quite properly stopped paying its 25 percent of the UNESCO budget.

Since then, we have withheld about $42 million and UNESCO has had trouble financing its activities, mischievous or otherwise. It faced a choice: to pursue its political vendetta, yielding to the militants and showing contempt for the U.S. and for its own mission, or to forsake this dead end road and recognize that without the U.S. it was only a rump organization.

At Nairobi, Kenya, this fall it chose the latter course, to the surprise of many and to the great relief of everybody sincerly interested in UNESCO's survival. It rejected a Soviet proposal that would have sabotaged UNESCO's very purpose by restricting the free exchange of news —by turning news agencies in the Third World into tools of government, just as is done in the Soviet Union. And it ended its boycott of Israel.

The many countries that stood up against the Soviet Union and the forces of hate deserve to be encouraged. With their help, UNESCO will have at least a chance of carrying out its worthy mission. The best encouragement the United States can give is to end its own partial boycott of UNESCO.

[From The New York Times, March 14, 1977]

EDITORIAL: GIVE TO UNESCO

In the fall of 1974, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization voted, in effect, to exclude Israel from its activities. This action transformed the basic nature of UNESCO, substituting political for humanitarian considerations in its choices of activities. To protest this politicization, and to force a reversal of its stance on Israel, Congress voted to suspend America's contributions to UNESCO's budget. The United States is now nearly three years—or $70 million—in arrears, and UNESCO, deprived of 25 percent of its annual budget, faces a major financial crisis.

The budget pressure, combined with some skillful diplomacy, has had its effect. At the most recent UNESCO general conference in Nairobi, Kenya, last November, the organization condemned Israel's policies in the occupied Arab territories but restored Israel to full membership.

Congress is now weighing a request by the Carter Administration to pay up our debts in full. Some argue that to protest the politically offensive resolutions at Nairobi, something less than the full payment would be better. Paying just one year's assessment would preserve our voting rights in UNESOC; but anything less than a two-year payment would leave the organization near bankruptcy. Not only would this threaten humanitarian projects, such as earthquake research and literacy programs, but it might also lead to a new and bitter confrontation inside UNESCO. A full payment, on the other hand, might consolidate the progress made so far, and still leave the United States the option of withholding future dues in case of a political relapse.

The purpose of holding back funds was to protest UNESCO's unacceptably political actions. Precisely because the tactic worked, it should not now be misused. Congress should vote to pay up the arrears in full.

Senator MCGOVERN. Ms. Power, I notice in the budget breakdown that UNESCO is the second largest of the specialized organizations in the amount of budget support it gets, running second only to the World Health Organization.

MOST VALUABLE UNESCO OPERATIONS

In view of the importance it has in the budget, and recognizing, as you point out, that it is not an enormous amount of money on a comparative basis, what do you see as the most valuable operations that UNESCO carries on? What does it really do that in your judgment makes it a good investment?

Ms. POWER. I certainly feel that the whole question of communications, one piece of which was this attempt to put a document with which we could not live, which would indeed have the moral sanction of the organization, is probably the whole revolution that is going on in communications, print, media, satellite broadcasting, in which UNESCO has a very strong role and is one of the most important things that is going to happen in the next 5 years in the country.

Perhaps you know, and I think partly as a result of the initiatives that we, the United States, took, the Director General is putting together a very small group of seven so-called wisemen to think about the problem on a worldwide basis.

Now on the face of it, one could say, oh well, another study. You may recall that the similar study in education, "Learning to Be,"

under the chairmanship of the former prime minister, Edgar Faure, was considered to be one of the most important things UNESCO has done.

I would say to you, as an example, one of UNESCO's strongest thrusts was the article that appeared in yesterday's New York Times on the preservation of the ninth century temples in Java (Boravadur). UNESCO has contributed some $11 million to that.

Literacy of women happens to be a particularly acute problem for them. At the General Conference 2 years ago, the United States was urged to introduce a proposal that would follow up the Percy amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. Twenty-four cosponsors were found for that.

Those would be some of the things I would suggest.

Senator McGovern. Was UNESCO involved in helping to finance the movement of the great monuments in the Nile Valley at the time of the Aswan Dam?

Ms. Power. Yes.

Senator McGovern. I thought it was.

PRINCIPAL GAINS CONCERNING ISRAEL AT NAIROBI CONFERENCE

You said that you attended the Nairobi Conference, Ms. Power.

What do you see as the principal gains made at that conference in terms of meeting some of the United States concerns over the action that was taken against Israel at an earlier time?

Ms. Power. I think I, myself, regarded the primary accomplishment as the development of the Drafting and Negotiation Committee, which was seen as an instrument designed to defuse some of the heavy issues and find a way for them to be negotiated out, not in hotly public contest. People with many more years and experience than I said there was no question about a new maturity on the part of the African countries participating, which, as Senator Clark pointed out earlier, are 55 of the 141 countries.

You have for the first time an African, and a black man, as chairman of the specialized agency. I think, for my part, I believe there are going to be exciting correlations between that and Ambassador Young's taking the post at the United Nations.

It struck me as a very serious conference. One of your own staff again commented that he thought it was the best delegation he had ever seen this country send to an international meeting.

I believe that money is indeed an important part, but only a part, of this. I think such things as very strong delegations and a strong office for UNESCO—because that is what I am equipped to speak about—here and in Paris are some of the things through which we can exercise the kind of leverage and clout and, I believe, desired leadership that was sought in Nairobi.

LEVEL OF U.S. PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO UNESCO

Senator McGovern. Are you satisfied with the level of Americans we have assigned to UNESCO in recent years? Do you think we have had a capable, well qualified group of people representing our interest on that body?

Ms. POWER. When you say to UNESCO, are you talking about our delegations to the General Conference?

Senator MCGOVERN. Our total representation in UNESCO.

Ms. POWER. No, sir. If you look over the last years, I do not feel it was as strong as it should have been. I think one of the things we are heavily paying for, in a certain sense, is some long-term lack of high-level interest to UNESCO. If we are going to be in these organizations then I believe we must be in them with the many levels of approach and involvement that go to make up a strong posture.

Senator MCGOVERN. I agree with that. I would like to underscore that. I think that the U.N. and its specialized agencies are worth U.S. participation. We ought to send the best people we can find to those posts. I think we have done that in recent years as far as our Ambassadors to the U.N. in New York are concerned. I had the privilege of working with Ambassador Scranton last fall and I thought he was superb in that post, and I think his successor, Andy Young, will be very, very effective.

One of the most dramatic ways we can demonstrate to the rest of the world that we are interested in the U.N. is by the quality of our Ambassador and the other people who we have assigned there.

Senator Case.

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMENDATION OF MS. POWER

I want to thank you for inviting me to these hearings. I am sorry that I was not able to arrive until only moments ago, but I am happy to be here. I am glad I did not miss all of your statement, Ms. Power. We very much enjoy seeing you.

Ms. POWER. It is nice to see you again, sir.

Senator CASE. I want to thank you for the job you are doing on the commission, and for your efforts to keep us straight, especially me.

I read with interest your statement and I shall read it again carefully. I am not going to ask you a lot of questions. I think I pretty well understand your tone. I want to point with pleasure to your statement in which you give us your view about UNESCO, that we must for our own interest, maintain closer support and a closer relationship. I do agree with that statement.

PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT UNESCO

Right after that you say that this view is not universally shared, that, "Public opinion of UNESCO and its programs is, at best, amiably confused, and at worst, suspicious or hostile." You don't mean all public opinion, but when you say "at best", who is the best, and when you say "amiably confused", who is amiably confused?

Ms. POWER. I think one of the problems for UNESCO, as someone this morning said, is what is UNESCO all about. I want to respond and not be facetious, but it thinks about everything from motherhood to God. In a certain sense, the problem is lack of understanding of what the organization is about, and an organization that is especially designed to think about the competition among ideologies for man's mind is a very difficult kind of organization to get a handle on. Unlike

some of the other specialized agencies—you think of health, or UNICEF for children—here there is no one target. You certainly know the views of thoughtful criticism, and I think it is appropriate to say that they are represented by some of Professor Beichman's colleagues. There is a certain evolution, I think, in his appraisal and in the appraisal of his colleagues to the political realities of UNESCO. I think it is interesting to note the editorial of the Chicago Tribune, which some years ago certainly would have probably taken a very different view toward UNESCO than it did in December of this year. I might make a similar statement for The New York Times.

One of the things I would like to turn the Commission to thinking about when we hopefully get a satisfactory level of funding reinstituted is how do you communicate somewhat in this country what UNESCO is all about. That is an enormous job still to be done.

I would point out, if I may, that I initially was the United Nations association's representative to UNESCO, and the United Nations association with considerable funding and a big program, in comparison with the office I direct, has only maintained about 30,000 active supports in the "on-the-book sense" for the United Nations association.

My point is that the degree to which it is in our self-interest is a very difficult thing to communicate, I think.

UNESCO AS POLITICAL ANIMAL

Senator CASE. I think your point about this being in a real sense a political animal, if you will, is very interesting indeed. I shall ponder it as thoughtfully as I can.

If it is true—and I am not sure that you are not right—certainly it is not the same. It is somewhat different from health, nutrition, and other matters, as to which there can be very little difference of opinion concerning their desirability. It does get into matters of communication, of the meaning of words. It is not just a matter of recognizing Proust as a great writer, no matter whether what he says is wrong, or that his life was a shambles. The question involved here is, what is the right kind of life?

When you get into this kind of operation and you are political, I wonder whether such an agency can hold itself above political matters, above political relationships, and above political ways of doing things.

I think you are on the right track, and I think you will help me to resolve some of my amiable confusion, because, you know, you are getting somewhere with this thing.

Most of our trouble in dealing with agencies of this kind that do good—and I say that without meaning in any way to downgrade the operation—is that we do not think about them hard enough and we therefore get to expect some kind of vague results. We endow them with some kind of immunity from ordinary tests of what is good and what is bad, of what makes sense and what does not. The result is often great disillusionment.

Of course, this is not the worst characteristic of Americans. We are optimistic. We have a good feeling about things. I think some of these Third World countries, and Europe especially, have a much more cynical attitude than we have and hold a closer view of truth in the

short run. In the long run, perhaps our vague and bumbling optimism and general good will may be better for the world and for our survival, too.

But I think what you have said is important. This is a political operation and not something above the battle. I know how difficult it is to deal in this area. I had a brief experience myself. I found myself in a situation when the Republicans had to deal with human rights, and the hardest thing to get hold of is what that is.

To you, I offer the best will in the world to try to do good, and I mean that in a deep sense. I have great admiration for your effort. It must be enormously difficult for you to keep yourself in that category of the American public which is amiably confused about such things.

I do want to thank you.

Mr. Chairman, my specific questions are for the administration witnesses, and those can be answered for the record. [See appendix.]

Senator McGovern. Very well.

Thank you, Senator Case.

Senator Javits.

Senator Javits. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had a question or two for Ms. Power.

I came, Mr. Chairman, hoping to hear something about the State Department budget.

WHY SHOULD WE PAY 100 PERCENT?

Suppose the United States pays half of its arrearages. Will that continue or cancel the right of the organization to take away the U.S. vote?

Ms. Power. That would maintain our vote.

Senator Javits. That would maintain our vote? I see.

Now, in view of the fact that we have not received 100-percent satisfaction in the actions of UNESCO, why should we pay 100 percent?

Ms. Power. Senator Javits, for my part I was attempting to reflect, as I have been doing practically around the clock for many months, on the situation of UNESCO in this country for the last 8 or 10 years. With particular reference to a comment of Senator McGovern, my feeling is, though I was not there, that we have not given UNESCO and our place in it the attention in Government and in our missions and our representations to delegations that we should have. Now though I speak strongly, I speak for myself. One of Senator McGovern's staff who was in Nairobi commented that he thought it was the strongest delegation he had ever seen this country send to an international meeting, this one. I think we have made some progress on what may be referred to as the Israel-related issues. I think we had significant accomplishment on the communications story. You will not hear me call it a "win." It is a part of an ongoing dialog, the communications story. I believe that the broader and indeed very hard to define reasons for which UNESCO exists are there and that we have made adequate progress to attempt to be in there in a stronger posture.

I don't want to repeat myself, but I think the Director General took a much more active role than he might—some would say ought—in terms of the fact that he has 141 nations to deal with and there were

no roll call votes in the plenary. The maturity of the African delegates and their moderation was considered much more marked than in previous meetings. I came away from those 5 weeks very persuaded that it is massively in our self-interest to be able to be in a strong posture, part of which I suggest is money.

I also said earlier that I left the conference early because I wanted to see and feel—both of those—the experience of being in Israel first-hand. Shlomo Aveniri, as you know, delivered the opening address of the country of Israel in Nairobi, and he was pleased that I was going to leave early and go. He and several of his colleagues made arrangements for the 5 days that I had there, and the people in Israel said that they want to stay in UNESCO, that they will stay in and fight, and that they would like the United States to be in a strong position.

I feel that we can best stand up for our friend and ally Israel by again being in that organization, which of all the specialized agencies deals with the things the people of Israel have been so preeminent in, artistic development and culture, by being in a strong position in the organization.

Senator JAVITS. I appreciate your fine statement of the reasons. I am not entirely convinced, however. The United States felt for a long time that we had to show by our example that we could take the slings and arrows of fortune. Then we learned that it really was not a matter of money; it was a matter of the other countries thinking we did not mean it, that we gave the money and took all of these fine positions, so they just thought we just did not mean it. So we had to show them that we meant it. Apparently it is not the language which we speak; it is the language many others speak.

I think that is a good policy to show that we mean it and that we are willing to implement our acts and that we are not bluffing. If we feel strongly about it as we did in the ILO, they can let us out if they wish.

I am not entirely convinced that we ought to go all the way with this thing yet. Again, we do mean it and there are some things we are simply going to be dug in about. We want to be sure that they understand that there may be some things that will be worth our leaving UNESCO if we feel that strongly about them. So, I will think it over like my brother Case, I will think over what you have said.

I would certainly favor a material payment. We are not even arguing that issue. But I am again concerned about doing what we have done for so many decades, which did not seem to work for us or for them, because after all, it does not do them any good if we pull out. It does them a lot more good if we are in.

I will worry about it and I very much appreciate your explanation. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MCGOVERN. Thank you, Senator Javits, and thank you, Ms. Power.

That completes our witnesses for this morning.

This subcommittee is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

Responses of Assistant Secretary of State Designate Maynes to Additional Questions of Senator Case

Question 1. Exactly what is our so-called treaty obligation to pay more than our arrearage to UNESCO? What is our obligation if the Organization does not act in accordance with its mandate to further scientific, cultural and educational objectives?

Answer. Our membership and participation in UNESCO were authorized by the Congress in a joint resolution (Public Law 565, 79th Congress) signed into law by the President on July 30, 1946. As a member of UNESCO, our responsibility to pay our financial assessments is an international legal obligation binding on the U.S. in international law. So long as the U.S. remains a member of UNESCO, we are legally obliged to remain current in paying our dues, including both arrearages and the amount payable during the current calendar year. In reply to the second question, if the Organization fails to carry out its mandate, the U.S. can either try to right its course or consider withdrawal from membership. There is no provision under the UNESCO Constitution or under international law to withhold dues legally. Only at such time as we feel compelled to take the drastic step of withdrawal, which we do not believe is warranted in the present circumstances, would our legal obligation to pay dues cease—and only then under the terms of the UNESCO Constitution.

Question 2. What obligation is there to pay for more than the current quarter or even forward fund as would be the situation if Congress approved 1977 and 1978 funding at this time? Do we provide such forward funding for other international organizations, and is so which ones?

Answer. There is no forward funding involved in the Administration's requests for the fiscal year 1977 supplemental or for the fiscal year 1978 regular request. For all organizations on a calendar year basis, funds have already been appropriated in the fiscal year 1977 appropriation to meet our assessments for calendar year 1977. Approval of the amount of $69.3 million requested for UNESCO in the fiscal year 1977 supplemental would place UNESCO in the same position as the other organizations.

Similarly, the Administration request for fiscal year 1978 includes funding of the calendar year 1978 dues for all of the international organizations, including UNESCO, that use the calendar year as their fiscal period. Such funds would become available October 1, 1977, but would not be used until the calendar year 1798.

In the case of organizations on a calendar year basis, the normal procedure for payments of these assessments is to pay quarterly, i.e. in January, April, July and October. Therefore, no forward funding is involved.

Question 3. The UNESCO November conference actions to defer the media issue and allow Israel into the European group have been described by at least one observer as an "implicit bargain." To what extent and how strongly did the State Department make it clear to the UNESCO officials and delegates that some Congressional supporters of the Case-Bingham amendment felt full funding required full action, that is alleviating all three objectionable resolutions which passed in 1974.

Question 4. What priority did the Administration give to the archaeological digs and West Bank resolutions? Where was it on the list of priorities and how much effort was made to obtain action?

Answers 3 and 4. The Department can categorically state that no "bargain", implicit or explicit, has been made, in Nairobi or elsewhere, regarding any aspect of the anti-Israel actions taken by the 1974 UNESCO General Conference. The "Draft Declaration on the Mass Media" was deferred because the United States mounted a major campaign well before the Conference to inform member states of the reasons for our opposition to the draft—a draft which did *not* address the issues of real concern to the developing countries, namely, the imbalance in the

flow of information between developing and developed nations, but *did* work, under the guise of paying lip service to the free flow of information, to frustrate that flow by giving UNESCO's imprimatur to the concept of state control. We offered, instead, support for a resolution introduced by Tunisia which aimed at helping the Third World to remedy a situation that we agreed needed to be corrected. This was no "bargain" but enlightened diplomacy in the service of legitimate and perceived self-interest.

The basis for our success in reversing the previous General Conference's hasty and grossly unfair political action rejecting Israel's request for assignment to the European region (which includes both East and West Europe, as well as North America) is equally straight forward and clear. It lies in the nature of the original action—which never had the support of more than a minority of European states, the ones most obviously concerned, and which was an insupportable, wholly unjustified abbreviation of the UNESCO tradition of leaving such matters to the region itself—and the enormous diplomatic effort undertaken by the United States and like-minded countries long before the General Conference as well as immediately before it and during it, to prevail upon members' sense of fairness to remedy a blatant injustice and permit Israel's assignment to the European region by the great majority of its members.

On both the mass media and regional grouping issues, there was an important foundation of support on which to base our intensive diplomatic efforts.

This was, unfortunately, not true with respect to the 18th General Conference resolutions on Jerusalem and the occupied territories: the 1974 votes on those issues, respectively, had been: 64–27–26 and 61–5–28. Given the strong support in 1974 for these resolutions critical of Israel, we were aware from the outset of our diplomatic efforts that the chances for success were limited.

These issues were, however, certainly an important objective in our diplomatic efforts—efforts which involved more than 200 diplomatic representations in foreign capitals and Washington before the General Conference, as well as further representations in Nairobi and in capitals, during the Conference. We do not believe that any UNESCO or member official or member state was left in any doubt as to the terms of the Case-Bingham amendment or the seriousness with which the amendment's supporters viewed *all* of the anti-Israeli actions taken by the General Conference in 1974.

At the same time we were making our approaches in capitals, we sought to encourage some event that would serve to mobilize support for Israel and could provide the Director General with a justification for a positive move and the Arab states with a justification for a positive response. In the matter of the occupied territories, we felt that should the Government of Israel agree that the Director General could send a team to gather information on the educational and cultural institutions there, this would vent a considerable amount of pressure that had built up on this issue. The Government of Israel in fact, indicated its willingness to recieve such a team. Unfortuanately, it did not prove possible to work out the conditions under which the team should make its visit before the Nairobi conference began.

Our delegation in Nairobi nevertheless undertook representations with friendly delegations and with the moderate Arabs to see if the positive prospect of a visit by the Director General's team in the near future, even though after the close of the conference, could not serve as a basis for withdrawal of the reconfirming resolution. We explained carefully and in detail to members of the Secretariat and to other delegations the extreme seriousness with which we regarded the practice of condemning a member state without first having investigated the alleged violations.

While not able to persuade the majority of delegations to refrain from adopting a reconfirming resolution, our efforts did prevent a harsher tone than the 1974 resolution—as well as the introduction of new, offensive elements (e.g., a reference to the "Judaization" of the populations in the occupied territories).

In the case of the resolution on Jerusalem, our soundings indicated that the Arab position remained unchanged from previous years: they wanted all archaeological excavations in Jerusalem terminated. We attempted to get some sign before the Conference that the principal excavation in the area of the most sacred Muslim shrines was nearing completion and would soon be halted, but this did not prove possible.

Our delegation again contacted friendly delegations, moderate Arabs, and many developing countries and explained to them the seriousness of levying a sanction on a member state without having access to the results of a careful investigation

of the facts. In the absence of any indication that the excavations were to be halted, the majority of the delegations proved unwilling to let the matter rest, and voted for the reconfirming resolution.

Again, however, our efforts prevented the expansion of the sanctions against Israel (e.g., no invitations to attend UNESCO-sponsored meetings).

Question 5. What was done to ward off the Taiwan resolution?

Answer. Resolutions on the question of nongovernmental organizations with affiliates in Taiwan were passed by the 93rd Executive Board (16–1(US)–10) in 1973 and by the 1974 General Conference (57–2(US)–22), and the issue was included on the agenda of the 19th General Conference at the request of the People's Republic of China (PRC). The PRC submitted a draft resolution demanding that nongovernmental organizations with Taiwanese affiliates break off relations with them and empowering the Director General of UNESCO to "Take other measures he deems necessary to urge" the nongovernmental organizations to do so. The U.S. vigorously opposed this resolution and our delegation succeeded in getting its language moderated, but was unable to prevent its adoption with lanugage empowering the Director General to urge the nongovernmental organizations to act in accordance with the resolution.

Question 6. If Congress goes no higher than the $39 million approved by the House of Representatives in the supplemental bill does the State Department really think a special conference would be called over the $3 million difference to bring the amount up to the $42 million described as necessary for two year's funding?

Answer. That is a question which can be answered only by the Director General—for it is his responsibility both to meet the Organization's financial obligations (including debts which now total $36 million) and to carry out a program mandated by the membership at the 19th General Conference. With a U.S. payment of $39 million, he could repay UNESCO's debts but would still face the issue of where the Organization could find the funds necessary to carry out the 1977 program without emergency cuts.

On the basis of what we have heard from our own representative at UNESCO Headquarters and from other governments, we can say the following: a final appropriation of only $39 million might cause the Director General to conclude he has no choice but to lay his financial problems before the membership in a special session of the General Conference. The $39 million figure, moreover, would not be enough to maintain our vote at the 1978 General Conference; an amount of $42.7 million is needed for this purpose. If there were some indication that additional funds might be appropriated later this year (to pay more of our back and current dues), the chances for avoiding a special session would be improved. If, however, there were no such indication and the final appropriation is at or near the $40 million level—a figure only slightly above the level of debts owed by the Organization at this time—it is not certain that a special session would be avoided.

Question 7. If the Congress approves funding for more than one year, what assurances does the Administration have that the UNESCO Executive Board will will do anything in its April meeting to alleviate some of the objectionable resolutions passed last November?

Answer. The resolutions of last November were passed by a General Conference and cannot be overturned by the Executive Board. What we can expect at the April–May session of the Executive Board is a demonstration of the willingness of the members to give us the same type of support and understanding which brought about the positive results achieved in Nairobi.

Our traditional friends and other states that supported us in Nairobi have made clear they helped us in the expectation we would return to full participation in UNESCO, including the payment of our assessed contributions.

The appropriation of funds to pay our 1975 and 1976 obligations—which would make us technically current in our payments—would be an important step toward convincing these members that the U.S. does intend to play a leadership role in UNESCO. The appropriation of funds to pay our 1977 assessment—which is due and payable now—would be an even more important step in the same direction.

Question 8. What comment do you have on the following passage from page 33 of the Senate Government Operations Committee report regarding the value of UNESCO:

"But calculating the precise benefits derived from U.S. participation in the organization, and clearly stating the reasons for continued U.S. participation, will become progressively more important *where international organizations are*

so politicized that the real advantages of continued U.S. participation must be weighed against the diplomatic and financial costs of continued involvement." (emphasis added)

Answer. While I agree with the thrust of this statement, I would note that the problems of politicization in the immediate past have been notably less than they were 2–3 years ago. This is in part due to developments—e.g. growing concern of developing countries over the impact of increased oil prices—for which we cannot claim credit—but in part it results from changes in our own policies and approaches, particularly those affecting issues of importance to developing countries.

I might comment that we welcome the inquiry of the Senate Government Operations Committee and we are cooperating fully with its members and staff. Although, as you know, I am not confirmed, it is my intention to establish in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs better mechanisms for coping with the problem of evaluating the effectiveness of international organizations across-the-board.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1977.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: In light of the relatively favorable resolutions at Nairobi of the political difficulties within UNESCO which had led the United States to suspend our contributions to UNESCO over two years ago, and in light of what appears to be the very real possibility of bankruptcy by that agency, we urge you and the members of the International Relations Committee to support the full payment of U.S. arrears and assessment.

By withdrawing financial support, the United States Congress effectively stopped the politicization of an agency that cannot afford to be hamstrung by the vagaries of international politics. The educational, scientific, cultural and humanitarian concerns of UNESCO must be above political manipulation. Now that such attempts at manipulation have been prevented, it is vital that we resume our support for the activities of this necessary agency.

The American Association of University Women, with 190,000 members in all fifty states, has consistently supported the activities of UNESCO. It has been a valuable source of information and has played an important role in developing and expanding the knowledge of the entire world. We urge you to give serious consideration to restoring full funding to UNESCO.

Sincerely,

MARGARET ACKROYD,
International Relations Representative.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR ENGINEERING EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1977.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: We believe that engineering and technology education have a leading role to play in the international effort to improve the economies of the countries of the southern hemisphere. Since the end of World War II we have contributed, often on a voluntary basis, to the building of technical schools and to the development of indigenous faculties in the less developed countries. In this effort we have identified many of the opportunities through our participation in the regional organizations of engineering educators which have been sponsored and partly supported by UNESCO, organizations such as the World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO) and the Union Pan Americana de Asociaciones de Ingenieros (UPADI).

The information exchanged through conferences and exchanges has been mutually beneficial, because engineering and technology education, in all parts of the world are not static and even the most developed systems are able to learn from innovations made in new institutions.

Our entire Board of Directors, in June of 1976, approved a memorandum on technology education which ultimately became one of the bases for the United

States intervention in the 19th UNESCO General Conference in Nairobi, which urged greater attention to this important question of technology education. This intervention was well received and our Society recently had the opportunity for further discussions in this area with Dr. Abdul Kaddoura, Assistant Director General of UNESCO, during his visit to the United States, in which we indicated a number of specific areas to which UNESCO should direct attention.

We are aware that your committee will soon be considering the authorization and appropriation of funds for the payment of overdue and current obligations of the United States to UNESCO, covering the years 1975 through 1978. Because we feel that the engineering and technology education exchanges have been mutually helpful and have contributed greatly to international understanding and progress, we wish to record our support of the Administration's position supporting full funding of the UNESCO obligations.

A similar letter is being sent to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. MARLOWE,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATED SCHOOLS PROJECT,
New York, N.Y., February 28, 1977.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: In reference to your committee's consideration of fiscal appropriations on March 10, we strongly urge restoration of full funds to UNESCO.

The two overriding reasons are (1) the programs of UNESCO are needed more than ever, and (2) the time is appropriate for resuming the payment of U.S. dues.

In his "Message to the World" inaugurating the new administration, President Carter pledged that we would "resolve international differences in a spirit of cooperation", that "we can and will (join) in a common effort based on mutual trust and mutual respect", that the United States will meet its obligation".

The Director-General of UNESCO has worked successfully to defuse the points of controversy. The majority of Member States have shown moderation at the General Conference and a deep concern for the preservation of UNESCO.

We consider that funds to restore UNESCO to full effectiveness will demonstrate a new commitment on the part of the United States to accept its international obligations and cooperate in the common effort to improve the lives of human beings through education, science, culture and communication.

Sincerely yours,

ADELAIDE KERNOCHAN,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS,
Washington, D.C.

The Executive Committee of the American Association of Museums has been concerned at the possibility that the United States would no longer participate fully in the activities of UNESCO. We are very conscious of the negative impact of actions taken by the General Conference of UNESCO in the fall of 1974 and deplore the attitudes which then manifested themselves. However, we have been heartened by the change that has occurred in the last two years, and by the positive, corrective steps taken in regard to Israel's participation in UNESCO's general program at the General Conference in Nairobi. We believe strongly in the goals of UNESCO and feel that only by the continued participation of the United States, at the governmental and non-governmental level, that they can be reached.

In the safeguard of the cultural patrimony, in furthering the protection of monuments and sites, the development of museums, and in the study of museum problems, UNESCO has played an important role. The International Council of Museums, a non-governmental organization, with national committees in some seventy countries, and of which the United States was a founding member, has and continues to provide professional expertise and guidance to UNESCO as well as to other organizations in matters relating to museums. In its relationships with UNESCO, ICOM and the ICOM Committee of the American Association of

the American Association of Museums have had the freedom to carry out their work according to the highest professional and ethical standards and without any interference of a political nature or otherwise.

We strongly believe that UNESCO has an important function to carry out and that the ideals upon which it was sounded are integral to the best interests of the United States. We are convinced that our continued participation and support of UNESCO will be of benefit to the United States and to humankind. Hence, I recommend the full restoration of the United States appropriation to UNESCO including arrears to a total of $97,300,000.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH V. NOBLE, *President,*
Chairman, ICOM Committee of the AAM.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C.

The American Council on Education, representing over sixteen hundred institutions and associations of higher education in the United States, urges you to vote the full amount due or overdue to UNESCO.

American academic institutions are peculiarly conscious of the 1974 political perversions of UNESCO's traditionally non-political role. We regret and resent such politicization of an essentially educational and cultural body. But we are heartened by the results of the 1976 UNESCO Nairobi Conference in which Israel was allowed to join the European regional group. We believe that most UNESCO members, notably the delegations from Africa, honestly tried at Nairobi to rectify the 1974 politically motivated actions.

ACE believes that a gesture of full funding and full faith by the United States is now in order. Any retrogression by a UNESCO majority can surely be dealt with when and if it happens.

We understand that roughly $98 m. will take care of U.S. arrearages and will meet in full the U.S. obligations represented in the 1978 budget. We endorse the payment of this full amount.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. HEYNS,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 9, 1977.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write as Chairman of the Joint Committee on International Activities of the American Society for Engineering Education. This Committee, a Board level Committee of that Society, is responsible for advice and counsel to the Board on all matters relating to the international dimensions of engineering and technology education throughout the United States.

My Committee has authorized me to inform you that we most strongly favor and endorse the administration position for full funding to UNESCO in the amount of 97.2 millions of dollars to cover payments to UNESCO for calendar years 1975–1978. This was, I believe, the position of President Ford and has been reaffirmed as the position of the Carter administration in the February 3 letter addressed to you by Mr. Vance.

UNESCO is admittedly far from perfect as an organization. But it seems critically important to us that the United States participate fully in the work of such bodies not only to exert our engineering and technological influence but, also, our leadership capabilities. Only thusly can we assist those who have worked with us in the past toward improvements in these organizations and in their own countries. We can only do this from within.

Thus we urge you and your committee as well as the Congress to act favorably on the recommendations from President Carter as transmitted to you by the Secretary of State.

Yours very truly,

H. E. HOELSCHER,
Professor-at-Large.

NEWS FROM FREEDOM HOUSE

WILLKIE MEMORIAL BUILDING,
New York, N.Y., February 17, 1977.

CRITIC OF UNESCO URGES UNITED STATES TO PAY ITS FULL DUES NOW, BUT MONITOR ORGANIZATION'S ACTIVITIES "AS NEVER BEFORE"

NEW YORK, February 17.—Freedom House, recently one of the sharpest critics of UNESCO, today urged the United States to pay the international organization "the full amount due under our treaty commitment," while monitoring, "as never before," the plans and programs of the institution. The U.S. owes $39 million in arrearages for 1975–76 and $30.3 million so far this year.

The executive committee of the human rights group declared that UNESCO had been designed to stand above "partisan hostilities, the haven of common values where the weapons were left at the door." The group renewed charges that member-states of UNESCO have been using the organization to propose varied controls over the mass news media and block Israel from normal participation in the institution.

The controversy over Israel led the U.S. to withhold its dues in 1975. Since American payments amount to one-quarter of UNESCO's income, the organization has faced critical financial problems. The U.S. paid just enough back dues last year to be able to participate in November at UNESCO's biennial general conference in Nairobi. There, first steps were taken to restore Israel to participation.

The biennial was also asked to act on a declaration of the "use" of the mass news media drafted by the Soviet Union. This declaration, put off for two years, would have made governments responsible for the activities of journalists under their jurisdiction. The declaration, said Freedom House, was "one aspect" of the broader "challenge to press freedom" promoted through conferences and specialists "retained by UNESCO." Since last June, the New York-based group has repeatedly criticized many of these proposals.

Freedom House today stated that it considered recommending the U.S. pay only the arrearages now and urge member-states to adopt UNESCO programs which promote the "free flow of ideas." That course, said the statement, "would have the practical effect of bankrupting UNESCO by this Fall." Then, it added, "there could be little opportunity to devise and apply constructive programs."

The voluntary group continued, "the present financial emergency should be taken by member-nations in UNESCO as reflecting America's deepest concern over the restrictive course the organization has been following, and our ending of the emergency as proof of our commitment to UNESCO's constructive work."

Freedom House called upon the U.S. to "monitor all UNESCO work plans and actual programs" and "lobby" the nations individually, using "all the diplomatic levers in our hands, as we did with some success last November" at Nairobi.

The U.S. was also asked to provide technology and technical assistance in the training of journalists from the Third World. Those nations, in turn, were urged to "improve mass news media exchanges under increasingly free, less restrictive procedures." The statement added, "only news which is made accessible can be widely disseminated." Third World countries have charged that Western news media distort or fail to report many events in their areas. This has been described as an "imbalance" of news from the industrialized countries. Freedom House urged the U.S. to "encourage better balance in the international flow of information."

The statement opposed "using UNESCO as a political weapon against Isarel, or any other nation that has fulfilled its commitments to UNESCO itself."

The 1,000-word statement was titled "UNESCO and U.S. financial support: an advisory on the issues." The full text follows:

UNESCO AND U.S. FINANCIAL SUPPORT: AN ADVISORY ON THE ISSUES

By the Executive Committee of Freedom House

The United States faces the immediate question of whether to pay UNESCO some $39 million in 1976 back dues which have been withheld, and the $30.3 million already due for 1977. The 1976 dues were held back because Congress, on a resolution by Sen. Clifford Case (R., N.J.), responded to UNESCO's elimination of Israel from the organization's European group, and related measures. At

Nairobi last November, first steps were taken to restore Israel to the European group. Final action is expected when the European Committee meets later this year.

This is not the only disturbing act that has been committed or threatened in UNESCO in recent years. Many member-nations of UNESCO have sought to make the organization restrictive rather than universal; oriented primarily to political rather than educational, scientific and cultural affairs; becoming a world-wide force for governmental control of information rather than the champion of "the free flow of ideas by word and image."

Specifically, over the past six years, numerous conferences of governmental representatives and specialists retained by UNESCO have devised elaborate plans which foster governmental ownership or control of the mass news media. One aspect of this challenge to press freedom came to a head at the biennial general conference of UNESCO at Nairobi in November: the Soviet Union's draft declaration that would make governments responsible for the activities and reportage of news services run by their nationals—that draft was sent to a negotiating group for reexamination in two years.

It is heartening that many Third World, particularly African, nations at UNESCO's Nairobi conference recognized the fallacy of applying the Soviet's restrictive resolution to correct the imbalance in the flow of information. These Third World countries made possible the delay which now enables UNESCO to work constructively to assist Third World news-media development in the spirit of UNESCO's constitution: advancing "the free flow of ideas." Nonetheless, the delay is only temporary and the press freedom issue is far from settled. The year-round programs of UNESCO in the mass news media field may still be captured by the conception of "developmental journalism" increasingly advanced in UNESCO discussion and resolutions. By this conception the news media are deemed essential to economic development and therefore are expected to serve the development goals of Third World governments.

Under this rationalization, member states have called upon UNESCO for assistance in establishing government-run news agencies, creating legal and ethical codes for journalists which governments would enforce, and threatening to increase restrictions on existing, free international news services.

Freedom House recognizes the urgent need to assist Third World countries in developing not only their economies and market systems, but also their essential channels of communication. There are indeed great voids in domestic communication within Third World countries, and between each of them and the industrialized world. And there is an imbalance in the flow of information.

That imbalance must not be altered, however, by applying further controls on the freedom of information; fewer than 20% of the world's population today lives in countries with free press and broadcasting systems. It is especially regrettable that UNESCO be made the vehicle for promoting these restrictions on the free flow of information and ideas. From the start of the United Nations, UNESCO has, more than any other part of the organization, embodied the higher aspirations of freedom of the world community. The Security Council and the General Assembly were expected to reflect the tensions and adversary conflicts among the nations; the founders at San Francisco, in 1945, were not naive. But UNESCO was considered above these partisan hostilities, the haven of common values were the weapons were left at the door. If that non-partisan spirit is destroyed, UNESCO may have little reason for survival.

In reaffirming these values and calling for their defense, Freedom House believes it vital to point out that these are not "American" or "imperialist" or "white" principles. They are the core of the entire humane civilization that has evolved in most parts of the world over the last five millennia, and are shared universally without respect to geography, ideology or race. We recognize that many of the governments of the world have no commitment to press or other freedoms, and that we cannot compel them to change their views. But to allow bodies like UNESCO to become the official agencies of restraints and vengeful politics, and to bestow the official seal of approval on these activities, is entirely unacceptable.

Giving full weight to these considerations, Freedom House believes, the United States should now pay UNESCO the full amount due under our treaty commitment. We have considered the possibility of paying only the arrearage now, making known to member states our strong desire to see UNESCO adopt programs reaffirming the organization's original, historic constitutional commitment "to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image" and, to universality of membership, before full American support is restored. This course would have the

practical effect of bankrupting UNESCO by this Fall. If that happens, there could be little opportunity to devise and apply constructive programs. Furthermore, the U.S. is obligated by treaty, and therefore international law, to pay its dues. This country must not set an example that flouts the very rule of law it is striving to protect.

We believe, therefore, that the present financial emergency should be taken by member-nations in UNESCO as reflecting America's deepest concern over the restrictive course the organization has been following; and our ending of the emergency as proof of our commitment to UNESCO's constructive work. At the same time, the U.S. should lobby the member-nations of UNESCO individually, bringing to bear all of the diplomatic levers in our hands, as we did with some success last November at the General Conference at Nairobi.

As we restore ourselves to full membership, the U.S. should state clearly and forcefully:

1. To the Third World, particularly those nations which helped delay the Soviet proposals which would have restricted international press freedom: It is in the interest of Third World countries themselves to strive to improve mass news media exchanges under increasingly free, less restrictive procedures. Only news which is made accessible can be widely disseminated.

2. To all countries: The U.S., in turn, will dedicate technical skills and planning to the effective training of Third World journalists, expansion of news technology in Third World areas, and—within the bounds of free journalistic practice—encourage provision of better balance in the international flow of information.

3. To UNESCO Member-States: The U.S.—as never before—will fully monitor all UNESCO work plans and actual programs and consult with member-states on ways to ensure fulfillment of the organization's commitment to broadening rather than constricting freedom. The U.S. is firmly opposed to using UNESCO as a political weapon against Israel, or any other nation that has fulfilled its commitments to UNESCO itself.

America thus would call for nothing less than the actual and perceived restoration of UNESCO's constitutional commitment to the "free flow of ideas," as well as to its role as a meeting-place for all nations willing to meet their Charter obligations to it.

TEXT OF TELEGRAM LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.A. SENT TO EACH MEMBER OF THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE

March 4, 1977.

The League of Women Voters of the U.S.A. supports full funding for UNESCO in keeping with U.S. treaty obligations, It is important for the U.S. to continue to press for depoliticization of UNESCO and, in League's opinion this can best be accomplished by working within this international specialized agency.

RUTH CLUSEN, *President.*

RESOLUTION ON UNESCO FUNDING

Whereas, The 93rd Congress enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, which withheld funding from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) until the President could certify that the organization (1) has adopted policies that are fully consistent with its educational, scientific, and cultural objectives and (2) has taken concrete steps to correct its recent actions of a primary political character; and

Whereas, On December 29, 1976, President Ford sent letters to the Speaker, United States House of Representatives, and to the President of the Senate certifying that the conditions of Section 9(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 have been met and requesting that the Congress authorize and appropriate funds to pay arrearages and other assessments owed by the United States to the organization as well as the assessment to become due in Fiscal Years 1977 and 1978; and

Whereas, UNESCO is the primary inter-governmental organization devoted to promoting library and information science and the only international agency which is concerned with education, science, and culture; and

Whereas, The American Library Association is on record in support of the principles of international cooperation relating to libraries and education: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Library Association endorses restoration of funds for UNESCO; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Library Association encourages Congress to appropriate these funds promptly; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Director submit this resolution to the chairman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Sponsored by: International Relations Committee.

Submitted by: E. J. Josey, Councilor-at-Large.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES, AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 28, 1977

By its actions at the November 1976 meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, the General Conference of UNESCO has paved the way for Israel to resume its full participation as a member of that body. These actions essentially undo the unfortunate actions of that body at its November 1974 meeting, actions which were condemned in resolutions passed by the APA Council at its January 1975 and January 1976 meetings. It is therefore appropriate for APA Council to revise its stand with regard to UNESCO, as reflected in the 1975 and 1976 resolutions.

Therefore, the Council of the American Psychological Association:

(1) Commends the UNESCO General Conference for its positive actions in deciding to permit each regional grouping to vote its own membership;

(2) Expresses the hope that the spirit of the Nairobi meeting will pave the way for a new era of international cooperation, in keeping with UNESCO's constitutional purpose "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture;" that the unfortunate events of the past three years will lead to increased vigilance in UNESCO and among those supporting that organization, in order to avoid politicization and diversion of UNESCO from its original principles and purposes;

(3) Reaffirms its strong commitment to the basic principles and purposes of UNESCO and espresses its continuing support for UNESCO activities, conducted within the context of its original mandate;

(4) Encourages members of APA, as well as other psychologists, educators, scientists, scholars, and artists to continue their collaboration with UNESCO in keeping with the high purposes of that organization and the prevention of politicization;

(5) Recommend a lifting of the Congressional block on payment of U.S. dues to UNESCO;

(6) Requests that the APA Central Office communicate this resolution to the Director General of UNESCO, the U.S. National Commission forUNESCO, and other interested bodies.

MARCH 15, 1977.

Hon. JOHN C. DANFORTH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DANFORTH: For the past two years I have been Vice President of the International Federation of Landscape Architects. Prior to that, for six years, I was the delegate from the American Society on the Federation's Grand Council. This letter urges you to support the full appropriation for UNESCO from the United States.

UNESCO is a major source of support to the International Federation of Landscape Architects. It provides us with a small part of our funding, but of greater importance it provides our Federation with an official international recognition as well as an opportunity to participate in international affairs on the part of our profession. The International Federation of Landscape Architects is currently a Category B organization for UNESCO but it has applied for the Category A status.

In 1974 UNESCO provided space for our Grand Council meeting at its headquarters in Paris and, in addition, through the good work of its top officials, provided an important source of arbitration to iron out some difficulties with the amount of financial contribution being made by our American Society. In 1975, through a grant to the American Society of Landscape Architects, UNESCO provided important assistance for a regional meeting of landscape architects from North and South America held in San Antonio, Texas. Although I exerted every possible effort, comparable U.S. assistance for such a meeting could not be obtained.

An international professional organization, such as the International Federation of Landscape Architects, provides an excellent means for bringing about the type of understanding that is necessary if we are going to have a permanent peace in the world. Support for our activities on the part of an international organization means much to us as it does to other international groups representing the other major professions such as architects, engineers, physicians, etc.

Some of the activities of UNESCO have been quite controversial and no doubt certain of them will always be so. In international work, particularly, I find that one does not very often get one's own way and that it is necessary to make a rather considerable adjustment in your point of view if any type of progress is to be made. I believe that an international organization is important if not absolutely essential and that it is virtually impossible to have one without encountering the same type of difficulties that UNESCO has been experiencing.

Consequently I would appreciate anything you can do to support the appropriation and any effort you can make in behalf of UNESCO despite the fact that none of us can approve of everything it may do.

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

ELDRIDGE LOVELACE,
Vice President, Western Region.

THE ALLIANCE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1977.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Dirksen Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: As Executive Director of the Alliance, I am writing with respect to the work of Unesco and the strong, positive working relationship that our group has had with that organization. Over the past few years, Unesco has been a leader in international, environmental education efforts. In cooperation with the United Nations Environment Program and other members of the U.N. family, Unesco has mounted a well organized effort in this important education area. U.S. organizations and professionals have played key roles in the development of this program. In turn, the United States has benefited from the efforts stimulated by the Unesco administered program in environmental education.

One example will help to illustrate the point. Last year, Unesco supported the preparations and conducting of the North American Regional Seminar on Enviornmental Education. That meeting was organized and convened by the Alliance last October in St. Louis. The Seminar has contributed significantly to important efforts in this country by helping to delineate the major issues and priorities that U.S. educators need to address in this important area. This is only one small example of the vital work conducted by Unesco in the environmental area that is so vital to us all.

It is my understanding that hearings are scheduled on various aspects of U.S. support for the operations of Unesco. I would like to encourage every consideration for fully supporting Unesco and its continuing efforts to promote international understanding and cooperation in matters of vital importance to the global community.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. ALDRICH,
Executive Director.

FREEDOM HOUSE,
New York, N.Y., March 17, 1977.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I am pleased to transmit, on behalf of the Executive Committee of Freedom House, our advisory on the subject of United States payments to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Freedom House, during the past year, has been one of the sharpest critics of UNESCO. We particularly deplored activities of the organization which implicitly supported the control, regulation or harassment of domestic and international mass news media by governments and consortia of governments. We are concerned over the recommendations approved by Member States participating in the

Intergovernmental Conference on Communication Policies in Latin America and the Caribbean, July 1976, which recommendations have been "noted" for possible implementation in the forthcoming two-year budget of UNESCO. We are also concerned over the Soviet Union's draft resolution, considered and postponed at the Nairobi biennial of UNESCO, November 1976, by which governmental control of the mass media would become the international standard.

These objections notwithstanding, Freedom House believes that, for the reasons outlined in the accompanying advisory, certain payments should be made immediately to UNESCO. In making these payments, the United States should state clearly the concerns and commitments also described in the advisory.

Members of the Executive Committee of Freedom House who participated in the preparation of this advisory were former U.S. Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, Whitney North Seymour, Roscoe Drummond, Philip van Slyck, Leon Levy, Caroline K. Simon, Ned W. Bandler, Jr., John W. Riehm, Burns W. Roper and Jacques D. Wimpfheimer.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD R. SUSSMAN.

UNESCO AND U.S. FINANCIAL SUPPORT: AN ADVISORY ON THE ISSUES

The United States faces the immediate question of whether to pay UNESCO some $39 million in 1976 back dues which have been withheld, and $30.3 million already due for 1977. The 1976 dues were held back by Congress in response to UNESCO's barring of Israel from the organization's European group, and related measures. At Nairobi last November, steps were taken to include Israel in the European group.

This is not the only disturbing act that has been committed or threatened in UNESCO in recent years. Many Member States of UNESCO have sought to make the organization restrictive rather than universal; oriented primarily to political rather than educational, scientific and cultural affairs; becoming a worldwide force for governmental control of information rather than the champion of "the free flow of ideas by word and image."

Specifically, over the past six years, numerous conferences of governmental representatives and specialists retained by UNESCO have devised elaborate plans which foster governmental ownership or control of the mass news media. One aspect of this challenge to press freedom came to a head at the biennial general conference of UNESCO at Nairobi in November 1976: The Soviet Union's draft declaration that would make governments responsible for the activities and reportage of news services run by their nationals—that draft was sent to a negotiating group for reexamination in two years.

It is heartening that many Third World, particularly African, nations at UNESCO's Nairobi conference recognized the fallacy of applying the Soviet's restrictive resolution to correct the imbalance in the flow of information. These Third World countries made possible the delay which now enables UNESCO to work constructively to assist Third World news-media development in the spirit of UNESCO's constitution: advancing "the free flow of ideas." Nonetheless, the delay is only temporary and the press freedom issue is far from settled. The year-round programs of UNESCO in the mass news media field may still be captured by the conception of "developmental journalism" increasingly advanced in UNESCO discussions and resolutions. By this conception the news media are deemed essential to economic development and therefore are expected to serve the development goals of Third World governments.

Under this rationalization, Member States have called upon UNESCO for assistance in establishing government-run news agencies, creating legal and ethical codes for journalists which governments would enforce, and threatening to increase restrictions on existing, free international news services.

Freedom House recognizes the urgent need to assist Third World countries in developing not only their economies and market systems, but also their essential channels of communication. There are indeed great voids in domestic communication within Third World countries, and between each of them and the industralized world. And there is an imbalance in the flow of information.

That imbalance must not be altered, however, by applying further controls on the freedom of information; fewer than 20% of the world's population today lives in countries with free press and broadcasting systems. It is especially regrettable that UNESCO be made the vehicle for promoting these restrictions on the free flow of information and ideas. From the start of the United Nations

UNESCO has, more than any other part of the organization, embodied the higher aspirations of freedom of the world community. The Security Council and the General Assembly were expected to reflect the tensions and adversary conflicts among the nations; the founders at San Francisco, in 1945, were not naive, but UNESCO was considered above these partisan hostilities, the haven of common values where the weapons were left at the door. If that non-partisan spirit is destroyed, UNESCO may have little reason for survival.

In reaffirming these values and calling for their defense, Freedom House believes it vital to point out that these are not "American" or "imperialist" or "white" principles. They are the core of the entire humane civilization that has evolved in most parts of the world over the last five millennia, and are shared universally without respect to geography, ideology or race. We recognize that many of the governments of the world have no commitment to press or other freedoms, and that we cannot compel them to change their views. But to allow bodies like UNESCO to become the official agencies of restraints and vengeful politics, and to bestow the official seal of approval on these activities, is entirely unacceptable.

Giving full weight to these considerations, Freedom House believes, the United States should now pay UNESCO the full amount due under our treaty commitment. We have considered the possibility of paying only the arrearage now, making known to member states our strong desire to see UNESCO adopt programs reaffirming the organization's original, historic constitutional commitment "to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image" and, to universality of membership, before full American support is restored. This course would have the practical effect of bankrupting UNESCO by this Fall. If that happens, there could be little opportunity to devise and apply constructive programs, Furthermore, the U.S. is obligated by treaty, and therefore international law, to pay its dues. This country must not set an example that flouts the very rule of law it is striving to protect.

We believe, therefore, that the present financial emergency should be taken by Member Nations in UNESCO as reflecting America's deepest concern over the restrictive course the organization has been following; and our ending of the emergency as proof of our commitment to UNESCO's constructive work. At the same time, the U.S. should lobby the Member Nations of UNESCO individually, bringing to bear all of the diplomatic levers in our hands, as we did with some success last November at the General Conference at Nairobi.

As we restore ourselves to full membership, the U.S. should state clearly and forcefully:

(1) To the Third World, particularly those nations which helped delay the Soviet proposals which would have restricted international press freedom: It is in the interest of Third World countries themselves to strive to improve mass news media exchanges under increasingly free, less restrictive procedures. Only news which is made accessible can be widely disseminated.

(2) To all countries: The U.S., in turn, will dedicate technical skills and planning to the effective training of Third World journalists, expansion of news technology in Third World areas, and—within the bounds of free journalistic practice—encourage provision of better balance in the international flow of information.

(3) To UNESCO Member States: The U.S.—as never before—will fully monitor all UNESCO work plans and actual programs and consult with member-states on ways to ensure fulfillment of the organization's commitment to broadening rather than constricting freedom. The U.S. is firmly opposed to using UNESCO as a political weapon against Israel, or any other nation that has fulfilled its commitments to UNESCO itself.

America thus would call for nothing less than the actual and perceived restoration of UNESCO's constitutional commitment to the "free flow of ideas," as well as to its role as a meeting-place for all nations willing to meet their Charter obligations to it.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR ENGINEERING EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1977.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: We believe that engineering and technology education have a leading role to play in the international effort to improve the economies of the countries of the southern hemisphere. Since the end of World War II we

have contributed, often on a voluntary basis, to the building of technical schools and to the development of indigeneous faculties in the less developed countries. In this effort we have identified many of the opportunities through our participation in the regional organizations of engineering educators which have been sponsored and partly supported by UNESCO, organizations such as the World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO) and the Union Pan Americana de Asociaciones de Ingenieros (UPADI).

The information exchanged through conferences and exchanges has been mutually beneficial, because engineering and technology education, in all parts of the world are not static and even the most developed systems are able to learn from innovations made in new institutions.

Our entire Board of Directors, in June of 1976, approved a memorandum on technology education which ultimately became one of the bases for the United States intervention in the 19th UNESCO General Conference in Nairobi, which urged greater attention to this important question of technology education. This intervention was well received and our Society recently had the opportunity for further discussions in this area with Dr. Abdul Kaddoura, Assistant Director General of UNESCO, during his visit to the United States, in which we indicated a number of specific areas to which UNESCO should direct attention.

We are aware that your committee will soon be considering the authorization and appropriation of funds for the payment of overdue and current obligations of the United States to UNESCO, covering the years 1975 through 1978. Because we feel that the engineering and technology education exchanges have been mutually helpful and have contributed greatly to international understanding and progress, we wish to record our support of the Administration's position supporting full funding of the UNESCO obligations.

A similar letter is being sent to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. MARLOWE,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1977.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: As President of the National Council for the Social Studies and as Executive Director of NCSS, we urge you to support the request for full restoration of funding for the U.S. commitment to UNESCO, for the years 1975 through 1978, in the amount of $97.2 million.

The aims of NCSS, a 21,000 member organization of social studies teachers across this nation, have always included a commitment to increased international understanding. Since our founding in 1921 as a teaching branch of the American Historical Association, the Council has sought to promote human dignity and international cooperation. UNESCO seeks the same ends.

Our interest in UNESCO is more than academic; it is personal. We have participated in several UNESCO activities, which have been rewarding for the entire profession. Most recently, for example, NCSS participated in the North American Regional Seminar on Environmental Education in St. Louis. Again, last spring, the Council sponsored a UNESCO conference at Michigan State University concerning the teaching about peace and human dignity in the social studies. Both had important contributions to make to the profession.

Again, we urge restoration of full funding for our commitment to UNESCO.

Sincerely,

BRIAN J. LARKIN,
Executive Director.
HOWARD D. MEHLINGER,
President.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
THE FLETCHER SCHOOL OF LAW AND DIPLOMACY,
March 17, 1977.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. John Ritch).

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: In accordance with my recent conversation with your assistant, John Ritch, I am enclosing this statement concerning U.S. participation in UNESCO. It is my understanding that this will be inserted in the record of your hearings on this subject.

Sincerely,

H. FIELD HAVILAND,
Professor of International Politics.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT BY H. FIELD HAVILAND, VICE-CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to make this statement concerning U.S. participation in UNESCO. As Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Council of Learned Societies, which is an organization whose members are 42 professional associations in the fields of the humanities and social sciences, I have been particularly concerned with UNESCO's activities concerning these fields, and I have served as a member of the U.S. National Commission on UNESCO from 1971 to 1977. From 1976 to 1977, I was Vice-Chairman of the Commission.

My principal recommendation is that the U.S. Congress approve the position adopted by Presidents Ford and Carter and the Department of State that the United States pay to UNESCO our overdue obligations for fiscal years 1975 and 1976, totaling $42.3 million, and our current dues for fiscal years 1977 and 1978, totaling $55.1 million. My reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

(1) Substantial progress has been made in alleviating the situations which gave rise to U.S. termination of financial contributions to UNESCO. The exclusion of Israel from the European group in UNESCO has been reversed. The criticism of Israel regarding excavations in Jerusalem and her educational and cultural policies in occupied Arab territories has not escalated further, and there has been some progress in improving these situations. Identification of Zionism with racism has been avoided. A draft declaration which, among other things, endorsed state control of the media has been postponed.

(2) The United States has always considered UNESCO to be of great importance to the interests of this country since UNESCO is the principal international agency concerned with the advancement of education, the sciences, and the humanities. American specialists in these fields generally consider that UNESCO plays a significant role in strengthening international cooperation in these areas and especially in aiding the progress of the less developed nations. At the same time, we recognize that there is room for improvement in the performance of UNESCO, especially to concentrate its scarce recources on the most crucial programs.

(3) Continued withholding of funds is likely to be counter-productive in relation to the interests of the United States. The loss of 25 percent of its budget for two years has seriously damaged the work of UNESCO, and a continuation of this situation would be disasterous. This has antagonized and injured countries which are our friends, including the more developed, as well as the less developed, countries. The recent improvements in the UNESCO climate were significantly aided by such countries, especially in Europe and Africa, who hope that these developments will lead to a resumption of U.S. payments and cooperation. The new Director-General of UNESCO, Amadou Mahatr M'Bow of Senegal, has played a central role in these matters. At the same time, the withholding of funds has tended to play into the hands of those who have been antagonistic toward the United States and Israel, including forcing UNESCO to borrow $22 million from Arab member states. If the United States continues to withhold funds, the consequences for the United States will be even worse than at present.

(4) The best way for the United States to deal with the problems confronting UNESCO is not to withhold support and participation but to resume an active leading role within the organization. There will continue to be challenges to U.S. interests within UNESCO, as in all international—and national—organizations. The most effective response is not to withdraw, leaving a vacuum which tends to benefit our opponents, but to strive for a more effective active posture within the organization.

(5) The payment of dues to UNESCO is a legal obligation binding on the United States in accordance with the UNESCO Constitution to which the United States is a party, in accordance with a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress. It is regrettable that the United States is the only country that has restored to the withholding of its full dues for such a long period of time. Even Israel has not done this.

(6) Only partial repayment of dues, which a few people have suggested, would be subject to all of the criticisms cited above and would probably heighten the negative response to this use of financial sanctions.

(7) Several major U.S. private organizations concerned with UNESCO have endorsed the position recommended by the Executive Branch. These include the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and the National Council on Education. Others, including the ACLS, have decided it was not appropriate for them to take an official position on such an issue. I know of no major professional association which has opposed the recommendation of the Executive Branch.

Thank you for permitting me to make this statement.

○